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Abstract

This quantitative study was designed to exam leadership styles of school principals and student effectiveness in selected urban elementary schools in the State of Ohio. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) assessed school principals’ leadership styles as transformational, transactional or laissez-faire. The purpose of this study was to identify leadership styles of school principals in emerging, urban schools and to determine if certain leadership styles had a relationship to school effectiveness as defined by growth in the Performance Index. Emerging schools were defined as schools that showed a growth in their Performance Index over a three-year period. This study included both high performing schools as well as low performing schools; more importantly, the study examined schools that have shown growth over a three-year period. The primary goal of this study was to examine the predictive relationship between measures of leadership styles and school effectiveness. “Is there a relationship between leadership styles and school effectiveness or growth as measured by the Performance Index in elementary schools in the State of Ohio?” The researcher hypothesized that specific leadership styles will have a relationship on the school performance index as measured by differences in performance index scores from year one to year three. Eighty-one participants volunteered for the study. This included nineteen principals and sixty-two teachers.

Multiple Regression was used to examine the relationship between the principal’s leadership styles (Independent Variable) and growth in the Performance Index (Dependent Variable). The 19 principals’ dominant leadership style was transformational leadership. The
regression model failed to be significant; therefore, based on the data, leadership as measured by the MLQ-5X is not a good predictor for growth. The relationship on school leadership and growth was not significantly substantial. Although there was no predictive relationship, the data verify that the 19 schools that have shown growth had transformational leaders. Future research suggests a larger sample size to determine if leadership styles have a relationship to student growth.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Federal Educational Reform

The *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) signed by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002 has changed our educational system. Schools and school districts are now held accountable to improve student achievement. Therefore, leadership in schools is crucial in the success of all students. Students in grades 3-8 and then in high school are required to achieve proficiency on the state assessment exams. According to the NCLB website (http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/execsumm.html), this act will ensure that all children achieve at high levels.

The NCLB Act will strengthen Title I accountability by requiring States to implement statewide accountability systems covering all public schools and students. These systems must be based on challenging State standards in reading and mathematics, annual testing for all students in grades 3-8, and annual statewide progress objectives ensuring that all groups of students reach proficiency within 12 years. Assessment results and State progress objectives must be broken out by poverty, race, ethnicity, disability, and limited English proficiency to ensure that no group is left behind. School districts and schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward statewide proficiency goals will, over time, be subject to improvement, corrective action, and restructuring measures aimed at getting them back on course to meet State standards. Schools that meet or exceed AYP objectives or close achievement gaps will be eligible for State Academic Achievement Awards. (p. 1)
Accountability of student performance on state achievement exams has changed our educational system. Educators are examining, researching and applying best practice strategies to ensure student mastery. Effective school leadership will aid in school improvement. This study examined urban, elementary schools in the State of Ohio that have shown growth in the Performance Index over a three-year period. Leadership styles of these principals were studied to assist scholars in studying school leadership to improve student effectiveness.

Statement of the Problem

Leadership in today’s educational system is becoming increasingly important. Parents across the nation send their children to school for a quality education, yet many schools are failing to educate all children. The face of education has changed dramatically over the past century. After World War II, when the economy was booming, a person with an eighth-grade education could support a family, purchase a car, and pay college tuition for their children by having a blue-collar job. Times have changed. In the 21st century, a person with a high school education may struggle to accomplish those same goals. Education is becoming increasingly important for our children. According to the United States Census Bureau, a person’s educational level has a direct correlation with their level of income. A high school dropout’s average yearly earnings is $18,900, a high school graduate’s average earnings is $25,990, a person with a bachelor’s degree earns $45,400, and a college graduate with an advanced degree (M.D., D.D.S. and D.V.M.) earns $99,300. (http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf). This factor alone clearly supports the need for a quality education.

Jobs in America are becoming more technology based. The American economy relies on a highly educated labor pool. Workers today must be able to use technology, problem solve and work well within a team to make informed decisions. Without these skills, workers will struggle
to be successful. Therefore, an outstanding education is important. Schools must prepare students for this type of work environment.

A quality education, however, has many variables in the success formula such as the quality of the school, a powerful teacher, supportive parents, and a culture where failure is not an option. Leadership is another important variable. Excellent schools have leaders who positively influence their stakeholders resulting in high levels of student achievement. Unfortunately, not every school is achieving at high levels. Our current educational system fails to meet the needs of every child and results in many problems. Most of these problems have a direct impact on student achievement.

A significant number of urban schools are not meeting the academic and social needs of their students. One only has to read the newspaper or watch television to see the disarray of the public school system in the United States. What are the major problems in urban schools? Poor student achievement, unsafe schools, horrendous dropout rates and ineffective teaching methodologies are common assumptions in urban education. According to Rothstein (1996), urban schools are “overcrowded, underfunded, and dysfunctional” (p. 158). Thus, urban education has many layers of challenges. Students come to school tired because of poor living conditions, hungry because parents or grandparents cannot provide nutritious meals, and angry because of society’s low expectations. Predmore (2004) stated, “Problems include over-crowded classrooms, dilapidated facilities, lack of equipment, teacher shortages, and low student achievement” (p. 19). Teachers are exhausted because of poor working conditions, lack of support from administrators and parents, and the constant pressure to reach high levels of student achievement. Administrators are over-worked and under pressure to improve student achievement, decrease dropout rates, and establish safe environments.
Rothstein (1996) stated, “Urban schools are responsible for sorting out and evaluating the merits of students and assigning them to various tracks in the reaches of learning and earning” (p. 160). Schools are “…successful depending on their socioeconomic class of the students. The more successful schools cater to middle class students and organize themselves around college-bound curricula and standards of discipline” (p. 161). Gordon (2003) noted the problems of urban populations are multi-factored.

Urban populations are diverse and mobile and at the same time stereotypic and immobile. These populations vary with respect to their status (ethnicity, culture, class, social economic status) and their functions (language, cognitive style, affective response patterns). These differences have major implications for the ways in which educational opportunities are designed and delivered. Yet the various populations, despite the many worlds they represent, are ultimately held to a common set of mainstream standards. (pp. 203-204)

Leadership in schools is now more important than ever. Students deserve an education that will enable them to have options, an education that will allow the student to live a productive life. An examination of leadership styles in emerging, urban schools would allow current and future administrators to examine if one type of leadership style is most effective in urban schools leading to high levels of student success.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assist school administrators and educational researchers in identifying various leadership styles of school principals in emerging, urban schools. Schools that have shown growth over a period such as three years have unique characteristics. The study examined leaders who have led their school community to continued growth. The goal was for
current and future administrators to utilize the results of the study to deliver powerful leadership to their school community.

Principal Leadership and Student Effectiveness

The challenges for urban educational leadership are multi-factored. The possibilities to influence change are endless once communities begin to take ownership in the shared responsibility of educating children. Urban educational leaders will have to take the lead in transforming education through researched based practices that result in high performing schools. There is a strong correlation between effective leadership and student achievement.

“…our meta-analysis indicates that principals can have a profound effect on the achievement of students in their schools” (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003, p. 38). Leadership can have a reverse effect on student achievement. “. . . leaders can also have a marginal, or worse, a negative impact on achievement. When leaders concentrate on the wrong school and/or classroom practices, or miscalculate the magnitude or order of the change they are attempting to implement” (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, p. 5).

The principal, as an instructional leader, must understand best practice teaching strategies based on current research. Therefore, urban schools need principals to hire teachers who wholly understand children. Effective teachers break down the barriers between children and school. They know children on a personal and academic level. Children need to know that teachers care about them and strive to understand what motivates them.

Quality teachers have a direct impact on children’s learning. With the No Child Left Behind Act, schools are required to perform at high standards. Therefore, principals must hire, train, model, and guide teachers to excellence. According to Shellard and Protheroe (2000), the following characteristics were likely to be found in classrooms of highly effective teachers:
Time on task is high, and is focused on academic content; Learning goals are clear; Instruction encourages students to be active learners; Individual differences between students are acknowledged; Skills based instruction is balanced with higher-level instruction and the classroom climate is supportive and collaborative. (p. 54)

How do we change our current educational system so that all children are learning at high levels? Change begins with effective leadership. School districts need powerful superintendents and principals willing to foster high levels of student achievement. Every child can learn. Effective leaders believe in this statement and live the mission that all children can and will learn at high levels.

According to Avolio and Bass (2004), there were three types of leadership, transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. These three leadership styles have different characteristics. Transformational leadership involves a leader changing the associates’ awareness or behavior, transactional leadership focuses on the exchange between the leader and associate, and laissez-faire is an avoidance style.

Significance of the Study

This study measured leadership styles of school principals in urban schools that have show growth in performance Index over a three-year period. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio was used to measure the various types of leadership styles. The Ohio Department of Education Web Site was utilized to find individual school data such as the Performance Index, Economic Disadvantaged population and the number of years the principal was employed at the school.

This study will allow researchers and practitioners to examine different leadership styles of school principals in urban schools that have demonstrated growth. By studying urban schools
that have shown growth over a three-year period, this study will allow other urban schools to examine and apply the successful leadership styles in their schools. This study is also important because it will determine if emerging schools have similar or different leadership styles. Therefore, assisting researchers and practitioners in creating a transformational environment to improve student effectiveness. The end-result is for all students to be successful and providing outstanding leadership is one key variable.

Research Hypothesis

This quantitative study examined leadership styles in urban, emerging elementary schools in the State of Ohio. The question “Is there a relationship between leadership styles and school effectiveness or growth as measured by the Performance Index in elementary schools in the State of Ohio?” will be examined. This study was significant because it will add to the literature and focus on leadership styles of emerging urban elementary schools. Emerging schools will be defined as schools that have shown growth in the Performance Index over a three-year period.

The objective of this research was to identify leadership styles of urban, elementary principals in the state of Ohio and determine if there was a relationship between school effectiveness and leadership styles. School effectiveness will be determined by the Performance Index (0.0-120.0) as determined by the State of Ohio. Leadership styles will be determined using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X) by Bernard Bass (Bass & Avoilo, 1994). The MLQ-5X identifies three leadership styles such as transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership. The researcher expects to find transformational leadership as the dominant leadership style of the principals in the urban, emerging schools.

Definition of Key Terms

The following is a list of operational definitions of terms used in this study.

Elementary Schools are defined as kindergarten through grade five or six.
Emerging Schools are defined as schools that have shown growth in the Performance Index over a three-year period.

Growth is defined as improving the Performance Index at least one-tenth of a percent for three consecutive years.

Laissez-Faire is defined as a non-leadership component. Leaders avoid responsibility and are absent when needed.

Performance Index (PI) is one of the multiple measures used by the State of Ohio. The scale ranges from a low of 0.0 to a high of 120.00. Each public school in the State of Ohio has a PI score based on state assessment exams.

Principal is an individual hired by the Superintendent and Board of Education to lead and manage staff and students.

Urban is defined in this study as schools that have an economically disadvantaged population of at least 40%.

School Effectiveness is defined by the Ohio Performance Index rating of each school.

Transactional Leadership is a constructive style of leadership using constructive and corrective transactions by defining expectations and promoting performance to achieve these levels (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 98).

Transformational Leadership is defined as a process of influencing in which leaders change their associates’ awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 97).

This chapter contains a review of the federal legislation, statement of the problem, principal leadership and student effectiveness, significance of the study, research hypothesis and definition of key terms. Chapter II contains a review of the literature. Chapter III outlines the
research methodology. Chapter IV contains the findings, results, analysis and evaluation.

Chapter V contains the summary, discussions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

The Review of Literature allows the reader to develop a foundation of the literature on transformational and transactional leadership. The researcher believes that outstanding leadership in urban schools is crucial in the success of students, staff, schools, and communities. High performing organizations are driven by people, and this study will examine urban schools that have shown growth over a three-year period.

Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) identified two types of leadership, transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Burns (1978) acknowledged leadership as “Leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations-the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations-of both leaders and followers” (p. 19). Transformational leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that the leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Burns, 1978, p. 20).

Transformational leadership is a “…process whereby an individual engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (Northouse, 1997, p. 131). According to Burns (1978), “Transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (p. 19). Northouse (1997) described transactional leadership as the “…focus on the exchanges that occur between leaders and their followers….Managers who offer promotions to employees who surpass their goals are exhibiting transactional leadership” (p. 131).
With the complexities of urban education, transformational leadership allows the most amount of people to positively impact student learning. Transformational leadership uses a theoretical framework of all people working toward a common vision to accomplish high levels of student success. People are empowered to be change agents in the process of transforming low performing schools to high performing schools. Transformational leadership is moving people to a common vision by building trust and empowerment. “Principals who are successful in creating a culture that is collaborative in nature allowing change to be a natural process widely shared across the organization” (Carlson, 1996, p. 135). Transformational leadership is the “... process to develop and articulate a vision of what is possible and that challenges the status quo” (Carlson, p. 135).

Bass (1998) stated the following:

Transformational leaders do more with colleagues and followers than set up simple exchanges or agreements. They behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the four components of transformational leadership. Leadership is charismatic such that the followers seek to identify with the leaders and emulate them. The leadership inspires the followers with challenge and persuasion providing meaning and understanding. The leadership is intellectually stimulating. Finally, the leadership is individually considerate, providing the follower with support, mentoring and coaching. (p. 5)

Avolio and Bass (2004) described transformational leaders as “... inspirational, intellectually stimulating, challenging, visionary, development oriented, and determined to maximize performance. In many cases, the term ‘charisma’ was used” (p. 3). Burns (1978) described transformational leadership when “...one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p.
20). Transformational leaders allow people to share a common understanding or belief that all people are valued and important. Transformational leaders have the ability to make everybody in the organization better.

Bass (1985) believed transformational leaders have the ability to raise others around them to a new level of success.

Transformational leaders attempt and succeed in raising colleagues, subordinates, followers, clients, or constituencies to a greater awareness about the issues of consequence. Thus heightening of awareness requires a leader with vision, self confidence, and inner strength to argue successfully for what he sees is right or good, not for what is popular or acceptable according to the established wisdom of the time. (p. 17)

Avolio and Bass (2004) described transformational leadership as:

A process of influencing in which leaders change their associates awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. Transformational leaders are proactive: they seek to optimize individual, group and organizational development and innovation, not just achieve performance at expectations. They convince their associates to strive for higher levels of potential as well as moral and ethical standards. (p. 97)

Shackleton (1995) identified transformational leadership with the relationship between leader and follower. Transformational leadership is:

…concerned with the ‘engagement’ between leaders and followers. Leaders attempt to engage the full person of the subordinates and enthuse them. They arouse in their subordinates a heightened awareness of the key issues for the
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They seek to concern subordinates with achievement, growth and development. (p. 114)

Transformational leadership, specifically in the field of education, has been studied in great depth, using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The following studies have added to the educational field, examining transformational and transactional leadership through a different lens.

Huffman (2003) studied the relationship between transformational leadership styles and student achievement in low socio-economic schools. This study was completed in elementary schools in the state of Indiana. Schools were selected using Indiana’s annual achievement test and the school’s poverty rate. Huffman (2003) utilized the Indiana State Test of Educational Progress (ISTEP+) given in grades 3, 6, 8, and 10. According to Huffman (2003) “…low achieving schools are schools with an average percent of students passing the Indiana Test of Educational Progress less than 60 % and low socio-economic schools with a 40% or higher of students who qualify for free lunches” (p. 17).

Huffman (2003, pp. 59-64) examined several research questions.

Do principals in high achieving and low SES (Socio-Economic School) schools score higher in one leadership style (Transformational, Transactional, Laissez Faire) than another? Do principals in high achieving and low SES schools have similar leadership factors? Do principals in low achieving and low SES schools score higher in one leadership style (Transformational, Transactional, Laissez Faire) than another? Do principals in low achieving and low SES schools have similar leadership factors? Do principals in high achieving and low achieving schools have similar leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional, Laissez Faire)? Do principals in high achieving and low achieving schools have similar leadership factors? What is the extent of relationship between principals’ leadership styles of high performing schools and student
achievement as measured by ISTEP scores? What is the extent of relationship between principals’ leadership styles of low performing schools and student achievement as measured by ISTEP scores? What is the extent of the relationship between leadership factors in relation to student achievement as measured by the ISTEP+ in low and high performing schools? What is the extent of the relationship between the principal’s years of experience in education and student achievement in high and low achieving schools?

Huffman (2003) utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) that was developed by Bass and Avolio in 1994 to measure leadership styles such as transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. This study examined leadership styles and student achievement through a quantitative perspective. One hundred and six schools were selected to participate in the study and thirty-seven schools participated (twenty high performing schools and seventeen low performing schools).

The results from this study were mixed. According to Huffman (2003) the results were …no relationship was found between leadership styles and improved student achievement. It was concluded however, that transformational leadership was related to increased teacher satisfaction, a greater perception of principal effectiveness, and an increased willingness on the part of teachers to give extra effort. Transformational leadership was found to be the most common leadership style in both high achieving and low achieving schools. While transformational leadership did not have an impact on student achievement it improved teacher satisfaction, effectiveness, and willingness for teachers to provide extra effort for the principal in both high and low achieving schools. In terms of improving student achievement, it appeared from this research that transactional leadership made a difference in student learning as
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measured by a standardized test in elementary schools with a high poverty rate. (x-xi)

Huffman (2003) stated “Principals in low achieving schools scored higher in transformational leadership than principals in high achieving schools” (p. 130). “In terms of the relationship between principals in high achieving schools and student achievement, Laissez Faire and Transactional leadership were prevalent. In low achieving schools both Transactional and Transformational demonstrated significant correlations with the students passing ISTEP+” (Huffman, 2003, p. 130).

Deluga (1990) examined transformational, transactional and laissez faire leadership through an experiment to manipulate the relationship of the leadership styles. “Subjects were a sample of 228 men and 223 women enrolled in graduate and evening undergraduate courses at a business school located in the northeast. ... The average age was 29.61 years” (Deluga, 1990, p. 195).

According to Deluga (1990), leadership styles are “seen as illustrating and increasing magnitude of leader power” (p. 194). There were several hypotheses that were tested during this study:

…soft, rational and hard subordinates approaches to influencing their leaders subordinate power. It seems reasonable then, to propose that subordinate use of influencing approaches would vary as a function of a leader’s power position. For example, with less powerful leaders, subordinates could employ the more forceful hard influence strategies and have minimal concern for leader retribution. Thus, it was predicted that: subordinates will most often report using a soft approach to influence transformational leadership.

Subordinates will most often report using a rational approach to influence
leadership. Subordinates will most often report using a rational approach to influence laissez-faire leadership. (p. 194)

There were three approaches used in this study. Approaches such as “Soft approach involves the use of ingratiation, hard approach which was direct and forceful, and rational which involves the use of negotiation through the use of exchange of benefits or favors” (Deluga, 1990, pp. 196-197). Participants received a one-page scenario describing a male or female leader portraying certain leadership characteristics. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass (1985) was utilized in this study. Participants randomly selected one of 14 scenarios and competed two parts. Part one included reading the scenario and “complete manipulation and realism checks as well as demographic items” (Deluga, 1990, p. 196). “In part two, subjects were instructed to view themselves as subordinates and assume agreement with the description of their scenario leader. Subjects then indicated how they would attempt to influence their leader as described in the scenario” (Deluga, 1990, p. 196).

Results indicated that the hypotheses were true.

Transactional leadership contingent reward and management-by-exception characteristics were, most closely associated with subordinate use of rational and soft influence approaches during both the first and second influence attempts. The transactional leadership characteristics intellectual stimulation was, relative to the soft and hard approaches, most closely associated with the rational influence approach during both the first and second influence attempts. (p. 198)

The author was able to use a large sample size to allow participants to read a scenario and rate the leadership behaviors. This study has many interesting characteristics. First, the participants have a one-page scenario to evaluate. It might be difficult to fully understand the
scenarios by reading a passage. Leadership involves the process of interacting with people. Using this approach limits the participants’ ability to fully understand the people involved in the scenario, especially through a one-page scenario. Second, the participants were instructed to view themselves as subordinates and assume agreement with the scenario leader and then indicate how they would attempt to influence the leader. Deluga (1990) said, “…reaction to leaders, particularly in terms of influence tactics, may not be fully captured in the hypothetical situation of a scenario” (pp. 200-201).

Transformational leaders have the ability to develop the follower to their fullest potential. Marks and Printy (2003) studied transformational leadership and the leaders ability to actively “…collaborate around instructional matters to enhance the quality of teaching and student performance” (p. 370). According to Marks and Printy (2003), “…transformational leaders play a pivotal role in precipitating change, followers and leaders are bound together in the transformational process” (p. 375). Transformational leaders understand the importance of building wholesome relationships in order to successfully move people through the change process. Transformational leaders, “… in their relationship with followers, this theory posits, transformational leaders exhibit at least one of these leadership factors: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration” (Marks & Printy, 2003, p. 375). Authentic relationships are crucial in understanding and leading people. According to Wheatley (1999),

What is critical is the relationship created between two or more elements. Systems influence individuals, and individuals call forth systems. It is the relationship that evokes the present reality. Which potential becomes the real depends on the people, the events, and the moment. (p. 36)
Marks and Printy (2003) selected 24 schools (eight elementary, eight middle, and eight high school) in the United States to participate in this study. The Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools identified 300 schools that have made significant progress in their change efforts. From this list of 300 schools, 24 were selected for this study. This study used quantitative and qualitative instruments. Teachers completed surveys about their instructional practices and professional development activities. In addition, three researchers spent one week in the fall and one week in the spring at each school, interviewing 25-30 staff members. The researchers also, collected data from professional meetings.

The hypotheses were:

Transformational leadership is necessary for reform-orientated school improvement, it is insufficient to achieve high-quality teaching and learning.

...We inquire into the relationship of transformational leadership and shared instructional leadership to the pedagogical practice of teachers and to student performance on authentic measures of achievement. Recognizing that schools provide a context for teaching and learning that is shaped by ages or grade levels of the students enrolled and, as well, by compositional or demographic factors.

(Marks & Printy, 2003, p. 377)

One specific research question stated, “What is the effect of transformational and shared instructional leadership on school performance as measured by the quality of pedagogy and the achievement of students?” (Marks & Printy, 2003, p. 378). The results indicated that

...transformational leadership is necessary but insufficient condition for instructional leadership. When transformational leadership and shared instructional leadership coexist in an integrated form of leadership, the influence
on school performance, measured by the quality of its pedagogy and the achievement of its students, is substantial. (p. 370)

Marks and Printy (2003) results did not yield a substantial gain. According to the study, transformational leadership does not imply instructional leadership. An instructional leader could or could not be a transformational leader. This researcher’s interest includes examining leaders through a lens of different leadership styles to determine if a particular leadership style has an impact on student achievement. Therefore, we could generalize that if a school has high levels of student achievement, then the principal is a strong instructional leader.

The Effective School research is based on the principles that every child will and can learn. Using thirty-five years of research, they have four core beliefs: (1) all children can learn; (2) schools have control of the variables to assure that students do learn; (3) schools are accountable for measured student achievement; (4) schools should disaggregate the measured student achievement data in order to be certain that all children learn the intended curriculum (Lezotte & Pepperl, 1999, pp. 19-32).

One important component of the Effective Schools research is strong instructional leadership. According to Lezotte and Pepperl (1999), “the principal acts as an instructional leader, effectively and efficiently communicating the mission to the staff, parents and students. The principal understands and applies characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program” (pp. 108-109). The principal, as an instructional leader, facilitates the learning process for all stakeholders. The instructional leader understands and applies best practice teaching strategies based on research and directly influences student learning. Most importantly, the principal, using transformational leadership qualities, empowers all staff members to become active leaders.
As an instructional leader, the principal must understand best teaching strategies based on current research. Urban schools need teachers that first understand children. Effective teachers break down the barriers between children and school. They know children on a personal and academic level. Children need to know that teachers care about them and strive to understand what motivates them and applies this to best practice teaching strategies.

Kirby, Paradise and King (1992) completed two investigations of leader characteristics and behaviors. One investigation used a quantitative method and the other a qualitative approach. The first study, which utilized a quantitative approach, in which “103 practicing educators from six different school districts responded to MLQ-5X items about their immediate supervisors. The sample consisted of 88 teachers (K-12), seven principals and eight assistant school administrators” (Kirby, Paradise & King, 1992, p. 304). The purpose was to “determine the degree to which educational leaders were perceived to use transformational and transactional leadership behaviors and to determine which behaviors were best able to predict follower satisfaction and leader effectiveness” (Kirby, Paradise & King, 1992, p. 304). Participants used the MLQ-5X to describe their leaders’ characteristics.

The results of the first study were:

Transformational leadership significantly augmented the power of transactional leadership alone in predicting effectiveness and satisfaction.

Transformational leadership was apparently associated with higher levels of performance and satisfaction. Transactional subscales suggested that only charisma and laissez-faire subscales were significant in predicting satisfaction, whereas the charisma and intellectual stimulation subscales were significant predictors of perceived effectiveness. (pp. 305-306)
The second study focused on extraordinary leaders in education. “Fifty-eight graduate students enrolled in an introductory class in school leadership participated. The subjects represented 15 different school districts in one southern state. 60% were teachers and 40% were administrators” (Kirby, Paradise & King, 1992, p. 306). The participants were asked to describe an event or situation of an extraordinary leader. The participants were asked to “describe in detail the situation or event, how was it initiated, who was involved, the objectives the leader’s actions and the outcomes” (Kirby, Paradise & King, 1992, p. 306).

The participants then responded to Likert-scale items assessing how difficult it was to identify an extraordinary leader in education, how effective the selected leaders was overall in accomplishing goals, how satisfied employees were to work for this leader and how unique/extraordinary/special they perceived this leader to be. (pp. 306-307)

According to Kirby, Paradise and King (1992), the results “…emphasize the importance of professional development opportunities for followers and suggest that specific leader behaviors, rather than personality, inspire followers to higher levels of performance.” (p. 303) The results stated the importance of developing people and allowing people to grow and prosper.

Kirby, Paradise and King (1992), furthermore stated that…

…a cause and effect relationship cannot be established, the data do suggest that the transformational behaviors of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation are related to follower satisfaction and perceptions of effectiveness. Perhaps because of imprecise definition, the data are mixed regarding the effects on charisma on followers. Although transformational leadership may be charismatic, the motivational effectiveness of observable
teachable leader behaviors such as intellectual stimulation are supported in both studies. Our findings are direct implications for the training of future leaders in education. It refutes the “leaders are born, not made” adage, suggesting that skills in educating and challenging followers should be major considerations in leadership training. (p. 310)

One characteristic of this study was the examination of extraordinary leaders. As stated in the studies, defining ‘extraordinary’ is a complex process. Different people have varying definitions for extraordinary and therefore make this type of study difficult. “…only about 15% of educators asked could easily name an extraordinary leader in education, those who could had no difficulty describing examples of that person’s leadership, and they were able to indicate specific attitudes and behaviors that made leaders extraordinary” (Kirby, Paradise & King, 1992, p. 309).

Friedman (2004) examined transformational leadership within a large urban high school. “It documents how an urban public high continues to work toward developing and enacting a model of leadership that is transformational, distributed and democratic and the challenges and successes it has encountered as it struggles to establish such leadership” (Friedman, 2004, p. 203). The purpose of this study was to document and explain the process of changing a large urban school into a transformational environment. “The study was collective in that research addressed the perceptions, experiences, issues, conditions and contexts of one principal, one assistant principal, and many teachers as they explored, developed, implemented, reflected about and modified instruction to enhance student achievement” (Friedman, 2004, p. 211). This particular study was an action research study. The researcher “assumed several roles that impacted [sic] instructional change: consultant, literacy coach, professional developer, colleague, leadership team and pathway facilitator, and researcher” (Friedman, 2004, p. 211).
The setting was an urban public high school. The school enrollment was 1400 students with a population make-up of 50% African American, 34% Latino, 9% Asian and 7% White. 30% of the students enrolled in Spanish-English as a Second Language. “Our classrooms reflect a rich, ever-changing diversity of culture, race, ethnicity, achievement, learning styles socio-economic status, ability, power and geographic origins” (Friedman, 2004, p. 212).

Student achievement was very low in this high school. According to Ludlow (2001), in 2000, only 16% of tenth grade students passed the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment Test and 34% passed the test in English Language Arts. A change was needed for this high school, one that would allow students to receive a quality education and give them the opportunity to compete in the job market with other students across the world.

The large high school was restructured into smaller learning communities called pathways. Each pathway had a focus such as Health professions, Media and technology, Teach Boston, Law and Government, and Communication (Friedman, 2004, p. 213). The next order of change was to develop a process of shared leadership. A change team was established and this group met weekly to discuss issues concerning school change. “Vision was invisible or lacking, decision-making was absent or ambiguous, and collaboration nonexistent. Until participants could identify a shared focus and act as a team rather than assemblage of highly competitive, narrow minded individuals, …leadership would be transactional” (Friedman, 2004, p. 214). One year later, this team became the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT).

Shared leadership, if done correctly takes time to develop and grow. People through proper training, collaboration, and constructive feedback can positively change the culture to shared leadership. The ILT “committed to becoming first a community of inquiry and practice” (Friedman, 2004, p. 214). This team consisted of teachers who volunteered instead of being appointment. This team “brainstormed ideas and gathered feedback through whole school,
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pathway and department conversations” (Friedman, 2004, p. 214). This process allowed of all to be heard and ideas shared.

According to Friedman (2004) the ILT was making changes in the school, “teachers looked at student work, shared anecdotal, qualitative, and quantitative data, posed additional questions, and discussed the overall effectiveness of the strategy and their own instruction” (p. 217). This school was moving towards participatory leadership. Participatory leadership is a structural framework where all stakeholders are empowered in the organization. Leaders do not have all the answers, although, effective leaders have a profound knowledge of how to guide a group of people to high levels of achievement and better the organization. According to Wheatley (1999), “When power is shared in ways such workplace redesigns as participative management and self-managed teams, positive creative power abounds” (p. 40). Subordinates are most productive when they sense ownership in the problem and solution. “Ownership describes personal connections to the organization, the powerful emotions of belonging that inspire people to contribute” (Wheatley, 1999, p. 68). People desire to feel valued. Leaders that effectively understand how to empower stakeholders have a healthier culture and outstanding results in terms of personal and professional achievements.

This study examined a school where student achievement was poor, staff moral was low and the environment was not conducive for learning. Using a shared leadership approach allowed this school to excel to new heights. “In October 2003, 70% of all tenth grade students passed the English Language Arts and 60% passed the Mathematics subtests of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment Test” (Friedman, 2004, p. 222). The school is not finished growing but it is on the path to success.

Leadership is about understanding the research, and then being able to move people to changing the organization. The results of this school have grown over a three-year period. Now,
students at this particular school have the ability to further their education at the college level or enter the workforce with a strong educational background.

According to Marzano, Watters and McNulty (2005), four I’s are important in the transformational development process. The four I’s developed by Bass and Avolio are described below.

…the school leader must attend to the needs of and provide personal attention to individual staff members, particularly those who seem left out (individual consideration). The effective school administrator must help staff members think of old problems in new ways (intellectual stimulation). Through a powerful and dynamic presence, the effective school administrator must communicate high expectations for teachers and students alike (inspirational motivation). Finally, through personal accomplishments and demonstrated character, the effective principal must provide a model for the behaviors of teachers (idealized influence).

(p. 15)

“Transformational leadership is associated with motivating associates to do more than they originally thought possible….Associates’ perception of self efficacy or confidence, as well as their developmental potential, are enhanced through the transformational leadership process” (Avolio & Bass, 2004, pp. 26-27). Furthermore, “the process of transforming associates does not merely empower them or delegate to them the responsibility for fulfilling a goal; rather, it develops their capability to determine their own course of action, if they lack the ability” (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 27).

Understanding people is an important trait in transformational leadership. Stakeholders often become stressed when changing an organization from poor to great or even good to great. Transformational leaders alleviate stress from people. “…Inspirational leaders create a positive,
optimistic environment for identifying the conflict and an expectation of its resolution” (Bass, 1998, p. 30). Transformational leaders understand teams of people and can identify conflicts and act accordingly.

Transformational leaders seek input from others. According to Wilmore and Thomas (2001), “It becomes the principal’s responsibility to seek input from all stakeholders, help create the specific of a collaboratively developed school action plan, and achieve a mutually developed mission” (p. 4). Leithwood (1992) stated, “Transformational leadership is a collaborative, shared decision-making approach; an emphasis on teacher professionalism and empowerment; and an understanding of change, including how to encourage change in others” (p. 10).

**Transformational Leadership Behaviors**

Transformational leadership is about the development of people. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), “Transformational leaders help followers grow and develop into leaders by responding to individual followers’ needs by empowering them and by aligning the objectives and goals of the individual followers, the leader, the group, and the larger organization” (p. 3)

**Idealized Influence**

Idealized Influence behavior is defined as “leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Followers identify with and want to emulate their leaders” (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 97).

According to Bass and Avolio (1994), “Among the things the leader does to earn this credit is considering the needs of others over his or her own personal needs. The leader shares risks with followers and is consistent rather than arbitrary” (p. 3).

Idealized influence is also known as charisma. “… leaders who act as strong role models for followers; followers identify with these leaders and want to emulate them. These leaders usually have high standards of moral and ethical conduct and can be counted on to do the right thing” (Northouse, 1997, p. 134).
Inspirational Motivation

Bass and Avolio (1994) described inspirational motivation as:

Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work....The leaders creates clearly communicated expectations that followers want to meet and also demonstrates commitment to goals and shared visions. (p. 3)

According to Avolio and Bass (2004), inspirational motivation has four key characteristics. “First, talk optimistically about the future. Second, talk enthusiastically about the needs to be accomplished. Third, articulate a compelling vision of the future. Fourth, express confidence that goals will be achieved” (p. 97).

Intellectual Stimulation

Yukl (2006) described intellectual stimulation as “behavior that arouses strong follower emotions and identification with the leader” (p. 262). Avolio and Bass (2004), stated, “These leaders stimulate followers’ effort to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways. There is no ridicule or public criticism of individuals’ mistakes” (p. 98).

Individual Consideration

Bass and Avolio (1994) describe individual consideration as:

Transformational leaders pay special attention to each individual’s needs for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor. Followers and colleagues are developed to successively higher levels of potential....New learning opportunities are created along with a supportive climate. Individual differences in terms of needs and desires are recognized. The leader’s behavior demonstrates acceptance of individual differences. (p. 4)
Avolio and Bass (2004) described transformational leaders as utilizing individual consideration through coaching and mentoring, treating others as individuals, considering each individual as having different needs and abilities and helping others to develop their strengths (p. 98).

**Transactional Behavior**

Transactional leadership is associated with the exchange between the leader and the subordinate. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), “Transactional leaders are those who lead through social exchange” (p. 3). For example, “…transactional business leaders offer financial rewards for productivity or deny rewards for lack of productivity” (p. 3).

**Contingent Reward**

Yukl (2006) described contingent reward as “…clarification of the work required to obtain rewards and the use of incentives and contingent rewards to influence behavior” (p. 263). “Transactional contingent reward leadership clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved. The clarification of goals and objectives and provisions of recognition once goals are achieved should result in individuals and groups achieving expected levels of performance” (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 98).

“Transactional leadership occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines the follower depending on the adequacy of the follower’s performance. Transactional leadership depends on contingent reinforcement, either positive contingent reward or the more negative active or passive forms of management-by-exception” (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 4).

**Management by Exception**

Management-by-exception focuses on leadership as a negative behavior. This leadership behavior is when the leader concentrates on the subordinates “deviances, mistakes, and errors
According to Chemers (1997), management-by-exception:

…reflects the extent to which the leader intervenes only when things go wrong. This may involve active monitoring of subordinates performance or just waiting for trouble to indicate the need for contingent punishment. A sample is “takes actions only when a mistake has occurred.” (p. 87)

Avolio and Bass (2004) describe management by exception: active as “the leader specifies the standards for compliance, as well as what constitutes ineffective performance and may punish followers for bring out of compliance.” Furthermore, management by exception: passive is reactive. “…does not respond to situations and problems systematically.” (p. 98)

According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leadership is an expansion of transactional leadership.

Transactional leadership emphasizes the transaction or exchange that takes place among leaders, colleagues, and followers. This exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards these others will receive if they fulfill those requirements. (p. 3)

Strengths and Weaknesses of Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership has strengths and weaknesses. This type of leadership moves people to a higher level of performance through a relationship of mutual commitment and interdependence. One strength of transformational leadership is the process of guiding subordinates to new levels. This type of leadership is not about the leader but about the people. The leader takes a back seat and allows others to grow and lead in the process. The key is to
provide the support, training and follow-up for each constituent and not allowing them to fail. This leadership style is engaging and allows others to be a part of the leadership initiative.

According to Wilmore and Thomas (2001), transformational leaders care about people and their inventive ideas.

A transformational leader supports innovation. When teachers or groups come up with ideas they want to try, a transformational leader asks questions in a supportive, reflective manner and works as a part of the team to assess and analyze the new ideas. On the other hand, if an idea is not successful, it is still up to the transformational leader to be supportive and again, ask insightful questions designed to analyze what went wrong and why. The goal is to further innovation, not nip it in the bud due to a bad experience. (p. 5)

Collaboration is another strength of transformational leadership. Wilmore and Thomas (2001) described teachers in a professional learning community focusing on student learning:

A transformational leader makes use of all participants in a learning community to address the learning styles of each student. If individual needs as well as strengths in knowledge, ability to learn, and best ways of learning are not addressed, how can any school realistically expect to maximize learning for every student. (p. 6)

There are very few transformational leaders, partly because a leader must truly care about people and their well-being. A leader must then build a strong relationship with their subordinates through trust and empowerment. This relationship will take time to develop. Most leaders do not or cannot devote this amount of time. Another weakness is not every leader has the ability to convince their subordinates to make every effort to perform at a high level.
Transformational leader is challenging and difficult. If it were easy, there would be more leaders of this type.

**Transactional Leadership**

Shackleton (1995) stated that “transactional leaders clarify the role of the subordinates, show consideration towards them, initiate structure, reward and punish, and attempt to meet the social needs of subordinates” (pp. 113-114). Transactional leaders use two types of behaviors, management-by-exception and contingent reward.

Transactional leadership is defined by Avolio and Bass (2004) as “…setting up and defining agreements or contracts to achieve specific work objectives, discovering individuals capabilities, and specifying the compensation and rewards that can be expected upon successful completion of the tasks” (p. 3). Furthermore, “… in its corrective form, it focuses on actively setting standards. In its passive form, it involves waiting for mistakes to occur before taking action” (p. 3).

“Transactional leaders work toward recognizing the roles and tasks required for associates to reach desired outcomes; they also clarify these requirements for associates, thus creating the confidence they need to exert the necessary effort” (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 21). Bass additionally identified the associate’s needs. He stated:

> Transactional leaders also recognize what associates need and desire, clarifying how these needs and desires will be satisfied if the associate expends the effort required by the task. Such motivation to perform will provide a sense of direction and help to energize others. (p. 21)
The following model depicts a visual model of Transformational and Transactional Leadership.

*Figure I. The Augmentation Model of Transformational and Transactional Leadership* (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 21).

Avolio and Bass (2004) described transactional leaders as:

… behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. The constructive style is labeled contingent reward and the corrective style is labeled management-by-exception. Transactional leadership defines expectations and promotes performance to achieve these levels. Contingent reward and management-by-exception are two core behaviors associated with ‘management’ functions in organizations. (p. 98)
According to Shackleton (1995), management-by-exception and contingent reward were described as follows:

This is when a leader applies correct actions, such as reprimands, when, and only when, an employee commits an error or fails to deliver on agreed objectives. The leader does not attempt to change methods of work if subordinates are achieving performance goals. Leaders take no action unless a problem arises. Contingent reward or leadership by exchanging promises for results. This is the familiar work-for-reward exchange agreement, where the leader makes clear what tasks must be accomplished in order to obtain desired rewards and provides these rewards only when subordinates perform adequately or put in the necessary effort. (p. 115)

Yukl (2006) stated, “Transformational leadership increases follower motivation and performance more than transactional leadership, but effective leaders use a combination of both types of leadership” (p. 262). According to Bass and Avolio (1994), “Transformational leaders do more with colleagues and followers than set up simple exchange or agreements. They behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the four I’s” (p. 3).

**Strengths and Weaknesses of Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leadership allows leaders to set clear guidelines for their subordinates through personal satisfaction and the use of rewards and punishment. One strength transactional leaders offer is exchanges for efforts. This benefits both the leader and the subordinates. Leaders here express happiness when others meet or exceed expectations. Most of the attention is reactive instead of proactive. Attention is focused on mistakes of the subordinates. Time is another strength. Transactional leaders do not spend a lot of time making their subordinates
better, instead they wait until the constituent either fails or succeeds. Therefore, this could be perceived as a strength for the leader but also a weakness for the organization.

According to Avolio and Bass (2004), “Transactional leaders...recognize what associates need and desire, clarifying how those needs and desires will be satisfied if the associate expends the effort required by the task” (p. 21). Furthermore, “Such motivation to perform will provide a sense of direction and help energize others. This approach, currently stressed in most popular leadership training programs, is helpful but limited to first order exchanges” (p. 21).

A weakness of transactional leadership is the leader keeps track of mistakes by others. This is not a productive means of leadership. Leadership is not about tallying mistakes set by subordinates, but the ability to lead people in a positive and healthy manner. Transactional leaders wait until problems arise and then work to solve the problem. Transactional leaders do not try to make people better, rather they wait until they make a mistake and then take action. This type of leadership is reactive.

Differences between Transformational and Transactional Leadership

Bass (1985) believed that transactional leadership is about personal satisfaction. The transformational leader may be less willing to be satisfied with partial solutions, or accept the status quo, or to carry on as before. He is more likely to be seeking new ways, change for its own sake, taking maximum advantage of opportunities despite the higher risks. (p. 105)

Furthermore, Bass (1985) discussed more specifically the differences between transformational and transactional leadership. “…transformational leaders are more likely to be proactive than reactive in their thinking; more creative, novel, and innovative in their ideas” (p. 105). “Transactional leaders may be more equally bright but their focus is on how to best keep
the system running for which they are responsible-reacting to problems generated by observed deviances, looking to modify conditions as needed” (p. 105).

Emerging Schools and a Transformational Environment

People Driven

Creating a transformational environment in an urban public school is crucial for the success of children. A transformational environment allows teachers to grow as professionals which will have a direct impact on the success of children. This is accomplished by hiring and training teachers to have a deep compassion for children. As an urban educational leader, hiring the right people is important.

Collins in *Good to Great* (2001), used the analogy of getting the right people on the bus. Once the right people are on the bus, leaders emerge. Members on the bus will take turns driving the bus based on experiences, talent, desire and leadership. Many people could drive the bus at different times. These same people could lead an organization at different times. Leaders must be able to recognize talent and allow people to grow and thrive. Once on the bus, people will guide the bus in the right direction. People with high moral standards have the ability to get the bus moving in the right direction.

Building a professional learning community where all people are valued and have the ability to use open, honest conversations is important in a transformational environment. Humans are unique in the sense that there is not another facet in the world that is similar to humans. Each person has exclusive qualities and leaders who understand people, have the ability to drive off each other’s strengths. This being said, building an open, honest communication system where all people have the opportunity to be heard and valued is healthy.

Organizational culture plays an important role in determining the success of a school. “If an organizational culture has in place values and guides for autonomy at lower levels,
management will be unable to increase its personal powers” (Bass, 1998, p. 63). Leaders play an important role in shaping the culture of an organization through the empowerment of people. According to Bass (1998), “Leaders need to be attentive to the rites, beliefs, values and assumptions embedded in the organizational culture” (p. 63). In order to begin changing an organization, a transformational leader must first understand the organization and people within.

According to Maxwell and Dornan (1997), people fail to understand others for many reasons such as fear, self-centeredness and failure to appreciate differences. Laborers fear their managers. Middle managers are intimidated by senior managers. Both groups are sometimes afraid of executives. The whole situation causes undue suspicion, lack of communication and reduced productivity. One way to overcome our natural self-centeredness is to try to see things from other people’s perspective. Once you learn to appreciate other people’s differences, you come to realize that there are many responses to leadership and motivation.

Is transformational leadership an important leadership style needed in public education? Bass (1998) believed the answer is yes. He stated:

To be effective, leaders need to be truly transformational in identifying and publicizing the inadequacy of defensive pseudo solutions. To be effective, for hyper-vigilant followers in a state of panic, leaders need to be truly transformational in providing goals transcending self-interests. To be effective when panic is imminent, leaders need to provide clear, confident direction. The transformational leader’s vision for the future may set the stage for effective planning ahead. (p. 43)

Empowering people is important in the change process. According to Kotter (1996), “…with the right structure, training, systems, and supervisors to build on a well-communicated vision, increasing numbers of firms are finding that they can tap an enormous source of power to
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improve organizational performance” (p. 115). There are five keys to empowering people to affect change. Communicate a sensible vision to employees, make structures compatible with the vision, provide training employees need, align information and personal systems to the vision, and confront supervisors who undercut needed change.

Leaders have many different styles to move people forward. According to Sergiovanni (1995), there are five forces of leadership: technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural. The technical force is derived from using sound management techniques. Principals provide planning, organizing, coordinating, and scheduling. The human force involves social and interpersonal resources. Principals are concerned with the human aspect of leadership and assume the role of human engineer. Principals provide support, encouragement, and growth opportunities for teachers and others. The educational force is derived from knowledge about matters of education and schooling. The principal assumes the role of clinical practitioner who brings expert professional knowledge and bearing to teaching, educational program development and supervision. The symbolic force focuses on attention of others on matters of importance to the school. The principal assumes the role of chief, emphasizing selective attention of important goals and behaviors. The cultural force develops an unique school culture. The principal assumes the role of high priest seeking to define, strengthen and articulate those enduring values, beliefs, and cultural strands that give a school unique identity.

Teachers have a moral obligation to educate each child. Urban schools like many suburban or rural schools have their share of problems, such as unmotivated students, poor parental support and low expectations. How do we change these negative road-blocks? The answer to this complex question is people. Not only hiring teachers and administrators, who will not accept failure, but also providing them with the support to be successful. According to Weiner (2006) urban schools do not provide a structure for teachers to be successful.
A rational person would expect formal support systems to assist teachers new to the profession or school, especially in schools that serve students with the greatest need. This is almost never the case in urban schools. In general, the worse the teaching conditions, the less authentic assistance you’ll receive. In most urban schools, teachers are left behind for themselves. (p. 36)

According to Newman (2000), “…most children moved ahead best within an individualized learning program, with definite boundaries set by a sensitive listening teacher according to what best fitted each child” (p. 11). Teaching if done correctly is probably one of the toughest of all professions.

High Performing Organizations

High performing organizations have individuals who have the “ability to improve schools’ capacity for leading change through better training, communication, teamwork, and stakeholder involvement in problem solving” (Simmons, p. 34). Leaders “create a vision, shared by key stakeholders…identifying the human values of trust, honesty, and teamwork that are essential for building a strong culture and defining the mission that the organization will pursue” (Simmons, p. 34). Leaders in high performing schools allow people to be a part of the problem solving process. These behaviors are characteristics of a transformational environment. Leaders “…create and sustain organizational culture that emphasizes continuous learning for all employees and leaders at all levels are held accountable for growing their people” (Simmons, p. 34).

Creating a culture where people are valued is another important characteristic in high performing organizations. “The culture of an organization drives high performing schools. Culture is composed of…values, beliefs and behaviors that shape how people treat each other and how they work together” (Simmons, p. 40). Leaders must practice these beliefs and shape the
culture by building a shared leadership among all employees. According to Simmons (2006), “organizations that are underperforming have dysfunctional structures and cultures. They are schools where principals aren’t honest with teachers, parents and students; where teachers don’t want to help one another; and parents aren’t welcome in the building” (p. 41).

“…Schools must make bettering the quality of instruction a high priority. Most organizations provide training and information to their employees, but high-performing organizations focus on continuously improving the quality of training and information people get” (Simmons, p. 47).

Simmons (2006) identified several best practice strategies for improving instruction:

Training must be aligned with the mission, teachers are involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of training, standards of training are benchmarked against best practice and the school has a system to recognize the improved results teachers get with students. (p. 47)

Parental support in a transformational environment involves a commitment from all employees. Simmons (2006) stated, “all employees need to understand that parents are customers of the school system and parents are partners with teachers in establishing the best conditions for their children to learn” (p. 50). Building an authentic relationship with parents allows for an environment where children can prosper. Parents have a deep understanding of their children and teachers must be able and willing to tap into this knowledge through a strong partnership.

_School Improvement_

Successful school improvement is needed to fix urban schools, improvement that will make a meaningful impact on the lives of students. All children deserve a quality education.
According to Moore-Johnson (1996), three factors make a difference in successful school improvement.

First, constituents must be convinced that the proposed reform is educationally worthwhile and locally warranted, that it provides promising answers to important problems. Second, the strategy for implementing the reform must be viable, taking into account the expectations and experiences of those in the district. Third, teachers and principals must believe that the new superintendent advancing reform is credible, trustworthy, and ready to see change through. (p. 93)

School improvement, just as transformational leadership is about people. The relationship between the leader and the subordinates is crucial. Relationships, especially authentic relationships are essential in understanding and leading people. According to Wheatley (1999), the people, events and the moment are essential.

What is critical is the relationship created between two or more elements. Systems influence individuals, and individuals call forth systems. The relationship evokes the present reality. Which potential becomes the real depends on the people, the events, and the moment. (p. 36)

The future of effective leadership depends on the ability of a leader to develop bona fide relationships that are healthy, moral and productive. “All of us need to become better listeners, conversing, respecting one another’s uniqueness, because these are essential for strong relationships” (Wheatley, 1999, p. 39). Participatory leadership is a structural framework where all stakeholders are empowered in the organization. Leaders do not have all the answers. Although, they have a profound knowledge in how to guide a group of people to high levels of achievement. According to Wheatley (1999), “When power is shared in ways such workplace
redesigns as participative management and self-managed teams, positive creative power abounds” (p. 40).

Subordinates are most productive when they sense ownership in the problem and solution. “Ownership describes personal connections to the organization, the powerful emotions of belonging that inspire people to contribute” (Wheatley, 1999, p. 68). People want to feel valued. Leaders that effectively understand how to empower stakeholders have a healthier culture and outstanding results in terms of personal and professional achievements.

According to Simmons (2006), there are four necessary strategies for successful school improvement. “First, create leaders at every level. Second, transform the structure and culture. Third, improve instruction. Fourth, involve parents and make funding adequate and equitable” (p. 34). High performing organizations allow the leader to create a vision through shared ownership of the stakeholders. This culture is filled with “…trust, honesty and teamwork” (Simmons, p. 34). The leader along with the subordinates solves the problems together, not relying on an outside resource. Leaders are held accountable for subordinates’ life-long learning. Successful school improvement processes “…are dominated by people who have high expectations of themselves and others and who work who work with people based on the powerful values of trust, excellence, respect, fairness, integrity, honesty and cooperation” (Simmons, p. 40).

Simmons (2006) concluded with a 14-point plan for continuous improvement in education (pp. 219-220).

1. Focus on constantly improving teaching quality and serving the needs of students and parents. Do not waver from this commitment.

2. Be led by a shared vision of quality, values, beliefs, and mission in which negativism and mistakes are unacceptable.
3. Create a culture of mutual trust and caring among members of and taking a position so that everyone can work effectively for the students, school, and district.

4. Reduce dependency on standardized tests and grades to measure learning and develop new methods to measure and evaluate student progress.

5. Improve constantly and forever every process for planning, teaching, and serving students and parents in order to improve quality and productivity and to decrease costs.

6. Institute on-the-job training. Most people have not been properly trained because no one has told them how.

7. Deepen and broaden leadership. The role of supervisors is not to tell people what to do but to help them do a better job.

8. Transform school district performance by encouraging and recognizing teamwork across departments and classrooms, leadership at every level, and the results.


10. Make decisions based on data; regularly collect and analyze data from stakeholders on student, employer, and community needs and school results.

11. Focus all members of the school and district on just two or three measurable objectives at a time in order to improve the quality of their daily work.

12. Institute for everyone a vigorous program of education and retraining in these new methods, including teamwork and data analysis. It should mainly take place on the job and be led by peers who have been trained as trainers.
13. Take action to accomplish the transformation of the district and each school. A special top-management team (district) and leadership team (school) with an action plan are essential to implement the management philosophy and these 14 points. A critical mass of people in the organization need to understand and implement the basic concepts.

14. Celebrate the success of individuals, teams, schools, and the district often.

Successful school improvement centers on people. Transformational leadership involves relationships, which is the core of leadership. In order for schools to make a lasting change effort, people must be the center of the solution. Transformational leaders have a vision for the future, they emphasize trust, challenge subordinates with high expectations and standards stimulate new ideologies and focus on each employee as an individual.

Transactional leaders focus on the exchange between the leader and the subordinate. This relationship clarifies expectations and offers rewards when specific tasks are met. This leadership style also focuses on the mistakes of the subordinates. Transactional leaders wait for mistakes to occur instead of acting in a proactive manner. This study examined transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles of school principals.

This study is important because it draws on the past research of transformational leadership. Previous studies have examined leadership through a qualitative lens and few studies have examined leadership and student achievement using a quantitative design. This study examined leadership of urban, school principals who have shown growth in student achievement over a three-year period.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Overview

The purpose of this study was to identify leadership styles of school principals in emerging, urban schools and to determine if certain leadership styles had a relationship to school effectiveness as defined by growth in the Performance Index. Several leadership styles were measured such as transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership. Data were reviewed to determine if certain leadership styles were common in emerging schools.

Emerging schools were defined as schools that showed a growth in their Performance Index over a three-year period. The Performance Index (PI) is one of the multiple measures used by the State of Ohio. The State of Ohio uses this index along with report card indicators to rate schools as Excellent, Effective, Continuous Improvement, Academic Watch or Academic Emergency. The Performance Index allows researchers and practitioners to gain an accurate picture of student performance. This study will include both high performing schools as well as low performing schools; more importantly, the study will examine schools that have shown growth over a three-year period. According to the Ohio Department of Education Web Site (http://www.ode.state.oh.us, 2006), the Performance Index portrays an accurate picture of student performance.

This measure rewards the achievement of every tested student, not just those who score proficient or higher. Schools and districts earn points based on how well each student does on all tested subjects in grades 3-8 and the OGT....All new achievement test will have five performance levels-Advanced, Accelerated, Proficient, Basic and Limited. A student score at the advanced level earns 1.2
points. An accelerated score earns 1.1 points. A proficient score earns 1.0 point. A basic score earns 0.6 points. A limited score earns 0.3 points. All the points earned by a school or a school district are averaged and multiplied by 100 to generate a school and district index. (2006)

The scale ranges from a low of 0.0 to a high of 120.00. According to the Ohio Department of Education, higher Performance Index scores translate into a higher classification for the school and school district. “The PI is calculated by using a weighted average of individual student performance levels of the proficiency and achievement tests at grades where multiple score levels are reported” (http://www.ode.state.oh.us, 2006). Each weighted score is multiplied by the percentage of student scores at that level. Students will be included in the calculations based on the enrollment rules (present during the October count and 120 consecutive school days of enrollment including the May testing period). The total count of all student scores includes up to five tests per student (http://www.ode.state.oh.us, 2006).

This chapter describes the participants, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analyses. First, the research question and hypothesis are defined. Then, the selection process and criteria are described. Third, the instrument used to identify the leadership styles, data collection procedures and data analyses are defined. Finally, the statistical methods used to analyze the data are explained.

The objective of this research was to identify leadership styles of elementary principals in the State of Ohio and determine if there were a relationship between school effectiveness and leadership styles. School effectiveness will be determined by the Performance Index, as determined by the State of Ohio. Leadership styles were determined using the MLQ-5X by Bernard Bass. The primary goal of this study was to examine the predictive relationship between measures of leadership styles and school effectiveness. “Is there a relationship between
leadership styles and school effectiveness or growth as measured by the Performance Index in elementary schools in the State of Ohio?” The researcher hypothesized that specific leadership styles will have a relationship on the school performance index as measured by differences in performance index scores from year one to year three.

Research Design

The study was a quantitative design using descriptive research. The analysis was exploratory in nature and examined whether leadership styles would predict growth in the Performance Index. The independent variable and dependent variable were reported and not altered. The researcher collected, analyzed and interpreted the data to determine if there were a relationship between selected leadership styles of school principals and levels of school effectiveness. The independent variable was the leadership styles: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. The dependent variable was the performance index for each school.

Population and Sample

The Ohio Department of Education web site provided the data for determining urban emerging schools. According to the Ohio Department of Education Web Site, typology of school districts was used for study and comparisons.

The purpose of developing a typology of districts is to provide a rational basis for making data-driven comparisons of groups of districts. Such groups include districts that share certain demographic characteristics. As a result, the groups can serve as a basis for a stratified sample of districts in the state.

(http://www.ode.state.oh.us , 2004)

This study used a cross-section of two groups in the Ohio School District typology. Participants were from large or major urban districts and small or medium cities with low
median incomes and high poverty rates. Schools with an economically disadvantaged population of at least 40% were also located in metropolitan areas. According to the Ohio Department of Education Web Site, the two groups are described below.

The first group is Urban – low median income, high poverty. This category includes urban (i.e., high population density) districts that encompass small or medium size towns and cities. They are characterized by low median incomes and very high poverty rates. The second group is Major Urban – very high poverty. This group of districts includes all of the six largest core cities and other urban districts that encompass major cities. Population densities are very high. The districts all have very high poverty rates and typically have a very high percentage of minority students. (http://www.ode.state.oh.us, 2004)

This study consisted of urban schools with a 40% or higher classification of economically disadvantaged students as a baseline. Identifying schools that met this criterion along with showing growth over a three-year period was determined first. Eighty-one participants volunteered for the study. This included nineteen principals and sixty-two teachers. Eleven principals were male and eight were female. Nine of the nineteen principals were principals in their building for seven or more years. Eight principals were principals in their building fewer than four years. The principals of these schools were mailed the MLQ-5X (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Short Form). Principals who practiced for three years in the same building were eligible for this study. All others were excluded from this study.

Instrument Reliability and Validity

The original Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire “consisted of 73 items measuring five factors” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 20). In addition, the MLQ was described as:
The first published version of the MLQ contained 67 items measuring the FRL model (with 37 of these items assessing transformational leadership). The current, revised form of the MLQ (5X) is substantially refined and contains 36 standardized items, 4 items assessing each of the nine leadership dimensions.

(p. 21)

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) was developed by Bass and Avolio in 1994 to measure the leadership styles of Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-faire. According to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual and Sampler Set (Avolio & Bass, 2004), The MLQ-5X Short is “available in a validated form of 45 items for organizational survey and research purposes and for preparation of individual leader reports” (p. 5). Furthermore, the MLQ5X Long is “available in a validated form of 63 items for training, development and feedback purposes” (p. 5). The researcher utilized the MLQ 5X short-form in the study (See Appendix A). The researcher purchased the rights from Mind Garden, Inc. to use the MLQ-5X for the study. The MLQ-5X incorporated a leader form and a rater form. Each questionnaire included 45 items with a specific variable selected for each leadership factor (five subscales for transformational leadership, three subscales for transactional leadership and one subscale for non-leadership factor). The Transformational subscales were the following: Idealized Influence-Attributed (IIA), Idealized Influence-Behavior (IIB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individual Consideration (IC). The Transactional subscales were Contingent Reward (CR), Management-by-Exception-Active (MBEA), and Management-by-Exception-Passive (MBEP). The non-leadership subscale was Laissez-faire. There were three outcomes of leadership, Extra Effort (EE), Effectiveness (EFF), and Satisfaction with the Leadership (SAT). Participants answered the questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale
representing the frequency of each behavior, examples are 0=not at all, 1=once in a while, 2=sometimes, 3=fairly often, 4= frequently, if not always.

The MLQ 5X has many advantages in identifying and developing leaders. “It can be used to assess perceptions of leadership effectiveness of team leaders, supervisors, managers, and executives from many different levels of an organization” (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 4). In addition, the MLQ is an easy model to understand.

The model points to a leader’s performance on a range of leadership styles and to the directions he or she may pursue to be a more effective leader. ...the full range model links each leadership style to the expected performance outcome, which has been shown through literally hundreds of prior studies to support this connection. (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 5)

According to Huffman (2003), The MLQ-5X statistics are valid.

Avolio et. al. (1995) stated that the MLQ-5X has been used by over 200 researchers since 1990. The descriptive statistics and reliabilities for the MLQ-5X from the initial set of nine samples surveyed by Bass and Avolio (1995) are listed in Table 1. The reliabilities within each data set generally indicated that the MLQ-5X was reliably measuring each leadership factor across the initial nine data sets used by Bass and Avolio (1995).
Table I

**MLQ 5X means, standard deviations, and reliabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ 5X Factors</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (IIA)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (IIB)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward (CR)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-By-Exception (MBEA) Active</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-By-Exception (MBEP) Passive</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez Faire (LF)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort (EE)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (EFF)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (SAT)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2080 (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1995)

Rowold (2005) furthermore validated the instrument. He stated “…The MLQ has been developed and validated (Avolio & Bass, 2004). It is now the standard instrument for assessing a range of transformational, transactional and non-leadership scales” (Rowold, p. 4). According to Avolio and Bass (2004), the MLQ 5X is a full range leadership model. “This full range
includes leadership dimensions which are highly transformational at one end to those which are
avoidant at the other end” (p. 45).

Table II

1999 Normative sample summary of CFA results of each of eight models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>75 (67)</td>
<td>80 (75)</td>
<td>79 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6859)/594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Factors</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>86 (85)</td>
<td>87 (87)</td>
<td>87 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active vs. Passive</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>86 (85)</td>
<td>87 (87)</td>
<td>87 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3676)/593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Factors</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>77 (77)</td>
<td>81 (80)</td>
<td>80 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational vs. Non</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>77 (77)</td>
<td>81 (80)</td>
<td>80 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>77 (77)</td>
<td>81 (80)</td>
<td>80 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5509)/593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Factors</td>
<td>3528</td>
<td>86 (82)</td>
<td>87 (85)</td>
<td>87 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4229)/591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factors</td>
<td>2907</td>
<td>89 (88)</td>
<td>90 (88)</td>
<td>89 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3188)/588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 factors</td>
<td>2790</td>
<td>89 (88)</td>
<td>90 (88)</td>
<td>88 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3178)/584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Factors</td>
<td>2509</td>
<td>91 (91)</td>
<td>91 (90)</td>
<td>89 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2788)/579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Factors</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>90 (91)</td>
<td>91 (90)</td>
<td>89 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2769)/573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFA Confirmatory Factor Analysis
GFI Goodness of Fit Index
NFI Normed Fit Index
TLI Tucker-Lewis Index
Descriptive statistics and reliabilities for the MLQ 5X are shown in Table 2 for all items in each scale for the initial sample set. These scale scores are based on ratings by others evaluating a target leader from the initial set of nine samples (N=2,154) reported in the 1985 MLQ Technical Report. No self-ratings are reported. Reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94. All of the scales’ reliabilities were generally high, exceeding standards cut offs for internal consistency recommended in the literature. Table 2 also presents the reliabilities for each leadership factor broken down for each individual sample. Since some of data sets did not include all MLQ 5X scales, reliabilities for some of the scales were not available. (Avolio & Bass, 2004, pp. 48-55)

Note 1: All CFAs were conducted using the 36-item MLQ Form 5X survey. Values in parenthesis are for the replication sample.

Note 2: Chi-Square difference tests were performed comparing each subsequent model to the previous one, as well as comparing each model to the target 6-factor model, producing the following significant results in both sample sets. There was a significant decrease (p < .001) or improvement in Chi-Square value for all model comparisons except for the two alternative two-factor models, and for the comparison between six and seven factor models.

The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with the 1999 data set was used to determine whether the data from the initial and replication sample sets confirmed the proposed six-factor model of leadership. As noted, above the confirmatory factor analysis for the initial sample included all 80 items from the MLQ Form 5X with eight items measuring attributed charisma; ten items for charismatic behavior; ten items for inspirational motivation; ten items for intellectual stimulation; nine items for individualized consideration; nine items for contingent reward; eight items for active
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management-by-exception; sixteen items for passive management-by-
exception and laissez-faire leadership. The six-factor model did not
produce an adequate fit due to high inter-correlations among
transformational leadership factors, and correlations with contingent
reward leadership. (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 54)

Construct Validity

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass in 1985 has been criticized
for having “inadequate discriminant validity among the factors comprising the survey, for
including behavioral and impact items in the same survey scale” (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 45).
Furthermore, critics stated: (As cited in Avolio & Bass, 2004)

…the criticism concerned the high correlations among the transformational scales,
as well as between the transformational leadership scales and contingent reward;
the mixing of behaviors, impact and outcomes within a single leadership scale,
and distinguishing between behaviorally-based charismatic leadership [referred to
as idealized influence (behaviors) in this report], versus an attribution or impact
on followers referred to as idealized influence (attributed in this report, or
elsewhere as “attributed charisma”. (p. 46)

Researchers constructed the MLQ-5X from a series of studies. The development of the
MLQ-5X included many revisions and involved various researchers. According to Avolio and
Bass (2004), the MLQ in a “full range” leadership instrument.

MLQ-5X items were pooled from several sources. First, we completed a series of
factor analyses with the MLQ 5R, which provided a base for selecting items that
exhibited the best convergent and discriminant validities. Second, we made use
of Howell and Avolio’s (1993) preliminary results with an earlier version of the
MLQ 5X (MLQ Form 10), using Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis to select items for inclusion in the MLQ 5X. Third, we developed some new items for the MLQ 5X from recent literature distinguishing charismatic from transformational leadership. Fourth, six scholars in the field of leadership received an earlier version of the MLQ 5X (MLQ Form 10) and made recommendations for modifying and/or eliminating items based on the conceptual model of the full range of leadership Avolio & Bass, 1991. They judged whether items referred to behavior or impact, guided by the “full range” of leadership behaviors and styles. These recommendations were included in the final development phase of the MLQ 5X. (p. 48)

Data Collection

The target population was urban, emerging, elementary school principals in the State of Ohio. The participants were the principals and teachers from each school who would be rating the principal’s leadership characteristics. The participants were both male and female and ranged in age from 25- to-70 years old. All participants received a recruitment letter (Appendix A) that included the informed consent form as an attachment (Appendix B). The principals who volunteered to participate in the study provided their secretary’s name on the informed consent. The researcher then sent a letter to the administrative assistant (Appendix C). The administrative assistant then randomly selected six teachers to voluntarily participate in this study. The six teachers were given an introductory letter (Appendix D) that included the informed consent form as an attachment (Appendix E). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form is Appendix F and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Rater Form is Appendix G.
Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected for this study using two procedures. The first procedure involved obtaining data from the Ohio Department of Education Web Site (http://www.ode.state.oh.us, 2006) for every elementary school, principals’ name, school address, performance index and economically disadvantaged population. The researcher reviewed three years of school report card data, found on the Ohio Department of Education Web Site, to verify the principal years of employment at that particular school. The second procedure involved obtaining survey results from principals and teachers using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Schools were chosen from the Ohio Department of Education Web Site based on growth in the Performance Index over a three-year period and urban characteristics such as a minimum of 40% economically disadvantaged population. Schools were selected using the above criteria. School principals were contacted through e-mail, phone call or the United States Postal System.

Steps included selecting urban elementary schools that have shown growth in the Performance Index. Then, each building principal was mailed an informed consent form. Once the informed consent form was returned, the MLQ Leader Form was mailed to the building principal. Next, the secretary was mailed the recruitment letter to randomly distribute six MLQ Rater Forms, and the teacher informed consent to six teachers. Then, data were collected. Schools were contacted via the telephone if the principal informed consent was not been returned. Nineteen school principals and sixty-two teachers participated in the study.

Data Entry

Survey questionnaires were checked for missing data. Data items were coded as 90 = missing data, and 95 = Invalid. Surveys were rechecked for data transcription error, every survey was checked to ensure the data had been entered correctly.
The survey responses were recorded in Excel. See Appendix H for sample Excel spreadsheet. The code sheet also present. Each principal received a random code. For example, principal A was coded 100. Each of his or her teachers received a code of 100 A, 100 B, 100 C, 100 D, 100 E, 100 F. This will better ensure data quality. A data file was created using SPSS, for the data received from the Ohio Department of Education Web Site and results from the MLQ Leader and Rater form. All data collected using the paper version of the MLQ were hand-entered by the researcher.

Data Analysis

The independent variable was leadership styles, which are continuous variables. They include transformational, transactional or laissez-faire. The dependent variable was the performance index (0.0-120.0), which is a continuous variable.

The MLQ-5X leader and rater form were used to determine each principal’s leadership style. Each participant’s survey data were entered into an excel sheet. Transformational leadership questions were number 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34 and 36. Transactional leadership questions were 1, 3, 4, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 24, 27 and 35. Laissez-faire questions were 5, 7, 28 and 33. To determine a specific leadership style, the survey from the principal along with the teachers’ survey was summed together and an average was determined. Principals were then determined to be either transformational, transactional or laissez-faire based on the results from the survey. The highest mean score was the dominant leadership style.

Multiple Regression was used to examine the linear relationship between a combination of several independent variable’s (IV) and a dependent variable (DV). The study examined a linear combination of variables that will predict the direct variable. Multiple
regression is built from regression (simple regression) where there is only one independent variable. Simple regression uses the equation:

\[ Y = B_0 + B_1X \]

(y = mx + b)

Where:

- \( Y \) = the dependent variable
- \( B_0 \) = the constant (where the line crosses the Y axis, thus the point where \( X = 0 \))
- \( B_1 \) = slope (the coefficient of \( X \))
- \( X \) = the independent variable

Mertler and Vannatta (2002) stated the following:

Simple regression involves a single IV and a single DV. The goal of simple regression is to obtain a linear equation so that we can predict the value of the DV if we have the value of the IV. The correlation tells us how much information about the DV is contained in the IV. If the correlation is perfect (i.e., \( r = \pm 1.00 \)), the IV contains everything we need to know about the DV, and we will be able to perfectly predict one from another. (p. 165)

Since there is more than one independent variable in Multiple Regression, the formula becomes the following equation: \( Y = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 \ldots \)

The formula above is the theoretical formula. When actually using the formula in the social sciences, the following formula is used to show that predicting actual values (\( \hat{Y} \)) and that there is error (\( e \)) to deal with…

\[ \hat{Y} = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 + e \]

Thus, the formula for the study is:

\[ \text{Growth} = B_0 + B_\text{T\_Transform}X_{T\_Transform} + B_\text{T\_Transact}X_{T\_Transact} + B_\text{T\_laissez}X_{T\_laissez} + e \]
The data were entered and checked for accuracy against the raw data. Then, data were analyzed for the following: missing data, outliers, multivariate-outliers, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and assumptions.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Overview

The study included 81 participants, 19 urban elementary school principals in the State of Ohio and 62 teachers from their schools. The responses from each principal’s survey were averaged with teachers who rated their own principal to yield a total compiled score for each principal on each of the three leadership styles. All of the schools’ demographics included an economically disadvantaged population of at least 40 percent and have shown growth in the Performance Index over a three-year period. The participants, both principals and teachers, volunteered for the study.

Of the 90 principal packets that were mailed out, 19 were returned. As shown in Table III, the 19 schools’ economically disadvantaged percentage ranged from 40.4 % to 99.5 %. The Performance Index Scores ranged from a low of 50.2 to a high of 101.4.
Table III

Responded schools descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools (n=19)</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged Percentage</th>
<th>Performance Index Growth Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3</th>
<th>Growth Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>85.6, 89.8, 96.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>68.3, 89.8, 93.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>77.8, 84.9, 93.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>81.8, 83.0, 89.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>74.0, 81.9, 90.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>74.7, 75.6, 83.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>97.5, 97.6, 100.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>90.0, 90.5, 93.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>76.5, 77.8, 86.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>77.4, 81.1, 91.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>75.4, 75.8, 77.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>69.9, 79.2, 79.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>65.6, 65.7, 68.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>90.3, 94.4, 99.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>72.0, 75.5, 80.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>93.2, 101.1, 101.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>78.7, 80.3, 89.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>50.2, 65.5, 71.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>78.8, 80.1, 85.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prescreening of Data

Missing Data

Overall, missing data were low and accounted for less than 1% of the questions. Since each sub-dimension had several questions, any questions that were left incomplete by respondents were imputed using the average of the completed questions on the same sub-dimension for each respondent. There was little variability in each respondent’s answers to questions in each sub-dimension. This made the imputed data consistent with the respondent’s answers within each sub-dimension.

Univariate Outliers

Since outliers can skew the results of the analysis, the data were screened for outliers using 3.5 standard deviations as the cut-off criterion. There were no univariate outliers.

Multivariate Outliers

For similar reasons, the data were screened for multivariate outliers using Mahalanobis Distance. Mahalanobis Distance “…is based on correlations between variables by which different patterns can be identified and analyzed. It is a useful way of determining similarity of an unknown sample set to a known one.” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahalanobis_distance, 2007) With four variables in the analysis, Mahalanobis Distance was evaluated using F(4) = 18.47, p < .001 as the cut-off criterion. There were no multivariate outliers.

Correlation Between the Independent Variable and the Dependent Variable

Table IV shows the correlations between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The data indicated that there were not a correlation between growth and transformational leadership, yielding a weak correlation of .112. In addition, there was not a correlation between transactional leadership and growth; the results indicated a negative
correlation of -.053. Additionally, there was a moderate correlation between laissez-faire and growth, with a negative correlation of -.397.
Table IV

*Correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T_Transf</th>
<th>T_Transa</th>
<th>T_Laissez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumptions

The basic assumptions for statistical analyses in general, and, for multiple regression specifically, were checked. First, variables were checked for normality using basic histograms and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality (Table V). The Shapiro-Wilk test is used in situations where there are smaller sample sizes (less than 50).

The Shapiro-Wilk test, …calculates a $W$ statistic that tests whether a random sample, $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ comes from (specifically) a normal distribution. Small values of $W$ are evidence of departure from normality and percentage points for the $W$ statistic. (http://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/prc/section2/prc213.htm, 2003)

Results indicated that all variables did not significantly deviate from a normal distribution. Additionally, examination of scatterplots revealed that the variables met the assumption for linearity as seen in Figure II. Finally, examination of the standard deviations of each variable showed that the criterion for homoscedasticity was met as seen in Table VI.

In addition to the basic assumptions for statistical analysis, these following assumptions for multiple regression were also checked. First, the quantitative nature and use of the variables for prediction are consistent with the requirements of a multiple regression analysis. Additionally, there was no relationship between the error scores and the dependent and independent variables as evidenced by plots of the variables and the standardized residuals as seen in Figures III, IV, V and VI. Finally, the error scores were normally distributed as seen in Table VII. Thus, each of the above assumptions specific to multiple regression were met.
Table V

*Test of normality for each variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_Transf</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Transa</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Laissez</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Lilliefors Significance Correction
Figure II. Linearity Scatter Plot
Table VI

Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>10.2368</td>
<td>6.08178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_ Transf</td>
<td>3.1474</td>
<td>.35313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Transa</td>
<td>1.9965</td>
<td>.26813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Laissez</td>
<td>.8836</td>
<td>.48709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure III. Errors Not Associated to the Dependent Variable
Figure IV. Errors Not Associated to the Independent Variable (Transformational Leadership)
Figure V. Errors Not Associated to the Independent Variable (Transactional Leadership)
Figure VI. Errors Not Associated to the Independent Variable (Laissez-Faire)
Table VII

Tests of normality for error scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZRE_1</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multicollinearity

An additional consideration which must be checked when using multiple regression is multicollinearity. Multicollinearity can be a problem since independent variables that are highly correlated will essentially duplicate each other’s effects on the dependent variable. According to Downing and Clark (1989), multicollinearity is “when two or more of the independent variables are closely correlated” (p. 270). An examination of the correlation matrix indicates that the measures of transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership might pose the problem of multicollinearity as seen in Table VIII. There was a strong negative correlation of -.584 between transformational leadership and laissez-faire. To resolve problems with multicollinearity, one of the offending variables is typically deleted from the model. Since this study sought to ascertain the predictive power of the three leadership styles for academic growth and since multicollinearity was not severe, the analysis continued without deleting any of the variables. However, the results of the multiple regression needed to be interpreted with this in mind.
Table VIII

*Multicollinearity scatter plot matrix*

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T_Transf</th>
<th>T_Transa</th>
<th>T_Laissez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_Transf</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.584(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Transa</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Laissez</td>
<td>-.584(**)</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Analysis

The multiple regression analysis was run and yielded the following results.

The data results, as reported in Table IX indicated that the linear combination of the three leadership styles was not a significant predictor of academic growth since $F(3, 15) = 1.271, p > .05$.

Table IX

**Overall summary of the model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall summary of the model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>134.952</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.984</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>.320 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>530.833</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>665.784</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), T_Laissez, T_Transa, T_transf
b Dependent Variable: Growth
The data results, as reported in Table X indicated that the model had considerable problems predicting accurate scores for growth based on the leadership scores. The model accounted for only 20.3% of the variance in academic growth scores, leaving 79.7% of the variance in academic growth scores unaccounted.

Table X

*Model summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>5.94885</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), T_Laissez, T_Transa, T_Transf

b. Dependent variable: Growth
Examining Table XI shows that none of the leadership styles were significant predictors of academic growth. Based on the coefficients, our multiple regression equation became:

$$\text{Growth} = 23.283 + (-4.56) \cdot X_{\text{T,Transf}} + (4.020) \cdot X_{\text{T,Transa}} + (-7.607) \cdot X_{\text{T,Laissez}} + e$$

Ultimately, however, the great amount of error between the observed values and the predicted values was too great for this to be a useful model for predicting academic growth.

Table XI

**Summary of coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constants</td>
<td>23.283</td>
<td>17.816</td>
<td>1.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Transf</td>
<td>-4.560</td>
<td>5.347</td>
<td>-.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Transa</td>
<td>4.020</td>
<td>6.046</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Laissez</td>
<td>-7.607</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>-.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression results indicated that the overall model did not significantly predict growth, $R^2 = .203$, $R^2_{\text{adj}} = .043$, $F (3, 15) = 1.271$, $p > .05$. This model accounted for 20.3% of the variance in growth. Since the predictor variables contributed significantly to the model, these measures of leadership style were not useful for predicting growth. Therefore, 79.7% of the variance were related to another variable. For example, if a school improved their performance index score by ten points, the data stated that two points out of ten (20%) were related to leadership and the other eight points were related to other variables. The Discussion section will elaborate on the data analysis, interpret the results, discuss the limitations of the study and provide recommendations for future research.
Brief Summary

As people define urban education, the focus on knowledge and facts will be replaced with a focus on the art of culture through improved leadership. Urban school districts are challenged with maintaining and showing improvement in student achievement. There is a growing demand for highly skilled leaders who can have a positive impact on student achievement.

All stakeholders are accountable for educating every child. Urban leadership is about drawing on the strengths of diversity and connecting people through a common bond. Urban leadership consists of being connected with industry, business, family and community. If education is going to shed its negative connotations, it must be willing to improve the bond between local businesses and community circles through strong leadership.

The challenges for urban educational leadership in the 21st century are multi-factored and the possibilities are endless once communities begin to take ownership in the shared responsibility of educating our children for the world they live in today. Urban educational leaders will have to take the lead in transforming education.

Leadership is a passion, according to Bennis and Goldsmith (p. 101). Leadership is defined as “innovating, initiating, compelling, and enrolling stakeholders in their vision” (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1994, p. 4-5). Leadership is moving a group of people towards a common vision. Leadership is taking a group of people to a place they have never been and are unsure of the risks. Leadership in school districts has changed from a manager to a visionary and from moving paper to moving people. Effective leaders are the backbone in a changing environment. Every child has the right to a quality education leading to high levels of student achievement. Urban education is about people. According to Yukl (2006), “Leadership has been defined in
terms of traits, behaviors, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, and occupation of an administrative position” (p. 2).

The No Child Left Behind Act has changed significantly the leadership paradigm. School districts are now held more accountable than ever. State report cards and standardized test scores drive school districts to find powerful leaders to lead schools. School administrators now have a clear and focused mission beginning with moving people to successfully educate all children.

Transformational leaders lead people and allow others to lead when needed. Transformational leaders have behaviors that affect the organization, behaviors that can move an organization forward. These leaders understand how people function in an organization and know when to apply pressure and support to maximize performance. Situations arise and keen leaders understand when to use “different attributes in different situations” (Yukl, 2006, p. 14). Leaders are “willing to exert exceptional effort and make personal sacrifices to accomplish the group objective or mission (Yukl, 2006, p. 15).

This study examined the importance of strong leadership of principals in emerging, urban schools. These principals have shown the ability to improve student performance. This study is important because it points to the nature of leadership, which is required to improve urban education. Studying leadership through a quantitative approach has many obstacles. This researcher understands the multitude of variables with studying leadership. The following section will begin the discussion of transformational leadership and student achievement.

**Hypothesis**

The primary goal of this study was to examine the predictive relationship between measures of leadership styles and school effectiveness. This study examined the question, “Is there a relationship between leadership styles and school effectiveness or growth as measured by
Leadership Styles in Urban, Emerging Schools

The researcher hypothesized that specific leadership styles would have a relationship on the school performance index as measured by differences in performance index scores from year one to year three.

*Primary Goal Outcome:* Is there a relationship between leadership styles and school effectiveness or growth as measured by the Performance Index in elementary schools in the State of Ohio? The regression model failed to be significant; therefore, based on the data, leadership as measured by the MLQ-5X, is not a good single predictor for growth.

*Hypothesis Outcome:* The relationship on school leadership and growth was not significantly substantial. This study verifies that this measure of leadership style is not good for predicting growth.

*Null Hypothesis Outcome:* There is no relationship between leadership styles and school growth.

*Discussion*

The researcher predicted that there would be at least two different groups of leadership styles in the participants, possibly three different groups such as transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership. The original theory was all three leadership styles would be present leading to an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) analysis or at least two different leadership styles leading to a T-test. The data indicated that all 19 principals in the study were defined as transformational leaders. The mean transformational score was 3.1474, the mean transactional score was 1.9965 and the mean laissez-faire score was .8836. The structure of this study was to use the highest score as the dominant leadership style. Therefore, a multiple regression was used to predict a relationship between the independent variables or leadership styles to the dependent variable or school growth in the Performance Index.
All of the principals in this study were transformational leaders. Each school principal in the study had a transformational leadership style, 19 out of 19 principals were transformational leaders in schools with an economically disadvantage population of at least 40% and demonstration of growth in the performance index over a three-year period. The study was developed to examine urban schools that have shown growth in student achievement. Although the data did not yield a strong relationship in leadership predicting growth (20.3%), this researcher believes that transformational leadership is crucial in improving urban schools. Studying leadership and student achievement through a quantitative study has not been common practice. This study, along with the Huffman (2003) study provided a baseline for researchers to examine leadership and student achievement through a quantitative lens.

The data in Table III yielded eleven schools with an economically disadvantaged population of 54.0% or higher. These schools were able to show growth over a three-year period. Six schools demonstrated growth over a 10% gain. One school with an economically disadvantaged population of 99.5% demonstrated growth over a 21% gain. How are these schools making enormous gains despite being-faced with challenging obstacles? Effective leadership can play an important role in improving student achievement. The data yielded that leadership can improve student achievement. This study examined leadership styles of urban principals that have improved student achievement. The schools in the study have transformational leaders who have improved student achievement through building a transformational environment. Improving student achievement will take transformational leaders and communities willing not to accept failure when educating all children.

Multicollinearity was a concern in the study but not enough to stop the study. One solution would have been to drop one of the variables, but the study was to examine three leadership styles together to predict growth in the performance index over a three-year period.
Two independent variables were highly correlated with one another, transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership. This yielded a negative relationship of -.584 as seen in Table VIII Multicollinearity Scatter Plot Matrix. As participants’ transformational scores increased, their laissez-faire score decreased. In addition, there was a correlation between transformational and transactional, but it was not as large as transformational and laissez-faire. The small sample size could have played a role in the multicollinearity concern. Another factor could be the sample of principals was closely normalized. The negative correlation suggests that transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership are on opposite ends of the spectrum. This correlation is consistent with the literature on leadership. Avolio and Bass (2004) described transformational leadership as, “A process of influencing in which leaders change their associates’ awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. Transformational leaders are proactive” (p. 97). According to Avolio and Bass (2004) laissez-faire leaders “avoid getting involved when important issues arise, absent when needed, avoids making decisions and delays responding to urgent questions” (p. 99).

High performing schools have many variables that lead to their success. Leadership is one such variable. Educational researchers understand there are many variables that play into high levels of student achievement. This study did not yield that transformational leadership directly affected student effectiveness or student achievement. Leadership alone cannot improve student achievement. According to Chrisman (2005) there are four factors as to how schools sustain success: 1. Teacher leadership: Teachers in successful schools collaborate and make decisions about teaching and learning. Teachers meet regularly to review student work and discuss ways to strengthen classroom instruction. Student achievement results are analyzed and best practice teaching strategies are implemented to meet the needs of all children. Team
teaching, mentoring new teachers and sharing lesson designs are also obvious in successful schools. 2. Principal leadership: Successful schools have principals with tenure of at least three years. Many of these principals come from high performing schools. These principals create time for teachers to collaborate and the principal is active in these meetings serving as a functional member. Student achievement data are discussed and used to make decisions about the total school program. 3. District office leadership: Successful school districts have district office personnel providing services such as meaningful and engaging professional development, training for new employees and student assessment data analysis and training. In addition, benchmark assessment results are used to modify instruction and instructional pacing. 4. Programs and Practices: Successful schools focused on the working of the English language. For example, they learned how to use root words, suffixes, prefixes and verb endings. Unsuccessful schools focused on more conversational English and situational vocabulary. Successful schools benefited from principals and district office personnel who supported district-adopted programs (pp.16-20).

According to Reeves (2006), there are factors that school leaders cannot control. Factors such as, “The skills that students bring to Kindergarten; the education attainment of families in the community; the local tax base; the pool of available teacher candidates-all of these factors affect student achievement. (p. 86) In addition, Reeves discussed the areas that school leaders could influence and develop in obtaining high levels of student achievement.

1. Teacher assignment. The most important resource any education leader allocates is teachers. ...Does every student in my school have an equal opportunity to have the best teachers and take the most advanced courses that we offer? The all-too-typical answer is that the least experienced teachers are assigned to the classes with the most complex and challenging student needs,
whereas the teachers with the most experience and highest qualifications teach the most motivated and self-directed students.

2. Professional development. Leaders set the direction of the professional development agenda. Unfortunately, some schools are still influenced by vendors who cram every available second of professional development time with mind-numbing workshops. School should focus on items such as: what to teach, how to teach, how to meet the needs of individual students, and how to build internal capacity.

3. Collaboration. Effective leaders allocate faculty time to collaboration. High performing organizations score examples of student work, when they disagree, they work out their disagreement, clarify scoring guides, and, as a result, improve the clarity of the assignments.

4. Time. Principals and superintendents can exert considerable influence over the allocation of time within a school day. For example, schools that devote an exceptional amount of time to literacy...not only perform better in English, language arts but also show improved performance in science, social studies and mathematics.

5. Meetings. Faculty meeting, formerly dominated by dull announcements and endless discussions, would then focus on student learning, creative teaching strategies, collaborative scoring and the development of engaging assessments and individual instruction. (Reeves, 2006, pp. 86-87)

Effective school leadership is important in creating a culture where every child can learn at high levels. The research on school leadership was consistent with many factors affecting student achievement is outside of the control of the school. Additionally, school leaders have an
important role in student achievement. This role is both, a leadership role and a “behind-the-scene” role. The study examined leadership styles and yielded the following results.

The correlation between growth and the leadership styles yielded the following results as seen in Table IV. The researcher wanted to examine a correlation between growth and the leadership styles. The data indicated that there was no correlation between growth and transformational leadership, yielding a weak correlation of .112. This positive correlation yielded a slight escalation in transformational leadership and student growth. In addition, there was not a correlation between transactional leadership and growth; the results indicated a negative correlation of -.053. According to Gravetter and Wallnau (2004), a negative correlation is “…two variables tend to go in opposite directions. As the X variable increases, the Y variable decreases.” (p.523) In addition, there was a moderate correlation between laissez-faire and growth, with a negative correlation of -.397. For example, as the growth variable increased, the principal’s laissez-faire score decreased. The researcher believed that transformational leadership does influence student achievement or growth. With a moderate correlation, a small sample size could yield different results. Future studies would benefit from a larger sample size and reflect the research that transformational leadership will have a strong correlation with student achievement or growth.

The overall summary of the model indicated there is a 32% chance that this relationship is random, we can safely conclude it is random and there is no predictive relationship between the combination of independent variable and the dependent variable. Based on the data, the model is not a good model because it is not significant. To be significant, the significant level should be less than .05, the data stated that there is a 32% chance that this relationship was random or a 68% chance that is a real. In other words, there is a 1 out of 3 chance that the
relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable are related. This may be due to a small sample size or restricted sampling.

A good model will have at least a 15:1 ratio of subjects to independent variables. Since there are three independent variables, there should be at least 45 subjects. While there are only 19 scores in each independent variable, each score is the average of at least four raters including the self-rating of the principal and at least three teachers. A larger sample size would be more desirable. This was addressed in the limitations of the study section.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations to this study. One limitation of this study was controlling for all the variables in determining school effectiveness. Variables such as the student’s attitude on the day of the exam, or the amount of sleep the student received the night before the exam or the student feeling hungry before the exam. These outside variables were not examined in this study. It was the assumption of the researcher that the school principal played an important role in the development of teachers who then have a direct impact on student effectiveness. School effectiveness was determined by the schools Performance Index as determined by the State of Ohio. This index is based on the state standardized exam each student is required to take.

The second limitation of this study was the data retrieved from the Ohio Department of Education. These data were accurate as the Ohio Department of Education Website allows. The researcher examined three years worth of each school’s report card information to obtain accurate data.

The third limitation of the study was the number of schools that participated. The researcher examined urban, elementary schools in the State of Ohio to participate in this study. The sample consisted of eighty-one participants, nineteen principals and sixty-two teachers volunteered for the study. Further studies would benefit from a larger sample size.
The fourth limitation was the instrument used to determine the principal’s leadership style. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X is considered reliable and valid. The instrument has both a leader and rater form. Each school that participated had a minimum of three rater forms returned. This allowed for a more reliable analysis of the leadership style. The perception of the raters could flaw the study but the researcher used a summative and mean score to exempt scores that were extreme.

Recommendations for Future Research

School leadership is more important than ever before. Schools are now held accountable for student achievement. This study was a foundation to examining leadership through a quantitative lens and examining student growth over a three period. Recommendations for future research include and are not limited to:

1. This study would have benefited from an endorsement from a large membership driven organization such as the Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals. Having this endorsement, would allow a larger sample size. With a return rate of 22 %, the sample size caused some minor problems in the study. The endorsement could optimistically increase the return rate directly affecting the sample size.

2. This study examined school growth over a longer period. Three years might be too short of a time to examine growth. Future recommendations would be to examine growth over a five or ten year period.

3. This study examined urban schools that have shown growth over a three-year period. Future recommendations might include a study of urban, suburban and rural schools.

4. This study would have benefited from having a larger sample size. Data might yield different results. The original theory was to have principals in the transformational leadership category, principals in the transactional leadership category and principals in the
laissez-faire category. Then, utilize an ANOVA study to compare group differences.

5. This study was a descriptive and exploratory study. Adding a qualitative function would allow school leaders to elucidate school concerns and methods of improving student achievement.

6. This study examined urban elementary principals. Future studies might benefit from examining gender and racial differences. In addition, a study on schools that have shown growth compared to schools that have not shown growth.

**Implications for Practice**

This study would benefit practicing administrators through a practical understanding of a transformational environment. The data resulted in 19 principals being transformational leaders and 20.3% of school growth accounted for through leadership. School districts are examining best practice strategies to improve student achievement. Being able to identify the variables that directly influence student achievement is crucial for administrators and researchers. This study has functional implications for current administrators and university level institutes for preparing future leaders. Principals play an important role in the development of successful schools. The data yielded, transformational leadership plays an important role in student achievement. The researcher believes that transformational leadership will allow staff members to grow and develop into outstanding teachers influencing student achievement. Based on the studies findings, the following are specific areas for implications for practice:

1. Design leadership programs at the university level to train future administrators on transformational leadership.

2. Expand administrator development programs to add a yearlong mentoring program with a transformational leader.
3. Develop an influential leadership program for practicing transformational leaders to collaborate.

4. Develop a program for school superintendents to hire, train and develop transformational leaders.

Transformational leadership is a leadership style that allows people to feel valued and encourages shared leadership. Outstanding principals will be the first to admit that it takes a committed team to move a school forward. Transformational leadership allows staff members to grow and affect student growth. This study provided a baseline for improving student achievement. All nineteen urban principals were transformational leaders. These nineteen schools have shown growth in student achievement. Principals are important leaders who influence not only students, but also staff members and communities. Although there are many variables in the formula for improving student achievement, this study provided key information to the education field to create an environment where every child can succeed and develop a solid foundation for their future.
Leadership Styles in Urban, Emerging Schools
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Appendix A

Recruitment Letter to Principal
January, 2007

Dear Principal,

Hello. My name is Chad Konkle, a doctoral student in the Urban Educational Leadership Program at the University of Cincinnati. I am conducting a quantitative study and would like you to participate. The No Child Left Behind Act has changed the face of education. Teachers and principals are now accountable for high levels of student achievement. Leadership is now more important in schools than ever before. In order to assist schools in addressing federal and state mandates imperative for school improvement, this study will examine leadership styles and student effectiveness.

I am writing to request your help. I am well aware of the life of a school administrator, as I am one myself. The total time needed from you is approximately 30 minutes.

This study is a survey of principals and teachers to determine if leadership styles have an association to student effectiveness, based on the concept of transformational leadership. This study would allow for a quantitative study of leadership styles and student effectiveness. Student effectiveness will be identified using the performance index as set by the State of Ohio.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), measures several leadership styles. The MLQ is based on Bernard Bass’ work, as defined by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass.

Individual data will be absorbed into the group data. All individual names and results will be anonymous. This is to protect the principal, the raters and the integrity of the data collection all surveys will be sent back directly to me, Chad Konkle. After completion of the study, the overall results of the study will be available to you.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please follow the directions listed below:

1. Please read and sign the consent form if you agree to participate and mail the form back to me, using the self-addressed stamped envelope.
2. Also, complete the MLQ Leader Form and return it to me, using the same self-addressed stamped envelope.

By providing your secretary/administrative assistant’s name on the consent form, the integrity and confidentiality of the data will remain unbiased. Your secretary will receive a brief letter asking him/her to distribute randomly the MLQ Rater form and teacher consent form to six teachers in your building. If you agree to participate in the study, your secretary will randomly select six teachers to complete a survey anonymously.

If you have questions, please call me.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chad Konkle
Principal Investigator
Doctoral Student, Urban Educational Leadership Program
XXX-XXX-XXXX (home)
Appendix B

Informed Consent (Principal)
Introduction:
Before agreeing to participate in this study, it is important that you read and understand the purpose and procedures, risks and benefits that are involved. If you do agree to become a part of the study, you will be free to withdraw at any time.

Purpose:
The purpose of this study is to determine if certain leadership styles are associated with student effectiveness, based on the concept of transformational leadership through a quantitative study. Student effectiveness will be identified using the school Performance Index (0.0-120.0) as determined by the state of Ohio. Leadership styles will be determined using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

You will be one of approximately 30 principals taking part in this study.

Duration:
The study will take place during the 2006-2007 school year. The total time for completion is approximately 30 minutes.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please follow the directions listed below:

Procedure:
You will be asked to complete a survey that asks your opinion about your current leadership characteristics.

If you have questions, please call Chad Konkle (PI) at XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Risks/Discomforts:
There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts.

Benefits:
There are no monetary disbursements for your participation in this study. Your participation will be valuable, however, in helping the PI determine if there is an association between different leadership styles and student effectiveness.
Confidentiality:
The study data may be published but you will not be identified by name. In order to keep your identity confidential, names of participants will not be used. Data will be destroyed after three years of initial collection. The results will be studied in terms of statistical analysis and group data to offer insight for leadership development.

Right to refuse or withdraw:
Your participation is voluntary. You may choose to not participate at any time. Likewise, the PI may terminate the study or your participation in the study for not adhering to study-related directions.

Offer to answer questions:
If you have any questions about this study, please direct them to Chad Konkle at XXX-XXX-XXXX, by e-mail at XXX, or speak to Dr. Ted Zigler (assistant professor and advisor) at XXX-XXX-XXXX. For questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board – Social and Behavioral Sciences at 513-558-5784.

I HAVE READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE. I VOLUNTARILY AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

__________________________________________  _________________
Participant Signature                                                                 Date

__________________________________________
Participant Name (please print)

__________________________________________
Name of School

__________________________________________
Signature and Title of Person Obtaining Consent                     Date

___________________________________
Secretary/Administrative Assistant Name (please print)

__________________________________________
Number of years as Principal at this school.
Appendix C

Letter to School Administrative Assistant
January 2007

Dear Administrative Assistant:

Hello. My name is Chad Konkle, a doctoral student in the Urban Educational Leadership Program at the University of Cincinnati. Your building principal has agreed to participate in a research study that I am conducting.

Enclosed you will find six sealed envelopes labeled teacher one through six. Please randomly select six teachers in your building to participate in this study. Please do not inform the principal of the teachers who were randomly selected. There will be clear instructions for the teachers within each of the sealed envelopes.

By doing this, you are helping protect the integrity of the study.

If you have questions, please call me.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chad Konkle
Principal Investigator
Doctoral Student, Urban Educational Leadership Program
XXX-XXX-XXXX (home)
Appendix D

Letter to Teachers
January 2007

Dear Teacher,

Hello. My name is Chad Konkle, a doctoral student in the Urban Educational Leadership Program at the University of Cincinnati. The No Child Left Behind Act has changed the face of education. Teachers and principals are now accountable for high levels of student achievement. Leadership is now more important in schools than ever before. In order to assist schools in addressing federal and state mandates imperative for school improvement, this study will examine leadership styles and student effectiveness.

This study is a survey of principals and teachers to determine if leadership styles have an association to student effectiveness, based on the concept of transformational leadership. This study would allow for a quantitative study of leadership styles and student effectiveness. Student effectiveness will be identified using the school rating as set by the State of Ohio.

Your principal has been contacted and has agreed to participate in this study. Each principal who has agreed to complete the survey, six teachers will be randomly selected by the school secretary to complete a survey anonymously. Your participation in this study is strictly on a voluntary basis. Your principal will not know that you participated in this study. You are not required to participate. It is important for you to understand that I will preserve the anonymity of every school, principal and teacher participating in this study. No names will be used. This study is investigating leadership style, not individual schools.

Please complete the enclosed consent and MLQ Rater form. You are rating your building principal’s leadership characteristics. This instrument should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Then return both forms (consent and MLQ Rater form) directly to me, Chad Konkle, in the self-addressed stamped envelope. The code number on each form is for statistical analysis and does not compromise anonymity.

Thank you for your help in this study.

Sincerely,

Chad Konkle
Principal Investigator
Doctoral Student, Urban Educational Leadership Program
XXX-XXX-XXXX (home)
Appendix E

Informed Consent (Teacher)
Introduction:
Before agreeing to participate in this study, it is important that you read and understand the purpose and procedures, risks and benefits that are involved. If you do agree to become a part of the study, you will be free to withdraw at any time.

Purpose:
The purpose of this study is to determine if certain leadership styles are associated with student effectiveness, based on the concept of transformational leadership through a quantitative study. Student effectiveness will be identified using the school Performance Index (0.0-120.0) as determined by the state of Ohio. Leadership styles will be determined using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

Duration:
The study will take place during the 2006-2007 school year. The total time for completion is approximately 20 minutes.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please follow the directions listed below:

Procedures:
1. Your school was randomly selected from the Ohio Department of Education Website as a possible participant.
2. You principal has agreed to participate in this study.
3. Your principal will not know whether you participated in the study or what your answers are to the survey.
4. The school secretary has randomly selected you to participate.
5. You will be asked to rate your building principal’s leadership characteristics.

If you have questions, please call Chad Konkle (PI) at XXX-XXX-XXXX.
Risks/Discomforts:
There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts.

Benefits:
There are no monetary disbursements for your participation in this study. Your participation will be valuable, however, in helping the PI determine if there is an association between different leadership styles and student achievement.

Confidentiality:
The study data may be published but you will not be identified by name. In order to keep your identity confidential, names of participants will not be used. Your principal will not know that you participated in this study. Data will be destroyed after three years of initial collection. The results will be studied in terms of statistical analysis and group data to offer insight for leadership development.

Right to refuse or withdraw:
Your participation is voluntary. You may choose to not participate at any time. Likewise, the PI may terminate the study or your participation in the study for not adhering to study-related directions.

Offer to answer questions:
If you have any questions about this study, please direct them to Chad Konkle at XXX-XXX-XXXX, by e-mail at konklece@email.uc.edu, or speak to Dr. Ted Zigler (assistant professor and advisor) at XXX-XXX-XXXX. For questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board – Social and Behavioral Sciences at 513-558-5784.

I HAVE READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE. I VOLUNTARILY AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

_________________________________________  _________________
Participant Signature                                                                 Date

__________________________________________
Participant Name (please print)

_______________________________________________  ____________
Name of School

_________________________________________  _________________
Signature and Title of Person Obtaining Consent                                                                 Date
Appendix F

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Leader Form

My Name: ____________________________ Date: __________

Organization ID #: ____________________ Leader ID #: ____________________

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts

2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate

3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious

4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards

5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise

6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs

7. I am absent when needed

8. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems

9. I talk optimistically about the future

10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me

11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets

12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action

13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished

14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose

15. I spend time teaching and coaching

Continued ➔
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved 
0 1 2 3 4

17. I show that I am a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” 
0 1 2 3 4

18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group 
0 1 2 3 4

19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group 
0 1 2 3 4

20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action 
0 1 2 3 4

21. I act in ways that build others’ respect for me 
0 1 2 3 4

22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures 
0 1 2 3 4

23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions 
0 1 2 3 4

24. I keep track of all mistakes 
0 1 2 3 4

25. I display a sense of power and confidence 
0 1 2 3 4

26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future 
0 1 2 3 4

27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards 
0 1 2 3 4

28. I avoid making decisions 
0 1 2 3 4

29. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others 
0 1 2 3 4

30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles 
0 1 2 3 4

31. I help others to develop their strengths 
0 1 2 3 4

32. I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments 
0 1 2 3 4

33. I delay responding to urgent questions 
0 1 2 3 4

34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission 
0 1 2 3 4

35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations 
0 1 2 3 4

36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved 
0 1 2 3 4

37. I am effective in meeting others’ job-related needs 
0 1 2 3 4

38. I use methods of leadership that are satisfying 
0 1 2 3 4

39. I get others to do more than they expected to do 
0 1 2 3 4

40. I am effective in representing others to higher authority 
0 1 2 3 4

41. I work with others in a satisfactory way 
0 1 2 3 4

42. I heighten others’ desire to succeed 
0 1 2 3 4

43. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements 
0 1 2 3 4

44. I increase others’ willingness to try harder 
0 1 2 3 4

45. I lead a group that is effective 
0 1 2 3 4
Appendix G

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Rater Form
**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Rater Form**

Name of Leader: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Organization ID #: __________________________ Leader ID #: __________________________

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

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

- [ ] I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.
- [ ] The person I am rating is at my organizational level.
- [ ] I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.
- [ ] Other than the above.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Once in a while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fairly often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Person I Am Rating...**

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts ........................................... 0 1 2 3 4
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate .......... 0 1 2 3 4
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious ...................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards . 0 1 2 3 4
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise .................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
6. Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs ............................................... 0 1 2 3 4
7. Is absent when needed ...................................................................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems .................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
9. Talks optimistically about the future ............................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her .............................................. 0 1 2 3 4
11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets . 0 1 2 3 4
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action ....................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished ...................................... 0 1 2 3 4
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose ................................... 0 1 2 3 4
15. Spends time teaching and coaching ................................................................................ 0 1 2 3 4

Continued ➔
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action
21. Acts in ways that build my respect
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions
24. Keeps track of all mistakes
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards
28. Avoids making decisions
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles
31. Helps me to develop my strengths
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments
33. Delays responding to urgent questions
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way
42. Heightens my desire to succeed
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements
44. Increases my willingness to try harder
45. Leads a group that is effective

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.

It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If you need to reproduce the MLQ, please contact Mind Garden www.mindgarden.com. Mind Garden is a registered trademark of Mind Garden, Inc.
Appendix H

Sample Excel Spreadsheet
Appendix F

Data Entry Excel Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader ID#</th>
<th>Performance Index</th>
<th>Question 1 CR</th>
<th>Question 2 IS</th>
<th>Question 3 MBEP</th>
<th>Question 4 MBEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code Sheet Sample

Column A  Leader ID #
Column B  Performance Index
Column C- Leadership Behavior (IIA, IIB, IM, IS, IC, CR, MBEA, MBEP, LF, EE, EFF, SAT)

II(A) = IDEALIZED INFLUENCE (ATTRIBUTE)
II(B) = IDEALIZED INFLUENCE BEHAVIOR
IM = INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION
IS = INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION
IC = INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION
CR = CONTINGENT REWARD

MBEA = MANAGEMENT-BY-EXCEPTION (ACTIVE)
MBEP = MANAGEMENT-BY-EXCEPTION (PASSIVE)
LF = LAISSEZ-FAIRE
EE = EXTRA EFFORT
EFF = EFFECTIVENESS
SAT = SATISFACTION