Graduation Report:

Title:
Filming and Surveying the Behavior of Dutch Primary School Leaders: How Transformational Are the Effective Ones?

Name: Sonja S.E. Hulsman

Student number: S 0132896

Master: Business Administration

Track: Service Management

First graduation supervisor: prof. dr. C.P.M. Wilderom

Second graduation supervisor: J.H.E. Nijhuis, MSc

Enschede, 27 January 2009

Short title: Filming and Surveying Transformational Behavior of Dutch Primary School Leaders

Long title: Filming and Surveying the Behavior of Dutch Primary School Leaders: How Transformational Are the Effective Ones?

Abstract

We hypothesized that effective school leaders would display more transformational leadership behavior than their less effective counterparts. We sampled 21 primary school leaders of a Dutch city school system and filmed these leaders during regular meetings with their teachers. We then meticulously coded their behaviors and compared them to leadership content obtained through extant survey questions: perceptions of the leaders, their teachers and local school-system experts. All leaders were found to display a diverse behavioral repertoire and their actual and perceived transformational behavior was correlated with independent effectiveness ratings. We conclude that there is added value to systematically filming leaders.

Filming and Surveying the Behavior of Dutch Primary School Leaders: How Transformational Are the Effective Ones?

(Short title, truncated for purposes of the AOM-meetings submission: Filming and Surveying Transformational Behavior of Dutch Primary School Leaders)

Leadership 'behavior' is normally operationalized through survey items. This study is one of the first in which we have filmed leader behavior in a natural field setting. We filmed the behavior of 21 primary school directors/leaders during regular meetings with their teaching staff. A coding scheme, based on extant leadership theory, had been developed in a similar study that had been carried out earlier. This scheme enabled a number of coders to analyze the leaders' behaviors in-depth. The overall question for this line of study is: What is the pattern of leadership behavior of effective Dutch primary school leaders? In this particular study we also obtained survey data on the same 21 leaders.

School leaders are held accountable for their students' achievements, even though most studies show that primary school leaders do not have a direct effect on such achievement (Hallinger and Heck, 1996; Leithwood, 2008). We assumed in this study that the behavior of primary school leaders affected student achievement in indirect ways: through the teachers. In our study we observed and coded the pattern of leader-teacher interactions and correlated frequency and duration ratings of these behaviors with independent ratings of leader effectiveness. We also aim to detail – at the behavioral level- effective leadership, something that is especially useful for leadership training purposes.

THEORY

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is widely recognized by researchers as one of the most prominent of contemporary styles of leadership. Virtually all treatments of the theory claim that transformational leaders effect employee motivation and commitment and instill extra effort required for significant performance improvement (Yukl, 1989). Transformational leaders make followers more aware of what they are doing and what the consequences are of their actions. They go far beyond clarifying, rewarding and reprimanding, as might be more typical of transactional leaders; they help integrate emotional elements and intellectual challenges within the followers' work lives. Therefore the main hypothesis of this behavioral leadership study is that the most effective leaders exhibit transformational behaviors.

In contrast to transformational leadership, transactional leadership entails a business-exchange relationship between the leaders and followers. The main task of the leader is to create the right conditions so that employees can perform as expected. According to Burns (1987), transactional leadership occurs when a person interacts with another person for the purpose of exchanging valued things with no mutual pursuit of a higher purpose. Employees are rewarded when predetermined expectations are realized. Bass (1985) has developed two active dimensions of transactional leadership: "contingent reward" and "active management-by-exception". Contingent reward specifies what is expected of employees and what kind of rewards they will receive when expectations are fulfilled, whereas active management-by-exception specifies close control of employee task performance: taking rapid corrective action when employee performance is inadequate.

Based upon Burns' theoretical ideas, Bass and his associates (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1994) developed a model of transformational leadership and performed extensive survey research on the nature of such leadership. Whereas Burns considered transactional and

transformational leadership to be opposites, Bass and Avolio (1994) presented the two styles of leadership as part of a single factor.

Research results have shown that, in fact, it is a combination of active transactional and transformational leadership that makes leaders most effective (e.g., Hater and Bass, 1988; Avolio, Waldemar and Einstein, 1988; Jung and Avolio, 1999 and Wilderom en Van den Berg, 2005). The combination of leadership styles is known as “the augmentation effect”. The precise behaviors that leaders must display, in order to have an augmented transformational leadership style, is still largely unknown. To the best of our knowledge, no empirical study as systematically explored the actual behavioral correlates of both leadership styles. Studies have instead operationalized the leadership styles through perceptual, survey measures. Our study fills this gap by video-filming the observable leadership behaviors, as well as collecting survey data, in natural field settings.

Observable Leader Behavior

Leadership is a phenomenon that can be understood best by seeing it. In that spirit, Van der Weide and Wilderom (2004; see also Van der Weide 2007) filmed the behaviors of middle managers during staff meetings, and were able to code the behaviors with an extensively developed codebook: containing 15 mutually exclusive behaviors. These 15 behaviors could be summarized by three behavioral categories, namely, *self-defending, steering, and supporting* (see Appendix A). The latter, *supporting*-type behaviors represent a large part of what is known as a leader’s transformational style. For the purpose of this primary-school leader study, this observation scheme is collapsed into eleven behaviors across the same three categories: we thereby kept the eleven behaviors that in former, similar studies with the same scheme appeared most relevant.

The behavioral category *self-defending* contains the following behaviors: showing disinterest, defending one's own position, and providing negative feedback. *Showing disinterest* by a leader during a meeting is a form of passive management-by-exception or laissez-faire leadership. Leaders are often limited by time constraints and by a lack of resources when accomplishing their goals. They need to prioritize and are not always able to keep every follower satisfied. It is inevitable that leaders will be confronted with situations in which they need to defend themselves. In a transformational mode, *defending one's own position* does not occur. However, in leadership settings it can occur, for example, when the actions of a follower are not appreciated; then a leader will provide negative feedback in order to correct those actions. One may therefore associate providing negative feedback with the transactional dimension active management-by-exception.

Steering contains the following behaviors: directing, verifying, structuring the conversation, and informing. The behaviors included in this category denote ways in which leaders tell their followers about the type of tasks to be accomplished and how they should be prioritized. *Directing* can be seen as being closely associated with transactional leadership and leaders can either delegate or command. When leaders delegate, they will normally ask in a friendly manner whether a follower wants to accomplish a task or they will command it: as in an order. *Verifying* is related to active management-by-exception in that the leader demands to be informed about the progress of the work activities of one or more followers. *Informing* is also more related to transactional than to transformational leadership in that leaders provide factual information to their followers so the followers can accomplish their tasks.

Transformational leaders tend to support their followers by actively helping and/or motivating them. They show sincere interest in employees and try to stimulate them positively, so the emphasis here is on the emotional support. The third behavioral category of *supporting* contains the behaviors of visioning, intellectual stimulation, individualized

consideration and active listening. *Visioning* is clearly associated with transformational leadership because when engaged in it a leader relates current matters to future objectives and in so doing inspires followers. A leader can *stimulate* followers *intellectually,* by asking explicitly for their opinions. Leaders can ask followers for new ideas, for example, when relating a vision to a current business problem. *Individualized consideration* can come also in many forms. All proceedings of the leader by which he or she accepts or is interested in the personal circumstances in which a follower is carrying out their task can be ascribed to this *supporting* type behavior.

Active listening was also defined as a part of the *supporting* behavioral category. Leaders need to listen attentively and actively to what their followers say. Although active listening may be considered by some as transformational leadership behavior, no items in the MLQ denote such behavior nor do we find any emphasis on it in the readings on transformational leadership style.

Transformational School Leadership

When reviewing the literature on primary-school leadership and its effectiveness, no one can overlook the studies of Leithwood and his colleagues at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Toronto, Canada). His research did in fact import transformational leadership into school settings. He incorporated in his theorizing and survey scales the leadership effects on the school, the teachers, and the student outcomes. Leithwood and Stager (1989), for instance, reported high levels of school-specific problem-solving expertise. Transformational leadership emerged as needed by principals to lead schools through reform. As the school reform movement evolved, however, principals felt pressure to be accountable for school improvement and the achievement of students. Responding to these demands with an outmoded conception of leadership was senseless, but engaging teachers in a collaborative

dialogue about these issues and their implications for teaching and learning was essential. When transformational and more educational content-oriented notions of primary-school leadership were integrated, the influence on school performance, measured by the quality of its pedagogy and the achievement of its students, appeared substantial. Leithwood (2008) reports the data of 96 principals and 2,764 teachers in the form of a model of causes and consequences of leader efficacy. A significant relation was found between primary-school leadership and school conditions as well as between school conditions and student achievements; He established new evidence of an indirect effect of school leadership on student achievements. These results confirm the model of the relationship between school leader behavior and student outcomes reported for example by Bossert (1982). In an even more recent study, Leithwood (2008) hypothesized indirect leadership effects on student achievements. He found that collective leadership influences student achievement through teacher motivation and the situation in which the teachers perform their work. The results of this study confirm the results of an earlier study of Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) that perceived transformational school leadership was significantly related to both teachers' work setting and their motivation.

Leithwood et al. (1996) proposed three dimensions of transformational *school* leadership:

1. Charisma/inspiration/vision which means inspiring teachers to be engaged in their work by developing, identifying, and articulating a particular vision;
2. Individualized consideration which means concern and respect for the personal feelings and needs of teachers;
3. Intellectual stimulation which means challenging teachers to professionalize themselves in such a manner that the organization is learning as a whole.

These three dimensions resemble the four I's of Bass and Avolio (1994). The difference is the contraction of the two I's (Idealized influence and Inspirational motivation): into

Leithwood's one dimension of charisma/inspiration/vision (Leithwood et al., 1996). Moreover, operationalisations of transformational school leadership differ from the generalized transformational version in its explicit use of school language and situations.

With regard to linking transformational to transactional school leadership and its effects on educational improvement, Silins (1994) also finds transformational leadership to be reflected in the same three dimensions: charisma/inspiration, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Silins found transactional school leadership to be strongly dependent on transformational school leadership, which is in conformance with the aforementioned notions of Bass.

All in all, Leithwood and his associates made it clear that transformational leadership is indeed important for schools in current society. Moreover, based upon transformational leadership theory, Geijssel, Sleegers and Van den Berg (1999) found that highly innovative Dutch schools have more transformational leadership than schools, scoring low in terms of innovation. Hence, we have many reasons to believe that primary school leaders who are seen to display more transformational leadership behavior are rated more effective.

Hypothesis 1. Effective school leaders display significantly more transformational leadership behavior than less effective school leaders.

Hypothesis 2. Effective school leaders are rated significantly higher on perceived transformational (school) leadership than less effective school leaders.

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership theory had its origin in the late 1970's and early 1980's. Marks and Printy (2003) discussed the progression from transformational to instructional leadership and how the different styles affected student learning. The authors argued that a combination of instructional leadership and transformational leadership resulted in the highest

learning performance and called it “integrated leadership.” Robinson, Lloyd and Row (2008), in a meta-analysis of 27 studies published between 1978 and 2006, examined the impact of different types of leadership on student outcomes and confirmed the utility of analyzing various types of leadership rather than merely leadership in general. They reported that the impact of instructional leadership on student outcomes was three to four times greater than that of transformational leadership. The reason for this was that transformational leadership was more focused on the relationship between leaders and followers rather than on the educational outcomes of the school.

Instructional leadership, as reconceptualized by Marks and Printy (2003), replaced a top-down hierarchical leadership style with a model of “*shared* instructional leadership” in which teachers and principals collaborated actively on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Within this model, the principal seeks out the ideas, insights, and expertise of teachers in these areas and works with teachers to improve the school. The principal and teachers share responsibility jointly for staff development, curricular development, and supervision of instructional tasks. Thus, the principal is not the sole instructional leader but the “leader of instructional leaders” (Glickman, 1989: 6).

Robinson et al (2008) also concluded that effective school leaders do not limit themselves only to the quality of the relationship with their teachers. Rather, they tackle the content or educational challenges: and they incorporate both sets of constraints into their problem solving. Given the results of Marks and Printy (2003) and of Robinson et al. (2008) our third hypothesis reads as follows:

Hypothesis 3: Effective school leaders display significantly more instructional leadership than less effective school leaders.

METHODS

Participants

We sent letters to 33 school principals in one city's public primary school system in which we explained the design and intent of the study, as well as guaranteed anonymity to participants. The lead researcher also explained the purpose of the research during a meeting in which the school principals were present. Moreover, the study was endorsed by the board and staff of the foundation that administrates the schools.

Ten female and eleven male school principals agreed to participate in the study. Principals had an average tenure of 11 years, and an average of age of 51 years, with 59 being the oldest and 32 being the youngest. Principals had spent at least one year in their current jobs, and they managed between eight and 30 teachers. In addition, a total of 187 teaching staff, divided amongst the 21 schools, participated in the study and completed a questionnaire that surveyed their opinions on the leadership behaviors exhibited by their respective school principals.

Three distinct types of data were collected: 1) leader behaviors during staff meetings were videotaped for a minimum of 45 minutes and subsequently coded, 2) leader effectiveness was appraised independently by subject matter experts, and 3) surveys about leader behavior were administered to the teaching staff as well as to the leaders.

Leader Behaviors

School principals were video-taped during the normal course of periodic meetings with their teaching staff. The video camera was located in a fixed place within the meeting room, was directed entirely at the principal, and eventually blended into the background (Erickson, 1992; Mead, 1995). Because the camera was fixed, the cameraman had little freedom of movement.

According to Kent and Foster (1977), using video cameras to tape behavior seems to be largely unobtrusive and does not affect unduly the behavior of those being filmed. A camera is perhaps even less obtrusive than having researchers take field notes because cameras elicit less anxiety and curiosity from the participants. Collier and Collier (1986) found that normal behavioral patterns returned rather quickly during video observations of class room situations. Despite precautions to remain unobtrusive, we checked whether the observed behavior of the school principals was in any way atypical or irregular. Teachers were asked to respond to the following questionnaire item immediately after each meeting: "How representative did you think the behavior of the school principal was compared to other typical meetings?" Ninety-eight percent of the teachers answered that the behavior during meetings with the camera was similar to that of typical no camera meetings.

Videotapes were first converted into MPEG data files and then a behavioral-transcription software program "The Observer," allowed us to code behavior while watching the videos (Lancy, 1993; Ratcliff, 1996). The unit of analysis for coding was one sentence. We defined a sentence as anything a principal said to a teacher without interruption. Sentences ended when principals took relatively long pauses or breaths; the rule of thumb, for coding purposes, was that such a break would be transcribed with a period or a comma. Naturally, leader listening is the opposite of leader uttering, hence 'active listening' was recorded when the leader did not speak, unless it appeared that 'showing disinterest' was at the time applied.

We coded for 11 distinct behaviors: active listening, informing, verifying, structuring the conversation, individualized conversation, directing, visioning, intellectual stimulation, providing negative feedback, showing disinterest, and defending one's position (see Appendix A for summary of the coding scheme). The 11 behaviors were coded for how often the behavior occurred (frequency) as well as the amount of time a specific behavior endured

(duration). An analysis based on frequency accords with prior leadership and managerial work studies (e.g., Yukl et al., 1990), however, given the exploratory nature of our study we also coded the duration of a behavior. Duration provides an alternative index of importance because behaviors may occur infrequently but last a long time when they do occur.

In addition to the cameraman, five students with an advanced educational background in new media technology or business administration coded the tapes. These coders were thoroughly trained in the behavioral coding scheme (Reid, 1982). The training helped coders become aware of several biases that they might have had, such as coding according to the perceived logic of that situation instead of observing what is actually happening and matching that with what the codebook prescribed. Training also helped coders guard against developing positive or negative attitudes toward particular school principals, or developing biases for or against particular behavioral categories. A so called confusion error matrix, generated by the used standard behavioral-rating software, 'the Observer,' showed the exact differences per behavioral category: this was done to enlarge the learning effect of the coders (Reid, 1982). Every morning before coding the coders familiarized themselves again with the extensive coding scheme: to prevent them from developing their own idiosyncratic interpretations during the coding (Goldfried and Lineman, 1977). All taped video-observations were completed coded, which resulted in a total of 34,5 hours of available footage.

Two observers coded each tape separately and then discussed the coding differences together (Kent and Foster, 1977; Beck and Frisch, 2000). When differences were noted through reports generated by the software, the video fragment was retrieved and viewed again, resulting in recoding. The measure we used to establish inter-rater reliability was the percentage of raters who agreed to a specific code within the entire recorded footage. The obtained average inter-rater reliability value was 91%.

Expert Effectiveness Ratings of the Leaders/Principals

Each principal was rated on a ten point scale from 1 (highly ineffective) to 10 (highly effective) by four experts; all with a background in Educational Studies, who worked in various roles within the particular school system and knew the performance of the principals well. Effectiveness ratings for each principal were averaged across these four raters. The highest average score for a principal in our sample was 8.3, whereas the lowest score was 5.8. (Naturally, a restriction of range-type issue does play a role here.) Cronbach's alpha for the ratings among these four independent raters was .68.

In an effort to validate the expert effectiveness ratings, the scores were correlated with the seven-item perceived leader effectiveness scale that had been completed by the teaching staff (see Appendix B) and the significant result, $r = .44$ ($p < .05$), gave us more confidence that the ratings were accurate. The zero-order correlation with principals' self-perceptions of their effectiveness was not significant: $r = .37$. This is not a major issue, due to the well-known social-desirability bias inherent in leaders' ratings of their own degree of transformational leadership.

Based upon the average of each of the four expert scores – which we treated confidential - we split the school leaders in two groups: the effective school leaders (n=9) and the less effective school leaders (n=12). The average score school leaders needed to have in order to be treated in the study as 'effective' is 7, 5. School leaders with an effectiveness score lower than 7, 5 where considered 'less effective.'

Survey Data

Surveys were usably completed by the 187 teachers as well as by the 21 school principals. Questions were originally administered in Dutch to participants and have been

translated into English by a native English speaker for the purposes of this research paper. The questions were identical for both groups except that the version for teachers referred to principals in the third person (e.g. “The principal of our school creates opportunities for teachers to develop professionally”), whereas the version for principals referred to themselves in the first person (e.g. “I create opportunities for teachers to develop professionally”). The return rate for the 21 principals was 100%. The minimum response per school was three (two teachers and one principal) and the maximum response was 22. The return rate for this study was regarded as good compared to the normal return rates in Dutch studies. The scales were validated in pilot studies and seven-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*totally agree*) were used throughout the questionnaire.

Survey responses for the teacher version were averaged across the number of teachers who completed a survey for that principal. Thus, if a principal managed a staff of 15 teachers, then responses about that principal from his/her staff were averaged across the 15 teachers. Although our sample is not large it should be noted that taking the average across respondents also provides for more stable data in that error variance has been minimized.

Principal effectiveness. A perceptual measure of leader effectiveness was derived from a seven item questionnaire that was based upon a similar study among Dutch middle managers (Van der Weide 2007). Sample items in the version for teachers included: “The principal in our school is a good role model.” “The principal in our school thinks that his/her leadership style is well suited to our school environment.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale for the teachers was .94 and for the principals it was .88.

Transformational leadership. We employed a 12-item short version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, in which four separate dimensions are tapped: Charisma, Vision, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Earlier studies have shown that a 10-item version correlated with organizational performance (see, e.g., Wilderom, Van den

Berg and Boevink, 2009). Sample items in the version for teachers were: “The principal in our school gives teachers the feeling that the management team is there to help overcome obstacles.” “The principal in our school is optimistic when talking about the future.” Two items were added to improve the content validity for two of the dimensions and were as follows: “The principal in our school asks for the ideas and opinions of teachers.” “The principal in our school takes the needs of individual teachers into consideration.” Cronbach’s alpha for the teacher responses was .95 and for the principals it was .92.

Transformational school leadership. This scale consisted of 15 items, and has been used by Geijssel (2001). The items measured transformational behaviors such as visioning, providing intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration: in the specific context of a school. Sample items were: “The principal in our school expects teachers to consider whether their classroom practices are consistent with the overall strategy of the school,” and “The principal in our school ensures that we discuss what it is that we want to achieve with our curriculum.” Respective Cronbach’s alphas for teachers and principals were .89 and .91.

Instructional leadership. This scale consisted of 17 items, and was based upon the *ZEBO-instrument* of Hendrikse, Doolaard, Lam, and Bosker (2000), based in part on the research of Brandsma (1993). The ZEBO-instrument was developed by the University of Twente, SLO and CITO. SLO and CITO are Dutch institutions that assess the learning results of primary schools. The ZEBO included several questionnaires which can be used to determine whether a school delivers the desired quality according to students, teachers and management. We measured 1) general instructional leadership; 2) professional development, in which the leader actively works on keeping a teacher’s professional status up to date; and 3) holding regular meetings with the teachers. Respective teacher and principal Cronbach’s alphas were .91 and .92.

RESULTS

Descriptive results for the video behaviors show that active listening was the most frequently coded leader behavior as well as the behavior with the longest duration (Table 1). The second and third most coded behaviors were informing, with a frequency of 16.5% and a duration of 19.8%, and verifying, with a frequency of 12% and a duration of 3.5%. These three behaviors taken together accounted for nearly two-thirds of the total frequency data and 84.3% of the duration data. Not surprisingly, the categories of leadership behaviors displayed most frequently, at least during staff meetings, were supporting (especially active listening) and steering (especially informing, verifying). Whereas transformational leadership behaviors such as visioning, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration were displayed during the meetings, their relative frequencies and durations were much less relative to the top three behaviors (see Table 1).

Frequency rates for the remaining steering-type behaviors (see Appendix A) were: structuring the conversation (7.9 %) and directing (6.7%). The in the meetings displayed and coded behaviors in the category self-defending accounted for less than three percent of the total frequency data, namely, showing disinterest (1.1%), defending one's own position (0.9%), and providing negative feedback (0.8%). Thus, in the filmed public staff meetings, self-defending behaviors among primary school principals occurred rarely.

Insert Table 1 about here

The results showed that the leader effectiveness ratings (offered by the four school-system experts) correlated with two of the three transformational leadership duration scores: intellectual stimulation ($r = .50$, $p < .05$) and individualized consideration ($r = .41$, $p < .05$).

However, the expert effectiveness ratings did not correlate significantly with the duration scores of the third transformational leadership behavior: visioning (r = .30: n.s.). Moreover, none of the three transformational behavior *frequency* scores were correlated with the expert ratings of leader/principal effectiveness. Hypothesis 1: *Effective school leaders display transformational leadership behavior to a higher extent than less effective school leaders,* is therefore only partially confirmed.

In terms of the second hypothesis, the results showed that the survey scores correlated significantly with expert ratings of leader effectiveness. Principals who were rated high by their teaching staff on (generalized) transformational leadership (MLQ) were also more effective leaders ($r = .63$, $p < .01$). Furthermore, principals who were rated high by their teaching staff on transformational school leadership were also more effective leaders ($r = .50$, $p < .05$). Also, principal self-ratings of (generalized) transformational leadership (MLQ) correlated significantly with expert effectiveness ratings ($r = .57$, $p < .01$). However, principal self-ratings of transformational school leadership did not correlate significantly with expert effectiveness ratings (r = .33, n.s.). Taken together, these results largely confirm Hypothesis 2: *Effective school leaders are rated significantly higher on perceived transformational (school) leadership than less effective school leaders*.

In regard to the third hypothesis, expert ratings of leader effectiveness were significantly correlated with instructional leadership as rated by the teachers ($r = .43$, $p < .05$) but not with a school leader self-ratings of instructional leadership (r = .28, n.s.). Hypothesis 3 was therefore partially confirmed: *Effective school leaders display instructional leadership significantly more than less effective school leaders.*

Insert Tables 2A and 2B about here

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings of this study show that the effective principals spend significantly more time on intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Moreover, in terms of the MLQ, effective school leaders score significantly higher than those who are seen as less effective. Also the leaders who are rated high by their teachers in terms of the school-specific measures transformational school leadership and instructional leadership appear significantly more effective. Thus, besides spending more time on typical transformational leadership behavior during the meetings with their teachers, the perceptions of the teachers confirm that effective leaders are perceived as more transformational and show more transformational school leadership as well as instructional leadership. Instructional leadership may thus indeed be an essentially complementary factor in primary schools since in this study we do find that instructional leadership occurs more among the effective school leaders than among the less effective ones.

In addition to the behavioral scores of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, the effective and less effective leaders differ significantly on only 2 of the remaining 9 observed behaviors: directing and providing feedback. Neither of these additional behaviors covers any aspect of what is known as transformational leadership. Thus, the behavior of effective school leaders during meetings with their teachers appear only in small part to be transformational, that is, only in terms of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. These two transformational behaviors account for only 5.2% of the total tape time of the effective primary school leaders and for 2.2% tape-time among the less effective leaders. And note that both behaviors do not occur as frequently during the meetings as for instance active listening and informing and verifying. In other words, even though we do find evidence for the hypothesis that effective school leaders score significantly higher on

transformational behavior during their regular meetings with their followers, there are different behaviors that they display at those meetings, which may determine another part of their effectiveness. Thus, we do infer that, beyond the transformational behavior that we observe, there might be other aspects in which highly effective leaders differentiate themselves from the less effective ones. Directing as well as negative feedback behavior especially appeared to differentiate the effective from the less effective principals (Table 1). Hence also in terms of transactional leadership these school leaders appeared to differ: another paper of our hand will deal with that.

It might well be that among effective leaders it is not so much their visible behaviors but rather the type of content of what they stress during interaction with their followers. Our behavioral results can be interpreted as follows: Apart from the time spent directly addressing followers through stimulating followers' cognition (intellectual stimulation) and emotional support (individualized consideration), effective leaders may distinguish themselves from the less effective leaders in a more indirect manner. Effective leaders may try to channel the attention of followers through the content of what they pay attention to, thus not only through *how* they pay attention to it.

Taking the latter insight one step further into the future, we may need to start adding to our leader-behavior analyses some means of content analyzing the expressions of the leaders. It may well be that thorough content-coding --not only of the displayed leader behavior, but also of the content of what these leaders convey-- is the next important leadership-research step. Naturally we would need to develop a code-book of leadership content, and the difficulty is that such content is typically highly context-specific and we would need to determine how we would be able to content-analyze the degree of visioning and/or inspirational motivation contained in context-specific, task-related content emphasized by a leader.

Beyond such insights pertaining to possibly far-reaching next-step leadership research, we may conclude from this study that the video-based method of studying real-time, work behaviors of persons in leadership positions is a viable method in its own right. The fact that a new 'method' and not a new theory would spearhead such a renewal is not problematic as long as we utilize extant theory to guide us in the coding questions and/or hypotheses. Hence, our research agenda for further field leadership studies will include our promising filmed behavioral approach. We show in this study that, like looking through magnifying glasses, even a short film fragment contains an abundance of information that is not seen through the naked eye. Note that the intelligent coding of the images is very demanding work, requiring a high level of concentration and cooperation; yet it is in our view worth doing, also for daily leadership behavior as well as 'leadership speak' in other layers of organized hierarchies.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B. M., Waldman, D. A., and Eindstein, W. O. 1988. Transformational leadership in a management game simulation: Impacting the bottom line. ***Group and Organisational Studies***, 13(1): 59-80.

Bass, B. M. 1985. ***Leadership and performance beyond expectations***. New York, N.Y: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. 1994. ***Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership***. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beck, D., and Fisch, R. 2000. Argumentation and emotional processes in group decision-making: Illustration of a multi-level interaction process analysis approach. ***Group Processes and Intergroup Relations***, 3(2): 183-201.

Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., and Lee, G. V. 1982. The instructional management role of the principal. ***Educational Administration Quarterly***, 18 (3): 34-64.

Brandsma, H. P. 1993. ***Primary school characteristics and quality of the education.*** Groningen: RION.

Burns, J. M. 1978. ***Leadership***. New York: Harper and Row.

Collier, J., and Collier, M. 1986. ***Visual anthropology: Photography as a research method.*** Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Erickson, F. 1992. The interface between ethnography and microanalysis. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, and J. Preissle (Eds.), ***The handbook of qualitative research in education.*** San Diego: Academic Press.

Geijssel, F. 2001. ***Schools and innovations: Conditions fostering the implementation of educational innovations.*** Nijmegen: University Press.

Geijssel, F., Sleegers, P., and Van den Berg, R. 1999. Transformational leadership and the implementation of large-scale innovation programs. ***Journal of Educational Administration***, 37(4): 309-328.

Glickman, C. 1989. Has Sam and Samantha's time come at last? ***Educational Leadership***, 46(8): 4-9.

Goldfried, M. R., and Linehan, M. 1977. Basic issues in behavioral assessment. In A.R. ciminero, K. S. Calhoun and H. E. Adams, ***Handbook of behavioral assessment***. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hallinger, P., and Heck, R. H. 1996. Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. ***Educational Administration Quarterly***, 32(1), 5-44.

Hater, J. J., and Bass, B. M. 1988. Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. ***Journal of Applied Psychology***, 73(4): 695-702.

Hendrikse, M. A., Doolaard, S., Lam, J. F., and Bosker R. J. 2000. ***The arrangement "school and class characteristics," development and regulations (ZEBO-SK).*** Enschede: University of Twente, Research Center for Applied Didactics.

Jung, D. I., and Avolio, B. J. 1999. Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in groups, and individualized task conditions. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 42(2): 208-218.

Kent, R. N., and Foster, S. L. 1977. Direct observational procedures: Methodological issues in naturalistic settings. In A. R. Ciminero, K. S. Calhoum, and H. E. Adams (Eds.), ***Handbook of behavioral assessment*** (279-328). New York: John Wiley.

Lancy, D. F. 1993. ***Qualitative research in education: An introduction to the major traditions***. New York: Longman.

Leithwood, K. A., and Stager, M. 1989. Expertise in principals' problem solving. ***Educational Administration Quarterly***, 25(2): 126-161.

Leithwood, K. A., Tomlinson, D., and Genge, M. 1996. Transformational school leadership. In K. A. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, Ph. Hallinger and A. Hart (Eds.), ***International handbook of educational leadership and administration:*** 785-840 Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer

Leithwood, K.A., and Jantzi, D. 2006. Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. ***School Effectiveness and School Improvement***, 17(2): 201-227.

Leithwood, K.A., and Jantzi, D. 2008. Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. ***Educational Administration Quarterly***, 44 (4): 496-528.

Leithwood, K. A., and Mascall, B. 2008. Collective leadership effects on student achievement. ***Educational Administration Quarterly***, 44(4): 529- 561.

Marks, H. M., and Printy, S. M. 2003. Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. ***Educational Administration Quarterly,*** 39(3): 370-397

Mead, M. 1995. Visual anthropology in a discipline of words. In P. Hockings (Ed.), ***Principles of visual anthropology***. New York: Mounton de Gruyter.

Ratcliff, D. 1996. ***Video and audio media in qualitative research***. Retrieved June 6, 2007, from http://don.ratcliff.net/video

Reid, J. D. 1982. Observing training in naturalistic research. In D. P. Hartmann (Ed.), ***Using observers to study behavior***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., and Rowe, K. J. 2008. The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership styles. ***Educational Administration Quarterly***, 44(5): 635-674.

Silins, H. C. 1994. The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and school improvement outcomes. ***School Effectiveness and School Improvement***, 5 (3): 272-298.

Weick, K. E. 1985. Systematic observational methods. In. G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), ***The handbook of social psychology*** (3th ed.). New York: Random House.

Weide, J.G., van der, 2007. ***An explorative video-study to the behavior of effective middle managers***. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tilburg, the Netherlands.

Weide, J.G., van der, and Wilderom, C.P.M. 2004. Deromancing leadership: What are the behaviors of highly effective middle managers? ***International Journal of Management Practice***, 1(1): 3-20.

Wilderom, C. P. M., Van den Berg, P. T., and Boevink, A. 2009. Shared transformational leadership, firm culture and performance. Working paper: soon to be submitted.

Yukl, G. 1989. Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. ***Journal of Management***, 15 (2): 251-289.

Yukl, G., Wall, S., and Lepsinger, R. 1990. Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In K. E. Clark and M. B. Clark (Eds.), ***Measures of leadership***. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

APPENDIX A: Definitions and Examples of the 11 Observed Behaviors Coded in this Study

Behavior	Definition	Examples
1. Showing disinterest	Keeping distance toward followers Not showing any interest Not taking any action (when expected)	Talking to others while someone else is talking Not listening actively, looking bored, looking away
2. Defending one's own position	Defending one's own position or opinion Emphasizing own importance	"I cannot help it, my boss wants it like that" "I am the operations manager within the organization"
3. Providing negative feedback	Criticizing the behavior of followers	"I am not happy with the way you did this…" "You shouldn't have acted so hastily"
4. Directing	Disagreeing with a follower Opposing against a follower Enforcing a follower to (not) do something Calling a follower into order Interrupting when someone is talking Changing the topic abruptly	"I don't think that is true" "I still think we should invite another candidate" "I will decide what happens. I want this candidate to be invited for the job" "This decision has been made and there is no turning back" "Hold on, I want to make this clear first" "We will discuss this later. Let's move on to the next item on the agenda" "John, I'd like you to take care of that'

	Dividing tasks among followers (without enforcing them)	"Will you take responsibility for that project?"
5. Verifying	Checking on the current situation Coming back on previously made agreements	"How far are you with those activities?" "Last week we agreed upon this. How are things now?"
6. Structuring the conversation	Structuring the meeting	"The next item on the agenda is…" "We will end this meeting at 14.00 hours"
7. Informing	Providing factual information	"The budget for this project is…" "The board will make a decision within the next two weeks"
8. Visioning	Giving one's own opinion Determining the direction for teachers	"Given the recent developments, I think we should…" "Let's go through with this reading project"
9. Intellectual stimulation	Positively stimulating the behavior of the followers Challenging professionally Laughing, joking Stimulating followers to come up with	"Don't worry, we will handle this problem together" "I am sure you will do a great job" "What actions should be taken according to you?"

	ideas or solutions Inviting followers for discussion	 “How do you think we can solve this problem?”
10. Individualized consideration	Showing interest for the follower’s feelings or situation Showing empathy Showing sympathy Creating an open and friendly environment Agreeing with a follower Showing compliant behavior	“I am sorry to hear that, how are things at home now?” “You must be happy about that” “Would you like something to drink?” “Did you have a good journey?” “Yes, that is the way I see it too” Follower: “I suggest we will discuss this first” Leader: “That is fine”
11. Listening	Active listening Showing verbally and/or nonverbally that the speaker is understood	Nodding, eye contact “ok… yes…” Paraphrasing

APPENDIX B: Survey Items Used in the Study

Principal effectiveness

1. My superior is effective
2. My superior is an example of a good leader
3. My superior is effective in achieving goals
4. My superior utilizes a leadership style that leads to satisfaction
5. My superior finds frequently ways to optimize the learning outcomes
6. My superior thinks his/her leadership style is an good example for others
7. My superior thinks that his/her leadership style should be maintained

Transformational leadership

1. My superior can be trust completely
2. My superior has a strong charisma
3. My superior speaks positively about the future
4. My superior shows in words and action capability
5. My superior caries out a clear vision about possibilities in the future
6. My superior shows a extraordinary capability in everything he/she does
7. My superior shows him/her selves strongly convinced of his/her own way of thinking
8. My superior gives teachers the feeling that we can over win every obstacle
9. My superior creates a communal feeling by working on a important job/mission
10. My superior makes teachers aware of important communal values, aspirations and ideals
11. My superior asks for ideas or the opinions of teachers
12. My superior shows individualized consideration for teachers

Cont. APPENDIX B: Survey Items Used in the Study

Transformational school leadership

1. My superior has a clear vision of what is meant by “good education”
2. My superior knows what is going on
3. My superior knows about educational developments outside the school
4. My superior discusses about what we want to achieve with our lessons
5. My superior is constantly motivated to consider our own educational practices critically
6. My superior expects us to think about the strategies of our school with regard to educational practices
7. My superior makes sure that we consider our joint goals critically
8. My superior stimulates that new ideas are brought up regularly
9. My superiors appreciate teachers taking initiative in our school
10. My superior highly values the professional development of teachers
11. My superior stimulates teachers to try out new didactic methods
12. My superior creates opportunities for teachers to develop professionally
13. My superior sees that teacher training activities are in harmony with school-development activities
14. My superior creates plans for the professional development of teachers
15. My superior sees that training programs are followed up within the school itself
16. My superior stimulates teachers to exchange knowledge and skills in order to help each other

Cont. APPENDIX B: Survey Items Used in the Study

***Instructional leadership*[1]**

1. My superior takes care of the evaluation of new started learning methods
2. My superior takes care of equalization of teach programs of the classes
3. My superior supports teachers with the planning and implementation of school tasks
4. My superior is monitoring the progress of educational renewals
5. My superior stimulates teachers to start educational renewals
6. My superior gives teachers suggestions who to improve student outcomes
7. My superior takes care (direct or indirect) of coaching of (starting) teachers
8. My superior takes care (direct or indirect) of stock-taking of training needs
9. My superior equalizes trainings plans concerning the personal needs of the teachers
10. My superior takes care (direct or indirect) of task differentiation based on the expertise and experiences of the teachers

How many times are you or is your superior discussing the following subjects during intern meetings at your school?

1. The functioning of classes
2. The way of presenting the subject material
3. The professionalizing of teachers
4. Problems experienced by teachers
5. The evaluating of student improvement
6. Experiences and information received in ‘after-school’ activities
7. The equalization of educational activities of the different classes

[1] Answered on a 7-point Likert-scale: from 1 (never) to 7 (very often)

TABLE 1

Behaviors of the Effective and the Less Effective School Leaders

Behavior	Frequency Effective n=9	Frequency Less Eff. n =12	Duration Effective n = 9	Duration Less Eff. n = 12	Frequency n = 21	Duration n = 21
Self-Defending						
Showing disinterest	0,7%	1,4%	0,5%	0,7%	1,1%	0,6%
Defending one's own position	0,5 %	1,3%	0,1 %	0,3%	0,9%	0,2%
Providing negative feedback	1,0 %*	0,5%*	0,3 %	0,1%	0,8%	0,2%
Subtotal	**2,2%**	**3,2%**	**0,9%**	**1,1%**	**2,8%**	**1,0%**
Steering						
Directing	7,2 %*	6,3%*	2,8 %*	1,2%*	6,7%	2,0%
Verifying	12,8 %	11,1%	4,7 %	2,2%	12,0%	3,5%
Structuring the conversation	8,0%	7,7%	4,2 %	2,4%	7,9%	3,3%
Informing	17,0 %	16,2%	25,4 %	14,2%	16,5%	19,8%
Subtotal	**45,0%**	**41,3%**	**37,1%**	**20,0%**	**43,1%**	**28,6%**
Supporting						
Visioning	6,3%	6,9%	7,7%*	3,4%*	6,6%	5,6%
Intellectual stimulation	5,4 %	5,2%	2,6 %*	1,0%*	5,3%	1,8%
Individualized consideration	7,6 %	6,6%	2,8 %*	1,2%*	7,1%	2,0%
Subtotal	19,3**%**	18,7**%**	**13,1%***	**5,6%***	19,0**%**	9,4**%**
Active listening	**33,5 %**	**36,9**%	**48,9** %	**73,1**%	**35,2**%	**61,0**%
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

* = significant differences between effective and less effective school leaders based on t-test ($p<0,05$)

TABLE 2A
Means, standard deviations and correlations among variables on school leaders and their behaviors (frequency) (n = 21)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Leader effectiveness: experts	6.97	.77																			
2. Principal effectiveness: teachers (*n*=20)	5.48	.57	.44*																		
3. Principal effectiveness: leaders (*n*=20)	5.44	.75	.37	.21																	
4. Showing disinterest	1.50	2.49	-.25	.12	-.07																
5. Defending one's own position	1.25	3.15	-.27	.12	-.14	.91**															
6. Providing negative feedback	1.06	1.21	.27	.24	.35	.25	.14														
7. Directing	9.74	4.39	.46*	.14	.37	-.31	-.21	.34													
8. Verifying	17.26	10.71	.23	.13	.36	.25	.29	.44*	.72**												
9. Structuring the conversation	11.30	8.30	.25	.35	.28	.32	.20	.81**	.32	.58**											
10. Informing	23.96	14.39	.11	.39	.46*	.48*	.44*	.66**	.45*	.71**	.60**										
11. Visioning	9.51	5.82	.08	.22	.58**	.11	.06	.54*	.60**	.58**	.45*	.79**									
12. Intellectual stimulation	7.63	5.50	.24	.25	.35	-.18	-.14	.13	.50*	.45*	.18	.16	.35								
13. Individualized consideration	10.25	6.09	.32	.32	.65**	.24	.09	.76**	.51*	.66**	.76**	.76**	.78**	.47*							
14. Active Listening	50.74	24.43	.06	.23	.43	.50*	.44*	.69**	.43	.76**	.72**	.88**	.73**	.35	.84**						
15. Transformational leadership: teachers	5.43	.51	.56††	.82**	.48*	-.05	-.12	.36	.19	.16	.39	.29	.18	.43	.49*	.26					
16. Transformational leadership: leaders	5.37	.88	.63††	.26	.84**	-.24	-.27	.37	.42	.29	.32	.34	.43	.35	.54*	.30	.60**				
17. Transformational school leadership: teachers	5.55	.45	.28	.86**	.23	-.19	-.25	.15	.19	.03	.29	.10	.07	.40	.27	.04	.86**	.31			
18. Transformational school leadership: leaders	5.89	.56	.43†	.17	.81**	.06	.03	.32	.34	.37	.19	.35	.37	.36	.52*	.33	.47*	.75**	.16		
19. Instructional leadership: teachers	4.62	.48	.33	.82**	.33	.00	-.08	.09	-.04	-.09	.22	.07	-.03	.33	.27	.05	.89**	.40	.86**	.34	
20. Instructional leadership: leaders	5.10	.77	.50†	.24	.86**	-.15	-.20	.42	.40	.31	.30	.46*	.52*	.26	.61**	.40	.50*	.85**	.22	.81**	.39

*$p < .05$, two-tailed. **$p < .01$, two-tailed. † $p < .05$, one-tailed. †† $p < .05$, one-tailed.

TABLE 2B
Means, standard deviations and correlations among variables on school leaders and their behaviors (duration) (n=21)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Leader effectiveness: experts	6.97	0.77																			
2. Principal effectiveness: teachers (*n*=20)	5.48	.57	.44†																		
3. Principal effectiveness: leaders (*n*=20)	5.44	.75	.37	.21																	
4. Showing disinterest	12.80	27.08	-.25	.09	-.12																
5. Defending one's own position	5.12	15.70	-.35	.09	-.20	.86**															
6. Providing negative feedback	3.89	5.93	.09	.17	.13	.00	.14														
7. Directing	36.53	21.63	.49†	.05	.38	-.25	-.23	.36													
8. Verifying	65.19	43.16	.37†	-.14	-.20	-.09	.05	.02	.36												
9. Structuring the conversation	63.05	45.26	.27	.28	.23	.14	.23	.42	.46*	.47*											
10. Informing	381.39	201.99	.18	.31	.19	-.04	.06	.13	.17	.37	.16										
11. Visioning	103.96	63.04	.30	.32	.54*	.07	.08	.00	.38	.10	.31	.67**									
12. Intellectual stimulation	33.77	24.26	.50†	.25	.23	-.05	.12	-.04	.30	.32	.34	.09	.35								
13. Individualized consideration	38.00	24.89	.41†	.20	.31	.24	.21	.27	.41	.28	.79**	.17	.45*	.42							
14. Active Listening	909.92	286.18	-.08	-.37	-.25	.17	.00	-.29	-.29	-.02	-.14	-.29	-.37	-.09	.17						
15. Transformational leadership: teachers	5.37	.88	.56††	.26	.84**	-.31	-.33	.22	.43	.06	.32	.20	.39	.33	.34	-.39					
16. Transformational leadership: leaders	5.43	.51	.63††	.82**	.48*	-.10	-.17	.15	.19	-.03	.34	.15	.28	.40	.38	-.33	.60**				
17. Transformational school leadership: teachers	5.10	.77	.28	.24	.86**	-.24	-.26	.24	.41	.04	.32	.38	.45*	.09	.34	-.34	.85**	.50*			
18. Transformational school leadership: leaders	4.62	.48	.43†	.82**	.33	.00	-.09	.00	.03	-.12	.25	.03	.07	.30	.26	-.15	.40	.89**	.39		
19. Instructional leadership: teachers	5.89	.56	.33	.17	.81**	-.05	-.02	.13	.31	.20	.30	.31	.46*	.40	.43	-.20	.75**	.47*	.81**	.34	
20. Instructional leadership: leaders	5.55	.45	.50†	.86**	.23	-.22	-.27	.04	.16	-.10	.23	.10	.22	.42	.17	-.29	.31	.86**	.22	.86**	.16

*$p < .05$, two-tailed. **$p < .01$, two-tailed. † $p < .05$, one-tailed. †† $p < .05$, one-tailed.