

THE INFLUENCE OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STYLE ON TEACHER OUTCOMES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Margaret W Iyaya,

Assistant Registrar, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology

Kennedy Onkware,

Associate Professor in Disaster Management and Humanitarian

John O Shiundu,

Professor of Education in Educational Leadership major in Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

It is well established that the principal is best positioned to enhance teaching and learning in a school and that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to student learning. The purpose of this article was to investigate the influence of principal leadership style on teacher outcomes in secondary schools. From a sample of 36 secondary schools in Bungoma and Kakamega Counties, Kenya, 31 schools agreed to participate in a study on leadership attributes of principals. All principals in the participating schools were purposeful selected to complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X-Short) as well as 72 teachers for their respective principals. Based on teacher responses, Transformational leadership styles and Contingent Reward (a Transactional leadership style) were found to correlate highly with teacher outcomes. This study confirms the significance of leadership and provides specific insight into the nature of leadership.

Key Words : *Principal, Leadership Style, Outcomes, Secondary schools*

Introduction

It is well established that the principal, being the highest administrator in the school, is best positioned to enhance teaching and learning in a school and that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to student learning (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom, 2004). Wilmore (2002) states that principals play diverse roles: they are responsible for effecting education policy, keeping track of all activities within the school and ensuring that their schools run smoothly. Dinham (2005) acknowledges that leadership is important in developing effective,

innovative schools and in facilitating quality teaching and learning. Quinn (2002) says that while principals have strong, direct effects on intermediate school variables, such as teacher attitudes, they have little direct effect on student outcomes. Principals can only influence student achievement indirectly by working through the teaching staff. This article highlights the influence of principal leadership style on teacher outcomes in secondary schools in Bungoma and Kakamega counties of Kenya.

This study was based on the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) advanced by Bass and Avolio (1990) to broaden the range of leadership styles typically

investigated in the field. The FRLM provides a greater chance for finding the right combination of leadership styles for a particular situation (*Ibid*).

The FRLM is an extension of Transformational Leadership Theory to nine dimensions of leader behavior. The Bass' (1985) conceptualization of Transformational Leadership Theory included seven leadership factors which he labeled charisma (Idealized Influence), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception and *Laissez-Faire* leadership. In the Full Range Leadership Model, a distinction is made between the attributes and behavior facets of Idealized Influence and also the active and passive facets of Management-by-Exception (Antonakis & House, 2002).

The three broad categories of Full Range Leadership Model comprise the following nine leadership styles: Transformational Leadership – Idealized Influence Attributes (IIA), Idealized Influence Behaviors (IIB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), Individual Consideration (IC); Transactional Leadership – Contingent Reward (CR) and Management-by-Exception – Active (MBEA); Passive-Avoidant – Management-by-Exception – Passive (MBEP) and *Laissez-Faire* (LF) Leadership. Three leadership outcomes; Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction are also included in the model. These changes increased precision at measuring and describing a full range of leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1995).

Methodology

Principals and teachers in 36 selected schools were asked to respond to a Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5X-Short) intended to establish the type of leadership employed by secondary school principals. This study also assessed the outcomes of the leadership styles employed by secondary school principals. Using SPSS 16, data were collected from 25 principals and 60 teachers who responded to the questionnaire. The survey questions of the MLQ developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) measured both perceived behaviors and attributes in the full range

of leadership factors associated with Transformational, Transactional and Passive/Avoidant leadership styles. Four items correspond to each of the nine leadership style scales, Extra Effort has three items, Effectiveness has four items, and Satisfaction has two items. To identify the frequency of a particular leadership behavior, principals and teachers responded to a likert scale of 1-4 showing how often a principal displayed a certain type of behavior. The coding was as follows: 0-never, 1-once in a while, 2-sometimes, 3-fairly often, and 4-frequently if not always. The MLQ scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale.

Validity and reliability analysis

By using an existing research tool, the MLQ has already undergone over two decades of validity and reliability scrutiny. Additional piloting was however undertaken to ascertain its validity, reliability and practicability. To test the validity of the research instrument, two schools in Kakamega South District were used for a pilot study. A total of 20 respondents constituting 10 students from each school were randomly sampled for the pilot study. These schools did not participate in the actual study. The responses and information collected were used to clean the questionnaire items and hence eliminate unclear questions from the instruments before the actual study.

Using SPSS 16 analysis was undertaken to validate the MLQ questionnaire. The scales used needed to consistently reflect the construct they were measuring. Cronbachs alpha tested results for internal reliability. All 45 variable items were tested producing a computed alpha coefficient of 0.913 which represents an acceptable level of internal reliability. Wright (2007) noted that Cronbachs alpha should be applied separately to the items within each scale. In this article, therefore, consideration of each behavioral scale is presided with an assessment of the reliability of the items relating to the scale. Each leadership scale is measured by four highly inter-correlated items that are low in correlation with items in the other eight scales and have a

Cronbach alpha coefficient of at least 0.70. Nunnally (1978) maintains that an alpha value of 0.70 is an acceptable reliability coefficient.

Research Validated Benchmark for MLQ (5X-Short) compiled by Bass and Avolio (1996/2003) in Appendix I is used for comparison purposes throughout this study.

Results

Leadership styles

The descriptive statistics giving a summary of the mean item scores are shown in appendix III. Appendix III represents the ratings by the sampled teachers (herein referred to as raters) who responded to the questionnaire. Appendix IV gives a summary of the mean item scores of principals rating of themselves. The standard deviation has been taken as the measure of distributions of the frequencies.

Idealized influence (attributed)

Idealized Influence (Attributed) (IIA) measures the degree by which staff wish to be professionally associated with the principal. Variables 1-4 measured this scale (See Appendix III). Reliability analysis produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.826 which was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability with relatively high correlations. Reliability would not be strengthened by the removal of any variable statement.

The means comparison of principals' ratings of themselves shows a difference between their views and the views of the raters (See Appendixes III & IV). The principals slightly overrate themselves for variable 4, yet greatly overrate themselves on the other three variables. With principals' scores of 3 equating to 'fairly often' displaying these characteristics and teacher scores of 2 (except for one) equating to 'sometimes' displaying these characteristics, there is a large difference in views between teachers and principals.

Raters were able to identify characteristics of attributed idealized influence with their principals'

leadership styles. All principals demonstrated some ability to display power and confidence, to get their staff to have some pride through their mutual association, and to go beyond self interest for the good of the school. Principals considered themselves to be transformational on all the four variables while teachers considered principals to be transformational on only variable 4. For one to be transformational, he/she must score in the range of >3.0 to <3.35 (See Research Validated Benchmark Appendix II). The mean score for IIA (raters) is 2.56 (See Appendix V).

Idealized influence (behavior)

Four statement variables (5, 6, 7 and 8) were designed to test the degree by which the principal can be counted upon to take the right action, and to demonstrate high standards of ethical and moral behavior. At .829 Cronbach's Alpha was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability with relatively high correlations.

From the descriptive statistics in Appendix III, the raters scored the principals higher on IIB attributes than on IIA behaviors. The mean score on IIB of 2.803 (See Appendix V) from the raters suggests the principals overall are strong in this area. The overall mean results of principals' ratings of themselves of 3.26 (See Appendix V) shows that they consider that they are relatively strong in demonstrating these leadership style with the principals' means ranging from 2.88-3.40. This relative strength is supported by the raters. The principals rated themselves as transformational in three variables 6, 7 and 8 while the teachers rated the principals as transformational on only variable 8. Raters were able to identify characteristics of idealized influence (Behavior) with their principal. Idealized Influence (Behavior) style was seen to be displayed fairly often than Idealized Influence (Attributed) behaviors. It was also displayed more often in schools than other organizations (Compare Appendixes V & II).

Inspirational motivation

Inspirational Motivation (IM) measures the principals' ability to sell the school' vision of the future to colleagues so that they would follow. In

considering the reliability of the IM data, at .802 Cronbach's Alpha was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability with relatively high correlations. Reliability would not be strengthened by the removal of any item. As Appendix III illustrates, variables 9, 10, 11 and 12 all part of the inspirational motivation scale scored relatively high across the schools. Overall variable (9) – 'talks optimistically about the future' had the highest mean score of the thirty six behavior variables rated by teacher respondents. Overall, the range of means across the variables (from 2.88-3.22) were relatively high and demonstrated that the principals in the schools that responded, were relatively strong in motivational behaviors. The average mean of 3.038 raters is in the range for transformational leadership as can be seen in Appendix VI. The teaching staff therefore, averagely considers principals to be transformational in Inspirational Motivation behaviors.

The principals significantly overrated their motivational qualities compared to the view of their teaching staff (See Appendix V). The staff rated the IM qualities of principals as 3.038 whilst the principals rated themselves as 3.5. Despite the overrating, the teachers considered inspirational motivation to be the principals' strongest transformational qualities.

Intellectual stimulation

Intellectual stimulation (IS) measures those behaviors by staff that increase their understanding of the problems that schools face in achieving the school targets and vision. Variables 13, 14, 15 and 16 measured this leadership style (See Appendix III). A test of reliability on the IS variables produced a Cronbach's alpha of .903 which was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability. Reliability would not be strengthened by the removal of any item.

The impact of principals on the intellectual stimulation of their staff was relatively lower than on the other transformational scales considered to this point (See Appendix III). The strongest results were recorded in response to the statement that the principals re-examines critical assumptions to

question whether they are appropriate (variable 13). The principals overestimated their qualities in terms of intellectual stimulation that they provided for their staff (Compare Appendices III & IV). However, on overall, neither the principals nor the teachers considered the principals to be transformational in IS skills. Intellectual Stimulation was also displayed less often in schools than other organizations (Compare Appendices V & II).

The standard deviation measurements were larger than those previously reported (See Appendix III). The dispersal of the values illustrates an inconsistency of response by raters with the full range attitudinal measurements being used. This would appear to indicate a degree of selectivity on the part of the principals actively involved in stimulating efforts to be innovative and creative to a portion of their staff.

Individualized consideration

Individual Consideration (IC) measures the extent to which principals treated followers as individuals and how much mentoring orientation the principal had for the teaching staff. At .812 Cronbach's alpha was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability. However, it was noted that item 17 'spends time teaching and coaching' had a very low correlation with other items. There is a possibility that the teacher raters assumed this to mean that the principal spent time in the classroom teaching, rather than spent time with the staff coaching them. The deletion of this item returns a Cronbach's alpha of .881, which is still considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability.

Relative to other four sets of variables making up the transformational leadership scales, the raters' mean scores were lower but slightly higher than those of the IS scale which scored the lowest. The strongest results were recorded in response to the statement that the principals treats others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group (variable 18). The standard deviation (See Appendix III) also shows a large dispersal of the data across the 0-4 range. This may imply that the principal was selective towards those staff with the potential capacity to develop and support school improvement.

A comparison of the principal mean scores for IC compared with their rater mean scores continues to display the same pattern as seen in the other four transformational leadership scales. Principals overrated their transformational strengths when compared to their teachers' perceptions. Findings from this study indicate that Individual Consideration is not as strong in schools as behaviors associated with Inspirational Motivation and Idealized Influence. However, it appears to be stronger than Intellectual Stimulation. This finding disagrees with the research validated benchmark whereby Intellectual Stimulation is considered as being stronger than Individual Consideration (See Appendix II).

Contingent Reward (CR)

Measures the extent to which leaders set goals and make rewards contingent on satisfactory performance. Contingent Reward involves the principal agreeing with, or directing, the staff on what needs to be done, and making it clear what the rewards will be for satisfactory outcome.

At .857 Cronbach' alpha was considered to represent a satisfactory reliability with high correlations. The reliability could however be strengthened to .871 by the removal of item number 22; 'Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets'. Variable 21, 22, 23 and 24 were used to measure the leadership style Contingent Reward. Most of the principals were rated by their staff to fairly often display strong transactional qualities. The strongest response was noted for variable 24, and suggested that their principals expressed satisfaction when others meet expectations.

Despite the switch from transformational to transactional leadership styles, the CR mean score is higher than for IS and closely related to those of IC. Appendix 1 also reveals a high correlation between CR and all of the transformational leadership behaviors ranging from .611-.776. These results are significant with $p = 0.01$ level. The similarities between the findings of CR and transformational leadership styles are also reflected in terms of principals' assessments of themselves, with principals, in general, overrating themselves. The

mean for CR scale 2.398 is in the range of 2-3.25 as shown in the research validated benchmark (compare Appendix V with II).

Management-by-exception (Active)

Active Management-by-Exception (MBEA) measures those behaviors of the principal that closely monitor staff performance and keep track of mistakes. The principal arranges to actively monitor deviances from standards, mistakes, and errors in colleagues, and takes corrective actions as necessary. A reliability test on MBEA variables was undertaken and at .773 Cronbach's alpha was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability.

MBEA as a transactional characteristic was seen in a much greater intensity than may have been expected. The raters' mean score of 2.175 are shown in Appendix V. The range validated by Bass and Avolio (1996/2003) is 1-2 (See Appendix II). The total means reported for variables 25-28 (Appendix III) are, in every case, higher than that range. All of the principals were seen to be actively monitoring mistakes on a fairly often basis. It was thus observed that all the principals in the study have a measure of rating that is stronger than other organizational leaders in displaying MBEA attributes (Bass & Avolio, 1996/2003). Variable 29 centered on focusing attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards was the most frequently observed characteristic. From Appendix V the average mean score for MBEA of 1.925 reported from the principals' perceptions shows that the principals underestimated the strength of their MBEA qualities as perceived by the staff. The standard deviations were also relatively larger illustrating an inconsistency of response by raters with a big range of attitudinal measurements being used. This may suggest a degree of selectivity on the part of the principals actively involved in tracking the mistakes and deviations of a proportion of their staff.

Management-by-exception (Passive)

Management-by-Exception – Passive (MBEP) measures the degree of awareness of performance problems. A high score suggests that the principal is

unaware of performance problems until they are brought to their attention and that they may not be fully engaged in the day-to-day situations. It also suggests an environment of negative feedback and punishment. Passive Management by exception implies waiting passively for deviances, mistakes and errors to occur before taking corrective action. At .851, Cronbach's alpha was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability (Table 2). Item 29 'fails to interfere until problems become serious' however, has a low correlation with the other items. Deleting this item raises the reliability to .856. Given the passive nature of the leadership quality, effective leaders would be expected to score low. The range for MBEP according Bass and Avolio (1996/2003) is 0-1 (See Appendix II). The average mean score for raters in this study was 1.033 (See Appendix V). The teachers in this study, therefore, considered the principals to possess strong MBEA attributes than other organizational leaders. With a mean of 0.665, the principals underestimated the extent by which staff consider their leadership style to be passive (See Appendix V).

Laissez-faire

Laissez-faire measures the extent to which the principal chooses not to guide performance when the situation would warrant (Smith, Matkin & Fritz, 2004). A high score suggests that the principal avoids leadership; showing passive indifference about the task and subordinates. The reliability test on LF produced an alpha of .923 which was considered to represent a satisfactory measure of reliability. The removal of any item could not strengthen the reliability.

The mean scores for the *Laissez-faire* variables (33 – 36) are displayed in Appendix III. The Bass and Avolio 1996/2003, Research Validated Benchmark presents a range of 0-1 for the *Laissez-faire* scale (See Appendix II). Against this benchmark, the means appear to fall in that range; in fact, the average mean for the four variables is 0.793 (See Appendix V). On average, the raters indicated that the principals once in a while employ *Laissez-faire* leadership. All principals scored themselves in the range of 0.29 – 0.88. Again, the teachers gave the

principals stronger characteristics than they associated with themselves.

Leadership styles and their influence on outcome

Bivariate analyses investigated the overall IIA, IIB, IM, IS, IC, CR, MBEA, MBEP and LF means alongside the means of the outcome scales of effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction.

Idealized attributes category (IIA) in the Table 1 is a collapsed scale with all the scores of the related items within the scale being added up and divided by the number of items to provide an average score of the scale (will apply to all scales). With a Pearson correlation coefficient of between .494 and .751 for all three outcome scales it appears that IIA may have a large effect on the movement of these scales.

As Table 1 demonstrates, there is also a high correlation between the outcome scales. Therefore, there is a strong association between staff perceiving themselves to make extra effort, and consider themselves to be more satisfied with their work in secondary schools and Idealized Influence (Attributed) where these behaviors of the principal are seen to be strong. Effectiveness on the part of the staff is affected the most by changes in the IIA behaviors.

Analysis of the overall Idealized Influence (Behaviors) IIB means alongside the means of outcome scales of effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction showed strong correlations. With a Pearson correlation coefficient of .626 (effectiveness), .501 (extra effort) and .591 (satisfaction) high ratings on IIB items are likely to heighten teaching staff perceptions with regard to their performance. As noted, all three outcome scales correlate highly against each other. IIB, therefore, is also perceived to have a large positive effect on performance outcomes.

With Inspiration Motivation (IM), the measurement of the covariance of the random variables produced a Pearson correlation coefficient of .658 for effectiveness, .369 for extra effort and .658 for satisfaction outcome scales. The correlations were significant at the 0.01 level.

With Pearson correlation coefficient of .688 (effectiveness), .337 (extra effort) and .742 (satisfaction), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) is also seen to have a positive relationship on the movement of these scales within similar range to the other transformational behaviors considered. However, with Extra Effort, the correlation is only significant at 0.05 level.

A Pearson correlation coefficient of .783 (effectiveness), .376 (extra effort) and .803 (satisfaction) is reported with Individualized Consideration (IC); therefore IC is also seen to have a positive relationship on the movement of these scales. All the correlations are significant at 0.01 levels. IC seems to have the largest influence on the movement within the Satisfaction scale.

With the Pearson correlation coefficient of .786 (effectiveness) .438 (extra effort) and .720 (satisfaction), CR is also seen to have a large effect on the movement of these scales. These correlations being within the range as those reported for individual transformational leadership scales of .337 - .803.

Comparison of the overall MBEA mean alongside the means of the outcome scales of effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction showed a different set of results from those previously reported. With a Pearson correlation coefficient of .183 and .150 on perceived effectiveness and work satisfaction, MBEA was only seen as having a small association. A medium association of .372 was however observed with extra effort. This contrasts with all other behaviors previously reported as they were seen to have a large effect on the outcome scales.

With a Pearson correlation coefficient of -.515, -.210 and -.503 MBEP is viewed to have a negative effect on staff effectiveness, their extra effort and their work satisfaction. Given the passive nature of the leadership quality a negative effect on outcome scales was a possibility.

With *Laissez-faire*, negative and significant correlations at 0.01 were reported for -.668 (effectiveness), and -.618 (satisfaction). The correlation with extra effort (-.243) was not significant. The correlations between the three outcome scales mirror those shown in Table 1. The

degree of correlation suggests that the negative effect of *Laissez-faire* on the outcome scales is not small. Therefore the greater the extent by which principals are perceived to possess *Laissez-faire* characteristics, the less satisfied the staff become with the less effort being input and they feel they are less effective.

Summary of findings

In terms of staff perceptions, all five transformational leadership scales have a positive correlation with outcome scales – Effectiveness, Extra Effort, and Satisfaction. All five leadership scales have a positive association on the movement of the outcome scales whereby an increase in response of one transformational leadership area is followed by an increase in terms of response in perceived outcome (all move in the same direction, but not by the same amount). In all the five transformational scales correlation with the Extra Effort scale was the smallest, though significant. Contingent Reward can have a large effect on staff satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness. Management-by-Exception (Passive) can have a large negative effect on staff satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness. *Laissez-faire* leadership is negatively correlated to teacher effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction.

From the above, the findings would appear to support the following statements as related to secondary schools in Bungoma and Kakamega counties:-

All principals display transformational leadership qualities

Principals in most of the schools have strengths in inspiring and motivating their staff

The ability to inspire and motivate staff is the strongest transformational leadership quality displayed by the principals

Most principals are seen to demonstrate strong ethical and moral behaviors

Principals are not seen to be consistent in their intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration of their teaching staff

Intellectual stimulation is perceived to be the weakest transformational leadership style displayed by principals

Principals overestimate the degree by which they consider teachers to be individuals, with individual needs and concerns

Principals are perceived to have below average skills in IIA, IB, IS and IC when compared to the Research Validated Benchmark of the range of >3.0 to <3.75 (See Appendix VI). According to this benchmark, the strongest leaders achieve all rater averages outcomes in excess of 3.5.

Contingent Reward is a relatively strong characteristic of all principals

Most principals are perceived as actively monitoring mistakes and deviations from the standard

Secondary school principals are assessed to have relatively stronger behaviors in actively managing by exception than other organizational leaders

The findings suggest that the teaching staff consider principals in every aspect to be transactional Management-by-Exception (Passive) is a relatively strong characteristic of all principals

Secondary school principals are assessed to sometimes display *Laissez-faire* behaviors as other organizational leaders

Discussion of Findings

The findings illustrate relative strengths in all transformational and transactional leadership styles measured. Inspirational Motivation and Contingent Reward appeared to be displayed in greater intensity than other leadership styles. Also Management-by-Exception (Active) was reported in greater intensity than in other studies (Bass and Avolio, 1996/2003).

Idealized Influence centers upon the qualities of the principal that enable them to be observed serving as role models, displaying behaviors that can be admired, respected and trusted by most teachers. Idealized Influence (Attributed) reviews the charisma attributed to the leader. It is also an indicator that the principal is prepared to take risks and is consistent in their actions. Idealized Influence (Behavior) is a display of qualities emphasizing a

collective sense of mission and values. Both scales are a measure of staff confidence in the principal focusing upon higher-order ideals and values for the common good. Displaying a sense of power and confidence and emphasizing the importance of having a collective sense of mission were two strong statements associated with the principals in the study.

Analysis of Idealized Influence variables and outcome scales of Effectiveness, Extra-effort and Satisfaction demonstrate relatively strong correlations with positive association between them. Although there were strong positive correlations between Idealized Influence and outcome scales (Table 1), there was also an indication that not everyone puts in extra effort.

The greatest reported strength was the ability of principals to inspire and motivate their staff to work towards the vision. According to Harris and Chapman (2002), the effective leader of a school facing challenging circumstances is able to convince others that their vision is worth sharing and pursuing. Bivariate analysis of Inspirational Motivation and outcomes of Effectiveness, Extra-Effort and Satisfaction demonstrated relatively strong correlations with positive associations between them. Inspired and motivated staff perceive that they are more likely to make an extra effort, gain job satisfaction and be more effective.

The total teacher rating means for IS and IC were not as high as for other transformational leadership characteristics. The low scores for IS suggest that most staff did not frequently feel intellectually stimulated by their principals. Intellectual Stimulation is perceived by teachers to be the weakest transformational leadership quality displayed by principals in the study. It can also be said that most teachers did not feel that they were frequently individually considered by the principals. In contrast, the principals overestimated the degree by which they were seen to be considering teachers to be individuals, with individual needs and concerns.

Responses to variables concerning Contingent Reward show that it was also a relatively strong characteristic of most of the principals and that all

the principals considered themselves strong in this area. Contingent Reward involves the principal assigning work to the teacher, getting agreement on what needs to be done and then promising rewards for when the work is carried out satisfactorily. Bivariate analysis of Contingent Reward and outcome scales of Effectiveness, Extra-Effort and Satisfaction demonstrated strong correlations with a positive association between them. The majority of the teachers in all schools assessed the principals to, at least, fairly often provide them with assistance in exchange for their efforts and discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.

Contingent Reward is a transactional leadership quality when the reward is tangible, such as a bonus payment which is rare in education and can be transformational if the reward is psychological, such as praise (Wright, 2007). This may explain the relatively high scores returned. Bass and Riggio (2006) considered that Contingent Reward, although not as much as any of the transformational components, has been found to be reasonably effective in motivating others to achieve higher levels of development and performance. Because of the close association between Contingent Reward and the transformational components, the Leithwood Model of Transformational Leadership, includes the factor Contingent Reward.

All the principals were seen to employ active management by exception. This is a corrective quality whereby the principal arranges to actively monitor deviances from standards, mistakes and errors. The principal then take the necessary action to correct the situation. All principals scored higher than expected when compared to Bass and Avolio (1996/2003) Research Validated Benchmark (See Appendix II). The range of Management-by-Exception (Active) given by Bass and Avolio (1996/2003) is 1-2. As can be seen from Appendix III, the scores for the individual variables were well above that range with scores ranging from 2.07 – 2.40. Active behavior in monitoring and managing deviations was a feature of all schools.

Performance management in schools has become increasingly focused upon hard data centered upon

performance in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examinations and upon demonstrating satisfactory progress against value added charts. This may partly account for the higher than expected scores. Effective principals in secondary schools monitor and evaluate pupils' achievement (Wright, 2007). Among other functions, Wright (2007) notes that the testing of student achievement enables teaching staff to be monitored. With the increased focus on hard data, Hallinger (2005) foresees the re-emergence of instructional leadership. One dimension of instructional leadership is to manage instructional program. This requires supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum and monitoring progress. This supervision and monitoring of teaching and learning, with its emphasis on attention placed on mistakes and deviations from standards, is reported by relatively high levels of MBEA.

In this study the scoring for MBEP, normally associated with weak and unsatisfactory leadership practice, exceeded the range of 0-1 allowed by the research validated benchmark (See Appendix II). The teachers rated principals relatively highly on variables 29 'fails to interfere until problems become serious' and variable 31 'shows a firm belief in 'if it is not broken, don't fix it''. Wright (2007) noted that there are many barriers to progress which may create a need for prioritization and it is not so much the style of leadership that makes the principal effective, rather than their ability to prioritize and thereby establish a direction, motivate staff and build capacity by developing staff and harnessing resources. By 'failing to interfere' and leaving the 'unbroken' it may be that principals in Bungoma and Kakamega Counties are able to focus upon the greatest need. This is consistent with research by Eden (1998) which suggested that transformational leadership is effective when it incorporates transactional leadership practices that are sensitive to teachers and accepted by them. Hallinger (2003) maintains that no single style of leadership seems appropriate for all schools. Therefore Reynolds, Hopkins, Potter & Chapman, (2001) were cautious to prescribe any one right way and as Hopkins (2007) puts it, transformational leadership behaviors may

be necessary, but not a sufficient requirement for school improvement.

Conclusion

On average, Transformational leadership and Contingent Reward (a Transactional leadership style) is seen to have a large positive relationship on the movement of outcome scales. Despite the relatively high correlations between the transformational leadership behaviors and the perceptions of increased performance, the findings can only highlight a positive association. Other factors, particularly those related to students outcomes (e.g. students attitudes, classroom teaching) may be more effective. Also the measurements used in the scales were based on attitudinal perceptions. These may, or may not, be real in terms of the actual additional efforts put in or gains in both satisfaction and effectiveness. Management-by-exception (Active) is seen to have a small positive relationship with outcome scales while Management-by-exception (Passive) and *Laissez-faire* shows larger negative relationship with outcome scales.

Recommendation

The study recommends that secondary school principals employ FRLM of leadership since no single style seems appropriate for all schools. Transformational leadership should however be the focus.

References

- ❖ Antonakis, J. & House, R. J. (2002). The full-range leadership theory: The way forward. *Journal of Management Research*, 1, 149-159.
- ❖ Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B. M. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire instrument and scoring guide for use by Margaret Iyaya only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on July 7, 2015.
- ❖ Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. NewYork: The Free Press.
- ❖ Bass, B. M, & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- ❖ Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1996/2003). Multifactor Leadership questionnaire Feedback Report. Mind Garden, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.mindgarden.com> on 8th August 2009
- ❖ Bass, B.M. & Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. 2nd Ed. London.
- ❖ Dinham, S. (2005). Principal leadership for outstanding educational outcomes. *Journal of Education Administration* 43(4), 338-356
- ❖ Eden, D. (1998). The paradox of school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(3), 249-261
- ❖ Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329
- ❖ Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: a passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 1-20 accessed from <http://doi:10.1080/15700760500244793> on 7th November, 2014
- ❖ Harris, A. & Chapman, C. (2002). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances. Nottingham. NCSL.
- ❖ Hopkins, D. (2007). *Instructional Leadership and School Improvement. LCSL Leadership Evidence Base*. Retrieved from www.ncsl.org.uk/index.cfm?pageid=ev_auth_hopkins on July 28, 2010.

- ❖ Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S. & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of Research: How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Center for Applied Research and Education Improvement, and Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Retrieved at www.wallacefoundation.org on 10th September 2008
- ❖ Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- ❖ Quinn, D.M. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 447 – 467 accessed from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578230210440294> on 07th November 2014
- ❖ Reynolds, D., Hopkins, D., Potter, D. & Chapman, C. (2001). *School improvement for schools facing challenging circumstances: A Review of the research and practice*. London. DFES
- ❖ Smith, K. K., Matkin, G.S., & Fritz, S. (2004). A Review of gender and Full Range Leadership and suggestions for future research: *Journal of Leadership Education*, 3(2) fall 2004
- ❖ Wilmore, E. L. 2002. *Principal Leadership*. California: Corwin Press Inc.
- ❖ Wright, G. (2007). *Leading the Teaching and Learning*. A Study of Transformational Leadership in Secondary Schools Facing Challenging Circumstances. (Doctoral Thesis). University of Hull

Table 1: IIA Covariance with Performance Scales

		idealized attributes category	effectiveness category	extra effort category	satisfaction with leadership
idealized attributes category	Pearson Correlation	1	.751**	.494**	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	58	55	58	58
effectiveness category	Pearson Correlation	.751**	1	.456**	.868**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	55	57	57	57
extra effort category	Pearson Correlation	.494**	.456**	1	.448**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	58	57	60	60
satisfaction with leadership	Pearson Correlation	.730**	.868**	.448**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	58	57	60	60

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

Table 2: Reliability Statistics for MBEP

Cronbach's alpha = .851

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Fails to interfere until problems become serious	2.71	10.667	.607	.388	.856
Waits for things to go wrong before taking action	3.36	11.217	.777	.610	.778
Shows a firm belief in 'if it is not broken, don't fix it'	3.09	11.764	.678	.496	.817
Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before he/she takes action	3.31	10.920	.733	.566	.792

Appendix 1: Contingent Reward Correlation Analysis with other Eight Leadership Styles

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

		IIA scale	IM scale	IIB scale	IS scale	IC scale	CR scale	MBEA scale	MBEP scale	LF scale
CR scale	Pearson	.735**	.611**	.699**	.776**	.684**	1	.299*	-.558**	-.628**
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.024	.000	.000
	N	55	56	56	53	55	57	57	56	54

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Key

IIA	Idealized Influence (Attributes)	IIB	Idealized Influence (Behaviors)
IM	Inspirational Motivation	IS	Intellectual Stimulation
IC	Individual Consideration	CR	Contingent Reward
MBEA	Management-by-Exception (Active)	MBEP	Management-by-Exception (Passive)
LF	<i>Laissez-faire</i>		

Appendix II: Research Validated Benchmark

Factors	Research Validated Benchmark	All Raters Average
IIA		3.1
IIB		2.5
IM		3.2
IS		2.5
IC		2.4
TRANSFR	>3.0 to <3.75	2.7
CR	2-3.25	2.6
MBEA	1-2	1.9
TRANSAC		
MBEP	0-1	1.3
LF	0-1	0.8
PASSAVOID		

Source: Bass and Avolio (1996/2003)

The strongest leaders achieve all rater averages outcomes in excess of 3.5

Appendix III: Descriptive Statistics – Statement Variables

Descriptive statistics (Raters only –teachers)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Instills pride in others for being associated with him/her	60	0	4	2.28	1.485
2. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group	60	0	4	2.38	1.342
3. Acts in ways that build others respect for him/her	59	0	4	2.56	1.193
4. Displays a sense of power and confidence	59	0	4	3.02	1.122
5. Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs	59	0	4	2.47	1.344
6. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	60	0	4	2.90	1.231
7. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	60	0	4	2.72	1.316
8. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission	60	0	4	3.12	1.195
9. Talks optimistically about the future	60	0	4	3.22	.922
10. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	60	0	4	3.07	1.148
11. Articulates a compelling vision for the future	60	0	4	2.88	1.091
12. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved	58	0	4	2.98	1.132
13. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate	57	0	4	2.35	1.289
14. Seeks differing perspectives in solving problems	60	0	4	2.22	1.474
15. Gets others to look at problems from many different angles	59	0	4	2.12	1.543
16. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	60	0	4	2.27	1.351
17. Spends time teaching and coaching	60	0	4	2.37	1.540
18. Treats others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group	58	0	4	2.67	1.356
19. Considers each individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others	59	0	4	2.41	1.475
20. Helps others to develop their strengths	60	0	4	2.50	1.321
21. Provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts	59	0	4	2.32	1.306
22. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	60	0	4	2.37	1.314
23. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	59	0	4	2.24	1.478
24. Expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations	59	0	4	2.66	1.308
25. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards	60	0	4	2.40	1.238
26. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures	60	0	4	2.13	1.359

27. Keeps track of all mistakes	60	0	4	2.10	1.285
28. Directs his/her attention towards failures to meet standards	60	0	4	2.07	1.287
29. Fails to interfere until problems become serious	60	0	4	1.43	1.477
30. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action	58	0	4	.79	1.196
31. Shows a firm belief in 'if it is not broken, don't fix it'	60	0	4	1.05	1.199
32. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before he/she takes action	59	0	4	.86	1.293
33. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise	60	0	4	.83	1.224
34. He/she is absent when needed	59	0	4	.71	1.204
35. Avoids making decisions	59	0	4	.68	1.090
36. Delays responding to urgent questions	59	0	4	.95	1.292
Valid N (listwise)	48				

Appendix IV: Descriptive Statistics – Statement Variables

Descriptive statistics (Principals)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Instills pride in others for being associated with me	24	0	4	2.75	1.359
2. Goes beyond self interest for the good of the group	25	0	4	3.36	.995
3. Act in ways that build others' respect for me	24	0	4	3.17	1.049
4. Display a sense of power and confidence	25	1	4	3.36	.810
5. Talk about my most important values and beliefs	25	0	4	2.88	1.269
6. Specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	25	1	4	3.40	.866
7. Consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	25	1	4	3.36	.907
8. Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission	25	0	4	3.40	1.041
9. Talk optimistically about the future	25	1	4	3.60	.816
10. Talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	25	0	4	3.48	1.005
11. Articulate a compelling vision for the future	25	0	4	3.40	1.080
12. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved	25	1	4	3.52	.872
13. Re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate	25	0	4	2.80	1.041
14. Seek differing perspectives in solving problems	25	0	4	3.00	1.080
15. Get others to look at problems from many different angles	25	1	4	2.96	1.060
16. Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	25	1	4	3.16	.746
17. Spent time teaching and coaching	25	0	4	2.96	1.207
18. Treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group	25	0	4	3.28	1.137

19. Consider each individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others	25	1	4	3.52	.872
20. Help others to develop their strengths	25	1	4	3.20	1.000
21. Provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts	25	0	4	3.00	1.041
22. Discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	25	0	4	2.96	1.207
23. Make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	25	1	4	3.08	1.038
24. Express satisfaction when others meet expectations	23	0	4	3.35	1.191
25. Focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	25	0	4	2.24	1.480
26. Concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures	25	0	4	1.84	1.434
27. Keep track of all mistakes	24	0	4	1.62	1.345
28. Direct my attention towards failures to meet standards	23	0	4	2.00	1.414
29. Fail to interfere until problems become serious	25	0	4	1.08	1.412
30. Wait for things to go wrong before taking action	23	0	4	.35	.935
31. Show a firm belief in 'if it is not broken, don't fix it'	23	0	4	.91	1.311
32. Demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action	22	0	3	.32	.894
33. Avoid getting involved when important issues arise	24	0	3	.29	.690
34. I am absent when needed	25	0	4	.48	1.159
35. Avoid making decisions	24	0	4	.88	1.484
36. Delay responding to urgent questions	25	0	4	.64	1.221
Valid N (list wise)	16				

Appendix V: Comparison of Principals' Scores with Rater Mean Scores

Factors	Mean	
	Teacher	Principal
IIA	2.56	3.16
IIB	2.803	3.26
IM	3.038	3.5
IS	2.24	2.98
IC	2.488	3.24
TRANSFR	2.623	3.228
CR	2.398	3.098
MBEA	2.175	1.925
TRANSAC	2.286	2.511
MBEP	1.033	0.665
LF	0.793	0.573
PASSAVOID	0.913	0.619

Copyright © 2015 Margaret W Iyaya, Kennedy Onkware and John O Shiundu . This is an open access refereed article distributed under the Creative Common Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.