TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Introduction:

This research is centered on a particular model of leadership, Transformational leadership, which formerly was not conceptualized for the school system. The 1990s became the era of new leadership model, the era in which charismatic and transformational leadership theories evoked the interest of some outstanding Scholars. Leadership then became the property of the organization rather than of the individual. One of these studies, Rodney T. Ogawa and Steven T. Bossert (1995), contends that leadership is a quality of school organizations, which flow broadly through social networks and roles. For the interest of this current study, we concentrate on Transformational Leadership.

We take off by exploring fifteen articles so as to see the approaches and understandings of this model from a number of scholars as it came across the decades, some of which would expose, compare and criticize this model of leadership.

Transformational leadership, initiated by James MacGregor Burns (1978) and Bernard M. Bass (1985a), has become a very popular concept in recent years. Transformational leaders build commitment to the organization’s objectives and empower followers to achieve these objectives (Yukl, 1998).

Transformational Leaders in the view of Hoy & Miskel (2001) are expected to:

- Define the need for change.
- Create new visions and muster commitment to the visions.
- Concentrate on long-term goals.
- Inspire followers to transcend their own interest to pursue higher order goals.
- Change the organization to accommodate their vision rather than work within the existing one.
• Mentor followers to take greater responsibility for their own development and that of others. Followers become leaders and leaders become change agents, and ultimately transform the organization.

We shall summarize the views of some of the proponents of the transformational leadership, providing some background information on the concept, upon which two hypotheses would eventually be built.

Summary 1


In education, Sergiovanni (1984) had made a significant contribution in the development of transformational leadership. In his studies, Sergiovanni proposed five alternative dimensions of transformational leadership in relation to schools:

- Technical leadership which involves sound management techniques;
- Human leadership which involves harnessing social and interpersonal potential;
- Educational leadership in which the principal demonstrates expert knowledge about education and schooling;
- Symbolic leadership involving an emphasis on and modeling of important goals and behaviors;
- Cultural leadership in which the principal helps to define, strengthen and articulate enduring values, beliefs and cultural strands that give the school its identity over time.

For Sergiovanni, the technical, human and educational dimensions of leadership can enable a school to be effective. It is the symbolic and cultural dimensions, however, that Sergiovanni believes are value-added and allows schools to go beyond being effective and to achieve excellence. A central concept in Sergiovanni’s work here is Vaill’s (1984) idea of ‘purposing’, whereby leaders and followers are said to unite ‘in
pursuit of higher level goals that are common to both’ (Sergiovanni, 1990, p.31). It is through the symbolic and cultural dimensions that the so-called purposing is achieved. Indeed, it is this emphasis on developing shared vision through symbolic and cultural leadership that, for Sergiovanni, distinguishes the notion of transformational leadership from instructional leadership.

**Summary 2**


Bass (1985) at first drew a sharp contrast between a leader who is transformational and a merely transactional one. Transactional leadership is a leadership that proves instrumental in bringing about anticipated or expected outcomes in which the leader not only ‘recognizes the role the followers must play to attain the outcomes desired by the leader’ but also, crucially, recognizes what the followers need and clarifies how those needs will be fulfilled in exchange for the follower’s satisfactory effort and performance’. However, the transformational leadership is seen when leaders stimulate others to view their work from new perspectives, generate an awareness of the mission or vision of the organization, develop colleagues and followers to higher levels of ability and potential, and motivate them to look beyond their own interests toward those that will benefit the group more. In this understanding, transformational leaders set more challenging goals and typically achieve higher performances than transactional leadership that goes beyond simple exchanges and agreement by employing one or more of the four.

**Summary 3**

The source of transformational leadership is in the personal values and beliefs of leaders. By expressing their personal standards, transformational leaders are able to both unite followers and change their goals and beliefs in ways that produce higher levels of performance than previously thought possible. Kuhnert and Lewis also posit that Transactional leaders (compared with transformational leaders) give followers the things they want in exchange for things leaders want.

Summary 4

Acknowledging what earlier proponents of the transformational model herald in a new era of leadership, and as promising significant organizational change, the author accused the promoters of dismissing all the previous leadership as merely transactional. Leaning on such frame of thought, the article argues that such optimism is unfounded. The author did expatiate his position by pinpointing a number of significant, even fatal flaws in the model, claiming that evidence of transformational leadership is shown to be remarkably thin and to be derived from inadequate conception of leader-follower relations.

Regarding the expectations of this educational reform, Leithwood and Jantzi (2000), noted that these types of reform initiatives require “significant capacity development on the part of individuals and the whole organizations. They also require high levels of motivation and commitment on the part of individuals in order to solve the often complex problems associated with their implementation” (p. 112).

Transformational leadership has been extensively developed by research, which is located primarily in non-educational settings. Bass and Avolio (1993, pp. 49-80) are two scholars to consult, for the relevance of their idea. They described a theory of leadership that includes transformational, transactional, and non-leadership factors.
To a greater extent, this is based on extensive research over more than a decade and has primarily involved construction, analysis and refinement of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The research of Bass and his colleagues is important for education, as it has influenced the work of educationists such as Leithwood, whose thoughts we would discuss next.

**Summary 5**


In a study of a four-year period, Leithwood left an imprint as he studied a variety of structural changes, in equating transformational leadership to the school leaders as against instructional leaders.

Leithwood argues that Instructional leadership gains much of its power by tapping the shared values of followers and building normative commitment to the mission of the school, while transformational leaders focus on shaping the culture of the school as well as the professional and instructional aspects of the organization.

Leithwood (1994) opined that transformational leadership has arisen from a broadening of the instructional leadership concept to overcome its inherent deficiencies and that transformational leadership is particularly relevant to the current climate of school education, which is characterized by change.

At this juncture, we take note of the four premises that support the usefulness and applicability of transformational leadership from Leithwood’s point of view:

- The means and ends for school restructuring are uncertain and in this type of climate what is needed is commitment rather than control strategies; transformational leadership encourages employee motivation and commitment which lead to the kind of extra effort needed for significant change;
School restructuring requires both first-order and second-order change: i.e., it involves changes to the entire organization as well as to its core technology. First-order changes are the domain of instructional leadership, but second-order changes are the domain of transformational leadership;

School restructuring is aimed especially at secondary schools, where their size and complexity work against effective instructional leadership by the principal. In this situation, transformational leadership with its notions of empowering of staff and dispersed influence, is more viable than maintaining the principal as the instructional leader;

The professionalization of teaching is a centerpiece of the school restructuring agenda and this works against the principal as the instructional leader; instead teachers are encouraged to assume this leadership mantle. The components of transformational leadership are more congruent with a professionalized workforce.

The purpose of leadership is to facilitate group goal attainment by establishing and maintaining an environment favorable to group performance. “Successful leadership involves using social influence processes to organize, direct, and motivate the actions of others. It requires persistent task-directed effort, effective task strategies, and the artful application of various conceptual, technical, and interpersonal skills” (McCormick, 2001, p.28).

**Summary 6**


This article took-off by acknowledging that research on principals’ and teachers’ perception of principal leadership in schools is used to demonstrate support for transformational leadership. It is suggested that transformational leadership remains a
valuable leadership conception for education in current climate, although there are trends emerging that suggest that transformational leadership may need to be modified in the future.

During the early 1980s the dominant leader conception was that of instructional leadership, in which interest arose from the identification of key attributes of effective schools such as strong administrative leadership with a focus on quality instruction; high expectations for all students; a safe, orderly, flexible environment; a strong instructional focus with the acquisition of basic skills seen as the priority; frequent monitoring of student progress (Edmonds, 1979, 1982). It was not until later in this decade that the emphasis changed from instructional leadership to transformational leadership (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992, p.20; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; Leithwood, 1994).

Gurr (1996) went straight ahead to argue that even though transformational leadership has gained much support in education, there is emerging skepticism about its worth. In the inaugural year of Leading and Managing, two commentators questioned the dominant place of transformational leadership: Gronn (1995) viewed transformational leadership as revisiting earlier notions that linked leadership with atypical characteristics or greatness and Lakomski (1995) argued for the replacement of transformational leadership with the concept of organizational learning. The arguments of Gronn against transformational leadership are explored in detail in this article. But we tend to be sketchy because of the nature of the assignment. However we note still that for Gronn (1995) transformational leadership is often equated by its proponents with charismatic leadership and he criticizes the interest in it as premature and misplaced. The lack of broad-based research, the tenuous links between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes, and the poor understanding of how transformational leadership is learned are viewed as problematic for the adoption of transformational leadership in both non-educational and educational organizations.
Summary 7


Hallinger and Heck (1997) studied the impact of leadership, focusing on category and impact. On one hand they outlined under category the following: defining school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting the school climate. While on the other hand the following are named in terms of impact: direct, mediated and reciprocal. In the result of their study, they maintained that a primary avenue of influence lies in the shaping of the school’s direction through vision, mission and goals, and suggested that the broader approach is more effective because it encompasses the indirect as well as the direct impacts.

Summary 8


This article explores how gender and organization level interact to influence ratings of leadership and work satisfaction, and argues that transformational leadership permits women to simultaneously carry out leadership and gender roles. However, findings of the study of the management team of a large US social services agency confirmed the predicted similarities in male and female managers’ transformational leadership and work satisfaction. Top managers of both sexes saw themselves as more transformational leaders, while their raters perceived them as less transformational than average.
The younger employees of the US social services agency, who are at the lower managerial levels, underrated themselves as leaders, while their raters viewed them as higher than average in transformational leadership. The results were discussed in terms of how organizational status, experiences and feedback processes influence individual’s leadership perceptions and the potential obstacles to women’s accurate assessment of their leadership abilities.

**Summary**


This article examines Transformational and Servant leadership to determine what similarities and differences exist between the two leadership concepts. The authors posit that the primary difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership is the focus of the leader.

The Transformational leader’s focus is directed toward the organization, and his or her behavior builds follower commitment toward organization objectives, while the servant leader’s focus is on the followers, and the achievement of organizational objectives is a subordinate outcome. The authors unreservedly state that the extent to which the leader is able to shift the primary focus of leadership from the organization to the follower is the distinguishing factor in classifying leaders as either transformational or servant leaders. The primary premise of the article is that transformational leaders tend to focus more on organizational objectives while servant leaders focus more on the people who are their followers.

The authors shared Bass’s thought (1985a) that Transformation leaders transform the personal values of followers to support the vision and goals of the organization by fostering an environment where relationship can be formed and by establishing a climate of trust in which visions can be shared.
The principal difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership is the focus of the leader. While transformational leaders and servant leaders both show concern for their followers, the overriding focus of the servant leader is upon service to their followers. Transformational leader has a greater concern for getting followers to engage in and support organizational objectives.

Summary 10


Barnett and McCormick 2004 on the verge to assert that a serious relationship do exist between leadership and school learning culture, and the importance of individual principal-teacher relationships in schools, had to maintain that Principals are in a unique position to challenge the way schools do business and mobilize and motivate teachers to develop the new approaches to teaching and learning being demanded by governments through reform.

Increasingly, principals have been encouraged to adopt transformational approaches to leadership that are seen to be appropriate to schools faced with demands for reform.

The authors mentioned that the Advocates of transformational approaches to leadership (e.g., Leithwood &Jantzi, 1997; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999; Silins, 1994) have cited empirical evidence suggesting that transformational leadership contributes to a range of organizational outcomes including motivation, commitment, and capacity of teachers to develop new approaches to education. As the case may be, the article was critical about whether transformational leadership actually leads to changes in teaching, learning, and school organization and results in enhanced student learning outcomes.
Explanatory Theories

Having considered in a summary form the tenets of the proponents of transformational leadership, we gathered the following essentials:

Bass & Avolio (1993, p.53) view their transformational leadership theory as building upon, and not replacing, earlier approaches associated with leader-follower exchanges such as transactional leadership: we realize that this study did record that a more optimal profile of leadership is represented by a higher frequency occurrence of behaviors associated with active transformational leadership which are generally viewed as more effective.

Transformational leaders characteristically nurture personal and group improvement, share inspiring organizational visions, and foster commitment and motivation towards important goals (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership behavior in managers has been widely linked to positive individual and organizational consequences (Bass, 1998).

Typically, managers’ transformational leadership correlates with higher job, leader and organizational satisfaction of their employees. Some studies have found gender influences on transformational leadership: Male tended to be higher in aspects of vision creation, while females reported more vision implementation and follow-through, as well as employee and team development (Kabacoff, 1998). On the other hand, a research did discover that there is no differences in transformational leadership. Studying residence hall directors, Komives (1991) found that males and females held quite similar views of their transformational leadership behavior.
This view is given a detailed attention in Manning (2002). Since Leithwood (1994) claims that transformational leadership has arisen from a broadening of the instructional leadership concept to overcome its inherent deficiencies, and that transformational leadership is particularly relevant to the current climate of school education which is characterized by change, it goes to support the position of Burns (1978) when he posits that school leaders act less directly and more collaboratively with teachers, and regards this as transformational (i.e., transforming) leadership.

Bearing in mind that Gronn (1995) and Lakomski 1995) criticized the proponents of transformational leadership on the ground that they have insufficient data to prove the worth and effectiveness of Transformational leadership, our investigation gathered that Leithwood and his colleagues employed both quantitative and qualitative methodologies in leadership, as well as the roles of superintendents and assistant principals.

It is a common notion among the promoters of the transformational leadership, that all transformational leaders can develop a very powerful influence over followers. For example, several research studies have documented the power of transformational leadership in establishing value congruency and trust (Jung & Avolio, 2000; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Shamir, 1995). Secondy, the transformational leader articulates the vision in a clear and appealing manner, explains how to attain the vision, acts confidently and optimistically, expresses confidence in the followers, emphasizes values with symbolic actions, and leads by example, and empowers to achieve the vision (Yukl, 2002).

On the strength of the on-going discussion, we would posit that gender does not have any part to play with regard to the effectiveness of the transformational leaders. Males and females have similar views of transformational leadership behavior. Secondly, the organizations especially the schools would better achieve their goal, all-round formation of the youngsters if there is a greater collaboration, respect for one another and a clear vision of the organizational objective, among the leaders and followers, principals and teachers.
Research question:

Are women and men equally likely to be transformational leaders or does one sex have a slight advantage? Though male and female managers report comparable transformational leadership behavior, are there still differences in how others evaluate male and female managers as transformational leaders? Secondly, is it observable that transformational leaders could impact their clients/subordinates in such a way that they be more productive in achieving the organizational objective/intent?

So in studying the relationship of gender to self-reported and observer-rated transformational leadership and the two aspects of work satisfaction in a US social services agency found in the work of Tracy T. Manning “Gender, managerial level, transformational leadership and work satisfaction; and the influence of the school principal transformational leaders and school learning culture, studied by Kerry Barnett and John McCormick, “Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools, we posit the following hypotheses:

H1. The more positive a school principal is towards individualized consideration with the teachers, the greater is the teachers’ commitment to excellence in teaching

H2. There will be no significant differences between male and female transformational leaders on any of the five transformational leadership practices Inventory

**H1. Independent Variable:** Principal’s leadership

**Dependent variable:** Excellence in teaching.

Both the independent and dependent variables are variables that vary in degree, or along a continuum.
**Constitutive definition of individualized consideration:** A principal demonstrates individualized concern when he or she approaches each teacher individually with respect and fairness; is accessible to teachers; supports, encourages, and recognizes individual efforts, provides direction and guidance based on individual needs and development. (Barnett & McCormick 2004 p.429).

**Operational definition of individualized consideration:**
The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (The MLQ 5X [short]) developed by Bass and Avolio (1997) from confirmatory factor analysis was used to measure the leadership behavior of a transformational principal, and individual consideration was found to be consistent with vision, confirming that those two are a ‘sine qua non qualities of a transformational leader.

**Constitutive definition of commitment to excellence in teaching:** Teachers who are treated with respect and fairness based on individual needs and development, are willing to take challenges of hard work and improvement in teaching.

**Operational definition of teachers who commit to excellence in teaching:**
Analysis with multifactor leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was carried out on the school learning variable- excellence in teaching. Example, “This school makes teachers want to work hard” and “The administration is always looking to improve teaching.”

**H2. Constitutive definition of Transformational leaders:** are the organizational employees (male and female) that focus on the determination of organizational objectives and strategies, which entails creating and mustering commitment to the visions, mentor followers to take greater responsibility for their development, and influence others to work toward the accomplishment of the organizational objectives.
Operational Definition of Transformational leaders: The LPI in both self and observer form (Kouzes and Posner, 1988) is a 30-item leadership inventory, assessing five transformational leadership factors for both male and female managers/leaders (challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, modeling the way, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart). Each Factor is measured by six behavioral descriptions, rated on a ten-point Likert scale. A sample rated assessment item: “I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their jobs”.

As predicted by H2, the result reveals no significant differences between men and women on any LPI-self or LPI-observer scales or on total scores.

Observing the posited hypotheses, it is evident that the intervening variable is the individual consideration for the first hypothesis, because it is when the teachers are quite definite that the principals treat them with respect and regard (treats me as an individual rather than just a member of a group), that they will be most disposed to face the challenges of excellence in teaching.

We hereby propose that the statistical measure for bivariates would be used because the independent and dependent variables correlate.

Conclusion:

With the consultation of a variety of literature on Transformational leadership, we have been able to sum up this study, as well as posit the hypotheses herein.

Like much previous studies of this kind, this research found no significant differences in transformational leadership between male and female managers at equivalent levels, whether leadership was self-rated or observer-rated. This may indicate that transformational leadership is a more androgynous, feminine-role-compatible leadership style than earlier directive or task-oriented models of leadership. So at this juncture, the current study supports the premise that women and men in management have at least equal claim to transformational leadership.
We note in addition that although variations in school learning culture may be conceptualized at the school level, what individual teachers think is more important in disposing themselves toward excellence in teaching.

It should be emphasized that this result should be viewed with caution, because it is related to the specific school learning culture variables investigated and not school culture in general.
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