

# **TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLE IN THE EDUCATIONAL SECTOR: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF CORPORATE MANAGERS AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERS**

**Michael Onorato, SUNY at Old Westbury**

## **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this article is to explore educational school leaders, and the need for transformational leadership style within the educational sector. With society's focus on the present day school reform movement, there is significant emphasis on teacher and leadership performance. With the addition of charter school choice and new local laws, fueled by the federal government's race to the top incentive model, educational leaders are now faced with leadership mandates that will demand enhanced performance of their schools. In addition, recent focus on teacher and school leader evaluations have fueled the public's demand to transform educational school leadership from a status quo paradigm to a leadership framework similar to corporate leaders who must sustain performance while competing in a market driven industries. This discussion also assesses industry leaders and CEOs who practice transformational leadership and lead their respective companies to meet market and share holder demands. A discussion of transformational leadership style to support the strategic changes within the educational sector is presented with a sample of principals who employ the transformational leadership style.

## **INTRODUCTION**

In an era of accountability, our school systems are facing severe challenges to meet bottom line results while external pressures from federal, state and local mandates are compelling educational leaders to drive enhanced student achievement. With the addition of charter school choice and new local laws, fueled by the federal government's race to the top incentive model, educational leaders are now faced with leadership evaluations that will assess the accountability of overall performance of educational leaders. For example, New York State is currently assessing teacher-principal performance evaluations to qualify for federal grants to improve the quality of leadership and student performance in the classroom (Chen & Phillips, 2012).

In this ever- changing era of accountability and performance, we find school leaders are now faced with the same managerial tasks that are practiced by managers and leaders of businesses in private industry. Some of these tasks include managing personnel, controlling budgets, setting strategic goals and collaborating with external forces that include parents, unions, community outreach groups, and also political constituents.

The issue of managing for results takes upon a larger role in today's educational environment as educational leaders focus on the very managing skills that are practiced in private industry. To support the accountability – performance agenda, leadership proficiency has taken on a pivotal focus that can effect bottom line results. As society places more accountability on the educational sector, educational managers and leaders are being asked to perform as manages in private industry.

Managerial tasks have relied upon a leadership framework to help achieve the overall tasks and duties of managing. To support the managerial paradigm and the leadership framework, most theorists have studied the transformational leadership style for environments that are subjected to significant change for bottom line results.

Education in today's business context is an industry that comprises of elementary, secondary and post secondary institutions. Revenues for public elementary and secondary schools amount to \$525 Billion for the school year 2011-2012 (National Center for Educational Statistics). In addition, the post secondary education segment represented 19.7 million students for both public and private institutions, with a per student average annual tuition cost of \$32,184 for private and \$4,751 for public institutions (Department of Education, 2012). By industry comparison, according to the US Census Bureau, revenues (including service, insurance, and other items) for new car dealers in the US totaled an estimated \$553 billion in 2010.

According to the Government's BLS statistical data, the education industry can be considered the country's second largest industry, accounting for about 13.5 million jobs in 2008 with a total estimated worth of \$630 to \$680 billion (Light, 1998). So why do we consider the leadership in this industry as a representation of teachers who only focus students' assessment, who do not practicing the skills of a typical business management leader ?

CEOs of corporations play key roles to interact with their followers for organizational transformation and innovation. This emphasis has been evident over the last twenty years where more adaptive leadership styles can respond to the rapid changes in which corporate CEOs are confronted (Bass et al., 2003). In a study of 50 corporate CEOs, performed by Jung et al., (2008) they have concluded that a positive relationship exists between a CEO 's transformational leadership style and organizational innovation. Whereas, within the educational sector there is still limited research which indicate a consistent positive relationship between leadership styles and performance outcomes, particularly conceptualizing the transformational leadership style as the construct (Leithwood et al. (2004).

In general, principal leadership may be examined in terms of various leadership activities, such as managerial, instructional, financial and an overall responsibility in the general

oversight of all stakeholders associated with the institution. Dwyer (1986), contends that successful principals connect their daily on-the-job duties with their goals for student achievement along with the needs and resources of the school. Effective principals are better attuned to the behaviors that influence teachers, and thus effect student achievement. After reviewing many studies, Leithwood (1992) concluded that effective principals focus on monitoring student progress, evaluating and supervising teachers, and establishing and communicating clear expectations for higher student and teacher achievement. In 1998, Sergiovanni described the principal's role as managing technical activities, providing interpersonal support and encouragement of staff, modeling of important goals and behaviors, signaling to others what is important, and developing an appropriate and unique school culture.

Leadership in schools is no different from those regarding leadership in other institutions (Marzano et al., 2005). Leadership is vital to the successful functioning of the many aspects of the school. The following are just some duties of a school principal's leadership responsibilities with respect to the functionality of the school:

- Identifying a school's clear mission and goals
- Maintaining relationships with teachers and staff
- Managing classroom practices of teachers
- Coordinating the curriculum and instruction
- Ensuring the students' opportunity to learn and perform in accordance with standards

Marzano (2003) states that leadership is the most important aspect of any school reform; "leadership could be considered the single most important aspect of effective school reform" (p.172). To illustrate the importance of a principal's leadership within the school setting, a 1977 U.S. Senate Committee Report on Equal Educational Opportunity (U.S. Congress, 1970) defined the principal as the most influential person in a school "in many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He or she is the person responsible for all activities that occur in and around the school building. It is the principal's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for teaching, the level of professionalism, and morale of teachers, and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become" (U.S. Congress, p.56.).

Research that has been performed on principal's leadership has been dubious in characteristic definition in terms of defining it as a significant factor in contribution to school achievement (Donmoyer, 1985). Other assertions suggest that research does not support the notion that school leadership has an identifiable effect on student achievement, (Marzano, 2005). Through extensive studies, researchers Hallinger & Heck have supported their notion that "schools that make a difference in students' learning are led by principals who make a significant

and measurable contribution to the effectiveness of staff and the learning of pupils in their charge” (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, p.158). Their meta-analysis study consisted of 40 empirical studies that were conducted between 1980 and 1995. They stated; “the general pattern of results drawn from this review supports the belief that principals exercise a measurable , though indirect effect on school effectiveness and student achievement. While this indirect effect is relatively small, it is statistically significant, and we assert , meaningful” (Hallinger and Heck, 1998, p.186).

With continuing pressure from state and local reforms and the *No Child Left Behind Act (2002)*, a greater emphasis on accountability has been instilled in the leadership framework of this industry. According to Hess (2007) today’s school leadership is the critical key to school improvement. We are in an era of accountability where school leaders are asked to deliver bottom line results in scholastic achievement and overall effectiveness of the school. Hess states: “school principals, are the front-line managers , the small business executives, the team leaders charged with leading their faculty to new levels of effectiveness. In this new era of educational accountability, where school leaders are expected to demonstrate bottom-line results, the skill and knowledge of principals matter more than ever “(2007, p.7). According to Public Agenda, a research firm that works with community engagement, they reported that 6 in 10 public school parents surveyed have endorsed the idea of replacing tenure for principals with employment contracts that depend on schools reaching specific goals (Johnson, 2003). A more recent report by Public Agenda cites several basic ideas for education leaders. Several of these ideas; laying the groundwork, having a vision, involving the community in shaping the vision, providing information and communication, are all fundamental tasks that would be practiced by any typical business manager operating in any other industry (Rizzolo, 2011).

## EXISTING RESEARCH

Whether education leaders are adequately prepared for the challenges of managing for bottom line that depend on leadership skills, one needs to ask the following questions: Are principals and educational leaders taught the fundamentals of management , and are they practicing good leadership skills ? Recent research has examined the attributes that are necessary for leadership to meet the educational reform challenges and the ever mounting threat of competition by the increasing popularity of private charter schools. The seven areas of the management constructs studied by Hess (2007) are; managing for results, managing personnel, technical knowledge, external leadership, norms and values of the organization, managing instruction, school culture and leadership.

As such, the skills of the school’s leader will be assessed based on these achievements, with challenges from external forces such as budgetary pressures, charter school competition and community and parental expectations. Within this changing context, principals are challenged to

---

question their leadership style and effectiveness based on their traditional approaches to instructional leadership (Elmore, 2000).

Further discussion regarding management skills supports the notion that leaders must maintain human relationships and communications. Specific tasks such as hiring, evaluation of individual performance are critical to the tools that are required for a principal's performance. Survey data from Public Agenda suggests that 78% of superintendents and 57% of principals believe that principals are evaluated predominantly on their ability to judge and improve teacher quality (Farkas et al., 2003).

Although the practice of management principles have been utilized within the educational sector, commercial actions, such as market competition and satisfying community stakeholders, can be substantial only if the consumer market can drive performance of these institutions (McIllhatton et al., 1993). The opposing theory offered by Sharpe (1989) is that educational organizations have unique environments, where managers are driven by legislative mandates. They operate within an external environment that is constrained by political forces. The recent focus placed on student achievement, which has been indicative for leadership appraisal, and the lack of competitive forces and political constraints, has caused McIllhatton., et al (1993) to state: "such distinguishing attributes and requirements call into question the transferability of business management concepts to education". In addition, stakeholders such as parents, school boards, teachers unions community and advocacy groups politicians and government bureaucrats who initiate standards all influence strategy and the principal's ability to lead effectively. As such, school leaders have to spend significant time to focus on satisfying these external constituents, and thus less time on student achievement. According to Childress et al.; (2006) it is difficult to run and manage schools similar to private businesses since there are significant differences. Both school and private business are each accountable to various stakeholders, but prioritizing the strategies to achieve an accomplishment are more difficult in the school sector, due to the public domain. In addition, these public external forces are contrary to free market forces that identify for example, what products and customers usual businesses plan on. Childress et al.; (2006) also states that even with the presence of market competition, such as charter schools, their management practices are lacking the current management practices and are also in need of strategic policies that enhance student performance. Conclusively, educational leaders need to understand the competitive landscape that will drive school, student and leadership performance, in spite of the external forces that are in place which impede the prospects for performance enhancement. A framework for strategic change can be supported through leadership capability that helps drive new strategic direction. Leadership can be considered the driving force of any organization that needs to experience a change strategy. Mintzberg, along with numerous management theorists in defining what managers really do, has identified leadership as one of the critical interpersonal roles of a manager (as cited in Robbins & Judge, 2011).

In support of transforming change in the school's organization, Michael Fullan's research has studied the concept of turnaround leadership which focuses on accountability within the

school, thus effecting the critical outcome of student achievement. Fullan states; “schools are sent a clear message that status quo is not acceptable. Schools are challenged to adopt new strategies as a basis for continued support” (Fullan, 2005, p180). Fullan identifies a model for change which include: love your employees, connect peers with purpose, building capacity, and support learning, transparency and systems (Fullan, 2008). Fullan’s ideology suggests change processes in leadership, which models after the leadership style of transformational leadership.

In this era of principalship, a trend for reforming and restructuring schools began to rely on the importance of the principal and their ability to enhance the necessary skills for change and transformation. According to researchers Hallinger and Murphy, “principals are expected to display independent initiative and power over their environments to achieve both organizational and effectiveness” (Hallinger and Murphy, 1992, p.78). The *effective schools movement* identified an era where principals were questioned regarding their leadership and their general leadership capacity to effect a school’s effectiveness. Progressing into the decade of the 1980’s, scholars of educational leadership termed the definition of “instructional leadership” as a defining paradigm that will transform our schools into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. However, the Instructional leadership model represented a unitary style of management leadership, with minimal focus on specific leadership behavioral characteristics (Hallinger, 2005).

## **Transformational Leadership**

According to Hallinger, transformational leadership is an extremely popular image of ideal practice in schools at the present time (Hallinger, 2003). Jean Brown (1991) defined transformational leadership as leadership for change. Transformational leadership, which attempts to influence the conditions that directly impact the quality of curriculum and instruction delivered to students in the classroom, targets variables in the change process, using such strategies as encouraging continuous learning among staff, sharing learning throughout the organization and working with the community toward achieving broader organizational goals (Hallinger, 2003). In contrast, instructional leadership, targets primarily first-order variables through such strategies as “setting school-wide goals, direct supervision of teaching, and coordination of the curriculum” (Hallinger, 2003, p. 338). According to Avolio and Bass (1999): Transformational leaders seek new ways of working, seek opportunities in the face of risk, prefer effective answers to efficient answers, and are less likely to support the status quo. Transformational leaders do not merely react to environmental circumstances, they attempt to shape and create them. (Avolio & Bass, 1988).

Early researchers of the transformational framework included John Burns and Bernard Bass. Building on the work of Burns (1978), Bass(1985) and Bass & Avolio (1994). Leithwood (1992) was inspirational in developing the transformational model of school leadership. His assertion is that “the four *i*’s of transformational leadership (*individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and idealized influenced*), identified by Bass & Avolio

(1994), are necessary skills for school principals if they are to meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century” (as cited in Marzano et al., 2005, p. 14). According to Burns, his original ideology on transformational leadership was stated as; “the transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower; but beyond that the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs and engages the full person of the follower (Burns,1978, p,4). Bass added, “transforming leaders convert followers to disciples; they develop followers into leaders. They elevate the concerns of followers on Maslow’s need hierarchy from needs for safety and security to needs for achievement and self actualization, increase their awareness and consciousness of what is really important, and move them to go beyond their own self-interest for the good of the larger entities to which they belong. The transforming leader provides followers with a cause around which they can rally.” (Bass1995, p. 467). Bass also claimed that transformational leadership does not substitute for transactional leadership. Bass’ studies assessed a leadership style that provides transactional and transformational as a single continuum as opposed to separate domains. (Northouse,2010). The best leaders are both transformational and transactional; transformational behaviors augment the effects of transactional behaviors. Unlike many earlier theories of leadership which focused on character traits and rational situational processes, transformational leadership theory emphasizes emotions and values, attributes that are relative to behavior, that conceptualizes the role of the leader as helping making events meaningful for followers (Yukl, 1989). According to Hallinger, transformational leadership is an extremely popular image of ideal practice in schools at the present time (Hallinger, 2003).

The research of Bass and Leithwood shifted focus of instructional leadership to a greater emphasis on organization and followership. Their transformational leadership studies initiated a framework which included the leader’s ability to increase the organization’s capacity to innovate by elevating the follower’s interest and motivation to a higher level (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, Bass,1990). In addition, Leithwood (1992) found that principal effects are achieved through fostering group goals, modeling desired behavior for others, providing intellectual stimulation, and individualized support. In this context, principals were better at supporting staff, providing recognition, awareness of school problems, seeking new ideas and focusing on follower’s personal development. In addition Leithwood’s ideology is that “transformational leadership may well be a productive antidote to the stifling effects of excessive organizational constraint” (Leithwood, 2005, p.185).

Transformational leadership assesses the leader's values, and how the leader interacts with the organizational members in a way that conveys his or her values to each of the members which engages and transforms them to accept these values as their own. The leader conveys these values to the organizational members through the use of several behaviors designed to attract the members to the leader's goal. These behavior attributes include charisma, motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Transformational leadership is associated with motivating associates to do more than they originally thought possible. The original

expectation for performance is linked to an initial level of confidence or efficacy in the associates' perceived ability and motivation. Thus, associates' perceptions of self efficacy or confidence, as well as their developmental potential, are enhanced through the transformational leadership process.( Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). 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 that ability. Eventually, the followers will be in a position to assume some of the leader's responsibilities. In essence, the associates become leaders, and leaders become exemplary associates. Studies performed by Avolio & Bass (2004) summarize characteristics of a transformational leader as:

- Transformational leaders become a source of inspiration to others through their commitment to those who work with them, their perseverance to a mission, their willingness to take risks, and their strong desire to achieve.
- Transformational leaders diagnose, meet, and elevate the needs of each of their associates through Individualized consideration. They believe in promoting continuous people improvement.
- Transformational leaders stimulate their associates to view the world from new perspectives, angles, and informational sources. They question even the most successful strategies to improve them over time.
- Associates trust their transformational leaders to overcome any obstacle, because of their hard work, their willingness to sacrifice their self-interest, and their prior successes.

Management scholars initiated research as to the meaning of effective leadership and how this ideology transforms to practice of effective principalship. Thus, the role of the principal has been defined as the most important individual and the most influential person in the school (U.S. Congress, 1970). Additional researchers such as Sergiovanni (1995) have supported the principal leadership ideology by stating; “principals must be effective managers in order to have an effect on the organization to the point of principals being thought of as management engineers” (Sergiovanni, 1995, p.85). Student achievement became a critical outcome which was fueled by the passage of the *No Child Left Behind Act (2002)* thus becoming the impetus for school leadership and accountability. Researchers began to take a closer look at the effect of leadership on student achievement. Educational scholars , such as Hallinger & Heck (1998), Weitzers et al., (2003) and Marzano et al., (2005) have performed quantitative analysis on the effects of leadership on student achievement. Various conceptual frameworks have assessed the number of variables that effect student achievement outcomes. It is generally agreed upon that leaders play a major role, albeit indirect in effecting student achievement.

## METHODS

This study sought to examine the managerial leadership role of today's educational leader. Data was collected to present the most widely used leadership style between transformational, transactional and passive avoidance styles of leadership. In addition, the data also represented overall descriptives of the sample population.

### Sample

A sample of 45 principals from elementary, middle and high schools randomly selected within the New York State area were surveyed. The MLQ instrument was used to assess the principals' leadership style, along with a demographic profile data sheet indicating: *institution type, level of preparation, total years of principals' experience total years of teaching experience, age, gender, and ethnicity.*

### Procedures

The MLQ was originally developed by Bass (1985) and later refined as a 45 short form MLQ 5X by Avolio and Bass (2004). Responses for all 45 subscales were self measured using a 5-point Likert scale. Respondents were asked to indicate how frequently they exhibited specific behaviors corresponding to the following scale: 0 = *Not at all*, 1 = *Once in a while*, 2 = *Sometimes*, 3 = *Fairly often*, 4 = *Frequently or always*. According to Northouse (2010), this is the most widely used measure of transformational leadership. The MLQ instrument analyzes three characteristic domains: Transformational, Transactional and Passive Avoidance. The operational factors that define these leadership characteristics are:

#### 1. Transformational

*Characteristic variables:*

*Idealized Attributes and Idealized Behaviors* – these factors describes leaders who act as strong role models for leaders, followers identify with these leaders, and want very much to emulate them. These leaders usually have very high standards of moral and ethical conduct and can be considered to doing the right thing. They are deeply respected by followers, who usually place a great deal of trust in them. They provide followers with a sense of vision and mission.

*Inspirational Motivation* – describes those who communicate high expectations to followers, inspiring them through motivation to become committed to and a part of the shared vision in the organization. Team spirit is usually enhanced by this type of leadership.

*Intellectual Stimulation* - recognizes followers through stimulation, creativity and innovation. This type of leader challenges the follower's own beliefs and values as well as the

leader's and the organization. The leader support and collaborates with the followers as they try new approaches and develop innovative ways of dealing with organizational issues. The leader encourages followers to think things out on their own and engage in careful problem solving

*Individualized Consideration* - this factor is representative of leaders who provide a supportive climate in which they listen carefully to the individual needs of the followers. These leaders act as coaches and advisors while trying to assist the followers in becoming fully self actualized. These leaders engage with the followers' individual personal challenges.

## **2. Transactional**

*Characteristic variables:*

*Contingent Reward* – describes an exchange process between leaders and followers in which effort by the followers is exchanged for specific rewards. In this process, the leader tries to obtain agreement from the followers on what must be done and what the payoffs would be for the follower performing the task.

*Management by Exception (Active)* – this leadership factor is a style that involves corrective criticism , negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. A leader who practices management by exception, actively watches followers for mistakes and errors, and then takes corrective action.

## **3. Passive Avoidance**

*Characteristic Variables:*

*Management by Exception (Passive)* – a leader who practices this factor passively intervenes with the follower only when after standards have not been met or problems have arisen.

*Laissez – Faire* - describes leadership that actually represents no leadership at all. This type of leader takes a hands-off, let things ride approach. The leader abdicates responsibility, delays decisions, provides no feedback, and makes no effort to help followers satisfy their needs. There is no exchange with followers or any attempt to help them grow.

## RESULTS

### Leadership Style

After scoring the MLQ instrument utilized in the study, the leadership style most widely used by principals at all institutional levels was transformational, representing 31 principals or 68.9% of the sample population. Transactional leadership style comprised of 10, or 22.2%, while a passive avoidance style was represented by only 4 principals, corresponding to 8.9% of the sample population.

**Leader Style**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Transformational	31	68.9	68.9	68.9
Transactional	10	22.2	22.2	91.1
Passive	4	8.9	8.9	100.0
Total	45	100.0	100.0	

### Additional Descriptives

#### *Age*

The ages of the principals were reported as ranging from 32 to 65 years of age with an average age of 52.

#### *Gender*

Female principals comprised of 24 (53.3%), while male principals were 21 (46.7%).

**Gender**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	21	46.7	46.7	46.7
Female	24	53.3	53.3	100.0
Total	45	100.0	100.0	

#### *Ethnicity*

The ethnic composition included 39 (86.7%) Caucasian, 4 (8.9%) African Americans and 2 (4.4%) reported as other.

**Ethnicity-Please indicate your primary ethnic identity**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	African American	4	8.9	8.9	8.9
	Caucasian	39	86.7	86.7	95.6
	Other	2	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	45	100.0	100.0	

*Institution Type and Location*

**Institution Type-Elem-Middle-HighSchool**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Elementary School	20	44.4	45.5	45.5
	Middle or Junior High School	10	22.2	22.7	68.2
	High School	14	31.1	31.8	100.0
	Total	44	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.2		
	Total	45	100.0		

**Institution Location-Suburban-Urban**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Suburban	34	75.6	77.3	77.3
	Urban	10	22.2	22.7	100.0
	Total	44	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.2		
	Total	45	100.0		

*Years of Experience as a Principal*

Years of principals' experience ranged from 2 to 28, with an average of 9.42 years.

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Years of experience as a Principal (DO NOT include years as AP)	45	2	28	9.42	6.373
Total years Teaching Experience	45	5	34	13.60	7.515
Age	45	12	45	31.82	8.386
ELA Axchieve	45	-2.24	1.74	-.0875	.89175
Math Achieve	45	-1.71	1.40	-.2706	.87036
Valid N (listwise)	45				

### *Level of Principals' Education*

The principals' level of education was reported as 6 (13.3%) Doctoral Degrees, 22 (48.9%) Masters Degrees, 13 (28.9%) reported as Specialist Degree, and the remaining 4 (8.9%) as other.

**Principal's Level of Education**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Master's Degree	22	48.9	48.9	48.9
Specialist Degree	13	28.9	28.9	77.8
Doctoral Degree	6	13.3	13.3	91.1
Other, please specify	4	8.9	8.9	100.0
Total	45	100.0	100.0	

### *Institutional Level*

**Institution Type-Elem-Middle-HighSchool**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Elementary School	20	44.4	45.5	45.5
Middle or Junior High School	10	22.2	22.7	68.2
High School	14	31.1	31.8	100.0
Total	44	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	1	2.2		
Total	45	100.0		

## **DISCUSSION**

In this article, the current focus of accountability and performance of educational leaders has been presented as a major topic of concern in our society. Managerial comparisons to business leaders in private industry have also spurred much discussion among managerial and educational leadership theorists. For example, Hess (2007) has focused specifically on comparative managerial attributes of educational leaders. His concern is whether today's principals are taught the fundamentals of management. Most instructional institutions are taught the criteria for school curriculum, and teacher development, but they are not taught with considerable attention; managing with data, hiring, recruiting, assessing personnel performance, and exposing future principals to the vigorous responsibilities of organizational management. In addition, change strategies need to be implemented to meet the demands of strategic plans set forth by bureaucratic officials along with the increase in the public's educational awareness and expectations of student performance. Theorists such as Fullan (2008) have devoted research studies that define the constructs of the change strategy framework.

School performance and student achievement have been the driving force for researchers to take a closer assessment of the managerial practices and leadership practices of educational leaders. The expectations of today's educational leaders are comparative to the similar tasks practiced by business managers in the private sector. With the current focus on student achievement, through assessment testing and also increased demand for accountability within the sector's industry, managerial attributes such as leadership styles have become a significant topic within the educational industry.

Educational leadership researchers, such as Leithwood and Hallinger, have all subscribed to a transformational leadership framework that can ultimately change and elevate individual performance beyond expectations. Michael Fullan (2005) reminds us that the status quo is not acceptable, and only through a change orientation can leaders realize true effective results.

The small study of 45 principals presented in this paper supports the notion that the majority of those surveyed relied upon a transformational leadership style. In this context the principal will collaborate with followers to raise performance beyond what is expected. However, the study did not present comparisons of performance due to leadership attributes in comparison to private and educational sectors. Future research must assess the differences in performance constructs between the educational sector and other segments of private industry.

## REFERENCES

- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Third Edition Manual and Sampler Set*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baloga, H.P. Dachler, & C. Schriesheim. *Emerging leadership vistas* (29-50).Emsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-463.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B.J., Jung,D. & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207-218.
- Bass, B. M. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(4), 463-478.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.), New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York. NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.
- Brown, R. J. (1991). Cooperatives in managerial transition: What is the least disruptive way to introduce change? *Management Quarterly*, 32(1), 22-24.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2011). Retrieved January 3, 2012, from: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/cg>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row
- Chen, D.W., Phillips, A.M. (2012, January 13). Mayor takes on teachers' union in school plans. *New York Times*, p. A-1.
- Childress, S., Elmore., R., & Grossman, A. (2006). How to manage urban school districts. *Harvard Business Review*, Nov, 55-68.
- Department of Education (2011). Retrieved January 10, 2012 from: <http://www.ed.gov>

- Dwyer, D. (1986). Understanding the principal's contribution to instruction. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63, 3-18.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. New York: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- McIllhatton, Johnson, N., & Holden, N. (1993). What can educational managers learn from private enterprise. *Journal of Educational Management*, 7(1), 36-39.
- Frakas, S., Johnson, J., & Duffett, A. (2003). Rolling up their sleeves : Superintendents and principals talk about what's needed to fix public schools. New York: Public Agenda
- Fullan, M. (2005). Turnaround leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 69, 174-181.
- Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change*. San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221-239.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-346.
- Hallinger & Heck, R.H., (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980 – 1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1992). The principalship in an era of transformation. *Journal of Education Administration*, 30(3), 77-78.
- Hess, F.M. & Kelly, A.P. (2007). Learning to lead; what gets taught in principal preparation programs. *Teachers College Record*, 109(1), 244-274.
- Johnson, J. (2003). What does the public say about accountability ? *Educational Leadership*, Nov. 36-40.
- Jung, D., Wu, A., Chow, C.W. (2008). Towards understanding the direct and indirect effects of CEOs' transformational leadership on firm innovation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 582-594.
- Leithwood, K & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 177-199.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 8-12.
- Light, J. (1998). Education industry: The corporate takeover of public schools. Retrieved January 10, 2012 from <http://www.corpwatch.org>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Publ. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Denver, CO : McREL.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2011). Retrieved January 3 , 2012, from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/fastfacts>
- Northouse, P.G. (2010). *Leadership, theory and practice (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Los Angeles, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Rizzolo, A. (2011). Eight ideas to help leaders take bold action. Retrieved January 4, 2012 from: <http://www.publicagenda.org/press-releases>
- Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. NY : Prentice Hall.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship a reflective practice perspective*. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sharpe, F.G. (1989). Is educational administration distinctly educational profession ? *Practicing Administrator*, 11(4), 4-7.
- U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity (1970). *Toward equal educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations (2<sup>n</sup> ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hal
- Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Kruger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39, (3), 398-425.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.