The Influence of Primary School Principals´ Leadership Styles on Innovative Practices

Petra Heissenberger
University College of Teacher Education in Lower Austria

Nancy Heilbronner
Mercy College, New York

Abstract

This qualitative research explored the relationship between school principals' leadership styles and their innovative practices in schools. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 1995), was administered to 38 school principals in Lower Austria, who, based on their responses, were then categorized as leaders with stronger or weaker transformational leadership styles. Six of these principals were then interviewed: three with strong transformational leadership styles (Transformational – High) and three with weaker transformational leadership styles (Transformational – Low). Interview data were coded qualitatively, and patterns and themes emerged relating to how these two groups viewed innovation in their school. The two groups of leaders were similar in that they both viewed requirements for innovation similarly. Both groups also believed that the results of innovation could lead to an improvement in collegial collaboration and relationship. However, leaders with stronger transformational leadership styles viewed innovation more positively and placed more importance on innovation than participants with their weaker transformational counterparts. Implications for practice are discussed.

Keywords

Leadership, Innovation, School Administration

Introduction

Leadership is a studied quantity in many domains. In the business world, for example, entire courses are devoted to what makes a successful leader of corporations. While leadership in education is also an important concept, we focus on it less, especially from an international perspective. It might be argued that at the core of leadership is innovation, but what does it mean to be innovative when one is an educational leader? Innovative leaders may frequently possess an emotional energy and commitment, exhibit a sense of social responsibility and the courage to think and act afresh. These characteristics indicate a potential for leadership, but only through effective action can the leader translate such characteristics into

Corresponding Author:
Petra Heissenberger, University College of Teacher Education in Lower Austria, Mühlg. 67, 2500 Baden, Austria. Email: petra.heissenberger@ph-noe.ac.at

purposeful and meaningful outcomes. Leadership requires this effective transformation, because otherwise even the best leaders remain ineffective (Malik, 2014).

Effective action and management is therefore a requirement for leaders to translate their strengths and capabilities into performance and success (Malik, 2014). Drucker (1955) stated, "Effectiveness means doing the right things; efficiency means doing things right" (p. 18); Drucker was among the first to highlight the significance of management for modern society and its organizations, and he was able to communicate its complexity in simple terms. To be effective, he suggested, it is not so important who someone is, but how someone acts (Drucker, 1955).

Is the implementation of effective leadership as simple as knowing the right steps to take in a situation? Behaviorists such as B. F. Skinner (1953) have suggested that behavior is simplistic and controlled with a series of reinforcers and punishment, leading to a good output. However, such presumptions disregard human autonomy and individual experiences, which shape who we are and how we react to situations. Context also frequently influences behavior, and so good management through punishers and reinforcers offered at the wrong time and in an unsuitable situation can produce the opposite of what has been originally intended.

School principals deal with this reality on a day-to-day basis; they may view innovation as simply a construct that may be managed by planning for and encourage efficiency, but if the context of the school does not support innovation, it may not happen. Even the most well-meaning intentions of school principals can be completely misunderstood by the teachers, if they are put forward at a point of time where no cooperation is possible (Herrmann, 2014).

Leadership styles may be an important link in the chain between personality traits and effective outcomes. Leaders may be more or less managerial. They may take a hands-off approach, or they may dive into the complexities of overseeing a project. Each of these styles is likely to produce different outcomes.

Complicating the matter is the issue of vision. Does a leader need a vision to bring about innovation, or can she effectively control the development of innovation through a hands-on management approach? Recent studies in leadership have suggested links between school innovation and the leader's vision (e.g., Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarotiz, 2010).

School principals have had to become more innovative over the past decades as a changing landscape of curricular practices, teacher training requirements, and technological advances have extended the role of the school building leader. This changing landscape has led to renewed interest in leadership styles. That is, which leadership style enables some school principals to encourage innovative practices to flourish at their schools, and how do the different leadership styles encourage or hold back innovation at a school? These questions were explored in the current research.

Review of the Literature

School principals' leadership styles have been shown to have an effect on many different types of school variables, including organizational health (Cemalolu, 2011) and teacher satisfaction (Mota, 2010). Leadership styles are also recognized to be related to a faculty's ability to carry out a leader's vision (Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarotiz, 2010). Although a robust body of literature investigates the relationship between the influence of school principals and many different variables (eg, see Blase, 2001), few comparisons have examined how their leadership styles influence innovation in schools. Instead, these studies they tend to focus on the impact of principals' leadership styles on teachers' perceptions (e.g., Park, 2012), not on the perceptions of the principals themselves.

It is important to consider the implications of leadership styles on school innovation for a number of reasons. First, innovative practices are spreading, and one reason for this is that technology has enabled us to communicate in powerful ways as never before – as of 2015, almost half (46.4%) of the world was online, an 832.5% increase from 2000-2015 (Internet World Stats, 2015). And because more opportunities to connect with others exist, innovation is moving quickly across the globe. This expansion of innovation is not only encouraging communication - it is also encouraging cooperation and collaboration leading to new opportunities for innovations in our schools.

In schools, we see the evidence of large-scale innovative projects that may disrupt teachers' expectations (van den Berg & Sleegers, 1996) and actually lead to a sense of frustration in the school climate. To avoid this disruption, we need to understand the contextual factors and how they work with innovative practices. One of these contextual factors it the leadership style of school building leaders. It would be beneficial to understand the impact of leadership styles on innovative practices at schools, and from this understanding gain insight as to how we may promote leadership styles that encourage innovative practices aligned specifically with the context of the school they lead.

The study at hand distinguishes between leaders with strong transformational leadership styles and those who tend toward weaker transformational styles. Bass (1985) has described three styles of leadership: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. According to Avolio and Bass (1995), Transformational leadership is described as "inspirational, intellectually stimulating, challenging, visionary, development oriented, and determined to maximize performance" (Avolio & Bass, 1995, p. 3). Transformational leaders inspire and point the way towards the accomplishment of visions or missions. They tend to be more visionary (Avolio & Bass, 1995), and they may be less focused on managing the everyday context, choosing instead to direct their focus on the steps required to inspire and lead. They may be necessarily more open to the types of innovative practices we find transforming schools today.

Transactional leaders, on the other hand, tend to be more absorbed with day-to-day management as they utilize contingent rewards for a job well done, building loyalty as they do so, or they practice management by exception,

punishing followers when things don't go well (Bass & Avolio, 1993) Laissez faire leaders simply let events unfold without trying to intervene (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

When considering these three management styles, the researchers proposed that principals with a strong transformational leadership style would be more likely than colleagues with a weaker transformational leadership style to promote innovative practices in their schools. Transformational leaders would be interested in inspiring and implementing changes as a way to promote and further their own mission and vision for the school. Leaders who are less transformational, on the other hand, may be more focused on the day-to-day oversight of teachers through rewards and management by exception practices to focus on the visionary aspects connected to innovation.

The question at hand is how each of these leadership styles influence school leaders' perceptions and practices of innovation at their schools. We explored through interviews the relationships between principals' leadership styles and their perceptions and practices of innovation.

Methodology

Research Questions

Using a systematic approach, the researchers explored the following research questions:

1. How do primary school principals view innovation in their schools?
2. How do primary school principals support innovation in their schools?
3. What are the similarities and differences between in leaders with strong

transformational leadership styles and those with weaker transformational leadership styles in terms of how they view and support innovation?

Setting and Participants
Background of the Austrian Educational Setting

The study was conducted with a sample of convenience drawn from Lower Austria, a federal state located in the upper northeast corner of Austria. The annual net income in Austria at the time of the study was € 21,685, and in Lower Austria it was slightly higher at € 23,342 (https://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/index.html, 26.01.2017). There were 6,003 schools in Austria with over 1.1 million students. In Lower Austria there were 1.149 compulsory schools, 47 grammar

In the Austrian system of education, compulsory schooling starts at the age of six. Students attend primary school for 4 years until the age of 10. Following primary school, students choose between two different types of secondary schools – middle school or grammar school - each with varying academic emphases and admissions requirements. They attend a secondary school for 4 years, usually until the age of 14. Upon successful completion of secondary school, students continue their education by selecting a school that focuses on either general or vocational education. If they select a vocational education, they attend a polytechnic school for another year, followed by a three-or-four-year apprenticeship.

In Austria, school leaders do not need a formal Bachelor's degree to become principal.

Instead, teachers apply for a directorate issued in the Official Gazette of the School Board. In the application form to be filled in by the candidates, they must describe and reflect their personal and professional background. Next, candidates are invited to a hearing conducted by an external personnel consulting agency. The hearing consists of a self-portrayal, a presentation of a project and some other, profession - specific questions. The candidate also has to declare their personal and professional background and some fields are monitored and evaluated by the personnel consulting agency. These areas are: communicative competence, organisational capability, delegation ability, team orientation, decision capacity and conflict skills. Since September 1996 newly appointed principals have been legally obligated to take part in a compulsory, extra-occupational school management course within the first four years in their new roles.

Participants

Fifty participants received the online Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 1995) survey, and 38 participants completed and returned it, a participation rate of 76% All except for one participant had earned degrees which qualified them to teach in primary school; in addition, two participants had earned the middle school degree. Two of the primary school teachers had gone on to earn a Bachelor's degree, and three had earned a Master's degree. One was a middle school teacher with a Master's degree. Although all participants had served in either primary or middle school as a teacher, one principal had served as both.

A large majority of the participants (n = 32) were female, compared with six male participants. A majority of the participants were experienced administrators in that 23 participants had been principals for 5 years or longer. Most of the participants served as principals at larger schools in that 21 principals worked at schools with eight or more classes.

Instrumentation

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ—Short Form, Avolio & Bass, 1995) has been used over the last 30 years to identify and measure behaviors commonly associated with different leadership styles and "is considered the best validated measure of transformational and transactional leadership" (Ozaralli, 2003, p. 338). Participants rate themselves on 45 items on nine subscales using a Likert-type rating system of 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always) on a series of subscales that relate to the traits involved in transformational leadership. Higher scores on the subscales related to participants' transformational leadership styles were utilized in the study. Higher score indicate that participants exhibit more traits associated with a transformational leadership style. The MLQ has an additional optional component that allows others to rate their leaders. However, for the purposes of the current research, only participants' self-ratings on the transformational leadership subscales were used.

Interview Participants

Six principals were selected from the participants who returned surveys, and these principals were invited to be interviewed. These participants were invited based on their

responses to the MLQ: three interview participants were selected based on their high scores on the Transformational Leadership subscale, and three interview participants were selected based on their low scores on the Transformational leadership subscale. Each 45-minute semi-structured interview consisted of 13 questions (see Table 1). These questions were used in order to ascertain important information related to the study's research questions. The interviews were mostly held in small, quiet offices, were recorded and later transcribed for coding.

Data Analysis

Participants' mean scores were calculated for the Transformational Leadership subscales on the MLQ. Participants' mean scores were then rank-ordered from low to high. A higher score meant that participants exhibited more traits associated with the transformational leadership style (Transformational-High), or exhibited

Table 1

Interview Protocol

<u>Interview Questions</u>

Do you believe that your school is innovative? Why or why not?

How do you define innovation at your school?

What does a principal need in terms of support to promote innovation at his or her school?

What would you need to implement more innovations in your school? What would be helpful for you?

Are there any barriers to implementing innovations in your school?

How well do you think the process works in your school/situation?

Can you describe some innovative activities that go on in your school?

Do you think that you are an innovative leader? Why or why not?

What are some characteristics of innovative principals?

How can principals support teachers to become more innovative?

Who is responsible for initiating innovative processes? (Ministry, school-board, superintendent, principal, or other stakeholders?)

What do you think about your role in the innovation-process?

Do you think that innovations always need a top-down-process or do innovations come to schools by bottom-up-processes too?

Do you have anything to add?

Table 1

them more strongly. A lower score meant that the participants displayed fewer traits associated with the transformational leadership style (Transformational-Low), or exhibited them more weakly. These six participants with the highest and lowest scores in transformational leadership were invited to participate in a semi-structured interview. All participants who were invited agreed to be interviewed, and each interview lasted 45 minutes, was recorded, and was later transcribed. The mean score for the group of Transformational – High leaders of participants (n = 3) was 3.63 and the mean score for the group of Transformational – Low leaders of participants (n = 3) was 2.86.

Once participants were interviewed, researchers transcribed the interview data and began the coding process. Data from the interviews were coded separately for the three transformational and three transactional leaders so that they could be compared for similarities and differences. Using a process recommended by Saldana (2009), qualitative data from the interviews were coded through three cycles. First cycle codes yielded individual ideas or concepts. Second cycle coding grouped these ideas into related categories, as the researchers searched for patterns and connections between the codes. Finally, third cycle coding yielded themes that related to individual research questions.

Findings

Two themes emerged from the qualitative interview data; these themes related to participants' perceptions regarding the requirements of innovation and the results of innovation.

Requirements of Innovation

The theme, Requirements of Innovation, contained a total of 152 first-cycle codes. These 152 codes were split evenly between the comments of Transformational – High leaders (n = 76) and Transformational – Low leaders (n = 76; Table 2).

Table 2

Coding Results for Theme: Requirements of Innovation

Second Cycle Codes	First-cycle Codes - Transformational –High Leaders	First-cycle Codes - Transformational – Low Leaders
Importance of Getting It Right	25	
Importance of Relationships	20	14
Interested in New Things	19	
Mentoring System and Help for Principals	12	20
Principals as Managers		29
Concern about Change		13
Total	76	76

Table 2

Transformational-High leaders mentioned four second-cycle codes. First, they spoke about the importance of getting innovation "right." They stated that they are aware of the important role that principals play in setting goals. As one Transformational-High participant stated, "We are responsible for the ideas and for better planning" and establishing a climate for innovation, and they mentioned that principals need to be flexible in how they implement change. Next, they discussed the importance of relationships, stating that principals must be willing to listen to others' ideas: "I like to listen to others." Transformational-High participants also stated that it was important for the faculty and staff to be interested in new ideas or "things." For example, a Transformational-High participant discussed how she had "implemented the project Healthy School," focusing on initiatives such as proper nutrition and exercise for her faculty. Transformational-High participants described how they are responsible for making innovations popular— that they are responsible for choosing the topics and supporting ideas from their colleagues. Finally, they suggested that having a mentoring system in place for principals encouraged innovation.

Transformational-Low leaders also mentioned four second-cycle codes. Similar to their Transformational-High counterparts, they mentioned the importance of relationships. One Transformational-Low participant stated, "A positive working-relationship is a breeding ground for innovation." They also mentioned the importance of having good mentoring systems for faculty. However, a strong second-cycle code which emerged for Transformational-Low leaders that did not emerge for the other group concerned the principal as a manager. Transformational-Low participants spoke at length about specific managerial actions that they took to encourage innovation, such as doing classroom walk-throughs. Others spoke about the specific actions that were needed to "be open-minded and ... bring in new things." Another second-cycle code that emerged for only Transformational-Low leaders involved concerns about change. These participants expressed the concern that change was being forced upon them from the top-down. As one Transformational-Low participant discussed, "There is too little bottom-up innovation." These participants appeared to be concerned that authoritative and governing structures were trying to force change, rather than change coming about organically from stakeholders' desire to improve teaching and learning.

Results of Innovation

The theme, Results of Innovation, contained a total of 32 first-cycle codes. These 32 codes were fairly evenly split between the comments of Transformational-High leaders (n = 15) and Transformational-Low leaders (n = 17; Table 3). This theme contained three second-cycle codes that represented participants' positive views regarding what had come about as a result of their efforts towards innovation. Coding also revealed one negative second-cycle code.

Table 3

Coding Results for Theme: Results of Innovation

Second Cycle Codes	First-cycle Codes - Transformational – High Leaders	First-cycle Codes - Transformational- Low Leaders
Results of Innovation – Positive Improvements		
Improvement in Pedagogy	4	7
Improvement in Relationships and Collaboration	6	6
Personal Development	3	
Results of Innovation – Negative		
Fear and Resistance	2	4
Total	15	17

Table 3

First, participants in both leadership groups spoke about how teaching or pedagogy had improved as a result of innovation. Specifically, participants described how innovation led to practices which had removed the focus of instruction from the teacher and placed it onto the child. For example, one participant from the high transformational group stated, "We focus on the child´s needs." Participants also described improvements in their ability to achieve goals, and, interestingly, how innovation had reinforced rituals at the school.

Next, participants in both groups described how innovation had brought about an improvement in their professional relationships and ability to collaborate with colleagues. As a participant from the Transformation-High group stated, "[It is] no longer [about] ´me and my class,` but `[rather, it is about] 'we and our classes.'" Specifically, these leaders mentioned how communication with colleagues was important in the life of the school, and they described how innovative efforts had led to improved communication.

However, only Transformational-High leaders discussed how innovation had led to a growth in their own personal development. It is interesting to note that personal development was considered by some Transformational-High leaders to be both a cause of, and a result of innovation, indicating that for these leaders, there is a cyclical nature and interrelationship between innovation and personal development: personal development leads to innovation and innovation leads to personal development. The ways in which Transformational-High leaders developed personally varied. For example, one participant described how she had become more knowledgeable and developed an ability to think about and implement new ideas as she planned for innovation, which, in turn, had led to her become more successful in her position. "[My] colleagues want to develop themselves and they want me to support them, "one participant from the Transformational-High leaders mentioned. This type of statement was missing from the statements of Transformational-Low leaders.

One negative idea that surfaced was that innovation had led to fear and resistance among faculty and staff members. Transformational-Low leaders mentioned this slightly more frequently (n = 4) than did their Transformational-Hih colleagues (n = 2). One Transformational-High participant also described how she tries to learn how to deal with being unsure of results, and that she is always unsure about the quality of her efforts. Transformational-Low leaders specifically stated that some of their teachers are resistant to top-down-innovations, including one participant who related that some colleagues are not open-minded and that some teachers always say "no" to new projects.

Discussion

Using qualitative methodology, researchers in the current study investigated how school building leaders with different leadership styles view requirements for and results of innovations in their schools. Patterns of similarities and differences in how these different types of leaders viewed innovation revealed themselves; these patterns may result in differences in how innovation is expressed and managed at their schools.

Transformational-High versus Transformational-Low Leaders

The leaders in the two groups (Transformational-High and Transformational-Low) viewed certain requirements of innovation similarly. Both types of leaders spoke of the importance of relationships to the implementation of innovative practices, as well as the importance of developing a mentoring system to support principals as they strive to effect innovative practices in their schools. Similarly, both groups of leaders believed that the results of innovation could lead to an improvement in pedagogy, as well as an improvement in relationships and collaboration. Both groups also felt fear and resistance as a result of innovation, although fewer the leaders in the Transformational-High group expressed this view.

However, major differences emerged in how each group viewed other aspects of the requirements of innovation, specifically in terms

of how interested each group was in innovation and how they viewed their roles as implementers of innovation.

Transformational-High Leaders – Visionary Agents of Change

Transformational-High leaders in the current study viewed innovation as being more important and positive than Transformational-Low leaders, and they suggested that innovation had a positive influence in their schools. For example, they spoke more often about the importance of "getting it [innovation] right." Unlike Transformational-Low leaders, they expressed no reservations about change, and indeed, they saw themselves as agents of change – change that is necessary to bring about innovation. They described personal characteristics they believed they possessed, such as an interest in new things, that they believed to be necessary to become agents of change. They also seemed to understand the importance of relationships when implementing innovative practices at their schools.

In some ways, it is not surprising that Transformational-High leaders expressed a more positive view of innovation in their schools, for they are, by their own nature, more visionary and focused on transforming their organizations through leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1995), and vision is required for innovation. Transformational-High leaders may also possess more intuition regarding what is required for innovation, making them more naturally adept at influencing change and innovation.

Transformational-Low Leaders – Cautious Managers of Innovation

Grossmann, Bauer & Scala (2015) describe emotional stages in the process of changes, for example skepticism, shock, defense, resignation, frustration and insight. Unlike their Transformational-High counterparts who placed an emphasis on innovation, none of the Transformational-Low leaders spoke about the "importance of getting it [innovation] right." Nor did they express the idea that it was important to innovation to develop and maintain an interest in new or novel ideas. Taken together, these findings are intriguing, as they suggest that these Transformational-Low leaders exhibited through their comments both a diminished interest in, and a reduced emphasis on, the importance of innovation in schools. Based on these findings, Transformational-Low leaders, who expressed less interest in innovation and placed less emphasis upon it, may be less able to weather the difficult early stages—skepticism, shock, and defense-of the change process that accompanies innovation. They may also tend to dwell in the early stages, because they are cautious managers of innovation. Leaders who are lower on the transformational scale may also not realize the connection between innovation and personal development, making persistence less likely. Further research is necessary to confirm or clarify these findings.

Transformational-Low leaders also spoke more frequently about the logistics of management, emphasizing organizational skills

necessary to support their faculty in the pursuit of innovation. For example, they supported their colleagues by organizing lessons together with them and emphasizing hands-on management and collaboration, rather than on setting a vision and allowing their faculty to work towards the vision in their own way. Transformational-Low leaders overall also expressed more fear of, and resistance to, innovation, and they worried about the impact of change. It is possible that this fear and resistance is connected to a very hands-on approach; this management style may be an attempt to control the implementation of innovation.

Implications

A number of implications may be developed from the results of the current research. First, it is important to consider the match between leadership style and the type of school in terms of innovative practices. As noted by Avolio and Bass (1995), highly transformational leaders tend to find leadership intellectually stimulating and emphasize the development of a vision. However, transformational-low leaders may feel more fear of and be less interested in innovation than their high transformational counterparts, and thus they may resist the change process. However, they may compensate by emphasizing organizational skills and providing more scaffolding in terms of training and resources, which may prove helpful for leading a school with many novice teachers or teachers who are less interested in innovation.

High transformational leaders are visionary leaders. They feel responsible for defining goals, and they are interested in trying out new strategies (Avolio & Bass, 1995).

Transformational-high leaders may thus thrive at a school with teachers who are ready to try new and different innovative practices. It may help if these teachers are able to buy into the vision of the high transformational leader and believe in it themselves. It may also help if these teachers need little or no scaffolding to accomplish what they set out to accomplish, as high transformational leaders are likely to be more hands-off with their faculty, involving their colleagues in planning but not dictating the day-to-day activities for how to accomplish innovative goals.

For both types of leaders, an emphasis on mentoring may prove helpful in strengthening these leaders' management outcomes. In Lower Austria, new principals who have completed a compulsory school management course are invited to attend network groups consisting of other school building leaders from the region. The principals begin by discussing their schools, teachers, teams and general challenges, both in small groups and in larger groups. In written evaluations at the conclusion of each session, newer principals describe these discussions as necessary and helpful to understanding themselves in their new roles. However, because the network groups are optional and they only take place for four years after the completion of the courses, these principals do not have ongoing support.

Organizers of these network groups may also find it beneficial to allow participants to develop a better understanding of their own leadership styles. Because participants in the current study with different leadership styles viewed innovation somewhat differently, it follows that it would be helpful for principals to

understand how their own style impacts the outcomes of innovative practices at their schools. A valid and reliable leadership survey such as the one used in the present research could be taken by the participants. Once their own leadership styles are identified, principals in the networking group could form discussion groups or even be provided different types of management training focused on innovation based on their leadership styles.

It may also be useful for the school board to take into account leadership styles of the teachers who apply for principal positions. If the goal is to increase innovation at schools, college and universities with teacher preparation programs could support the school board in matching the leadership styles of these future principals with appropriate schools that fit their styles. That is, high transformational leaders may be matched with schools employing teachers who seek visionary leaders but who require less strategic support. Low transformational leaders may fare better in schools employing teachers who need to be guided, step by step.

Further research is required in a number of areas related to leadership styles and innovative outcomes. Longitudinally, it may prove insightful to track the current participants for a number of years in order to understand the lasting impact of leadership styles on innovative practices. Also, researchers may wish to determine whether there is a fundamental difference in innovative outcomes between principals with different leadership styles who are required to teach and those who are not

required to teach. Another area of future research would involve determining teachers´ perceptions of innovative practices at schools lead by high transformational or low transformational principals.

Summary

The current research utilized qualitative methodology to explore the perceptions of Austrian principals regarding innovation in their schools. Participants were asked to complete a survey and then their leadership styles were evaluated. Three participants with high transformational tendencies and three participants with weaker transformational tendencies were interviewed, and their responses were coded and analyzed for patterns and themes.

Participants' responses from the two groups differed in a number of ways. Overall, high transformational leaders placed more emphasis on innovation and were more positive about it, describing its importance in the school, as well as the importance of having certain requirements for innovative practices –good relationships and an interest in new things. They looked forward to seeing the results of innovation in their schools. Low transformational leaders, on the other hand, expressed more concerns about innovation – they were generally more fearful and talked about the importance of having mentors to "manage" the process. If we take into account the leadership styles of school principals, matching these styles to the proper school context, cultivating and nurturing these styles, these

leaders may learn to be more effective in their innovative educational practices.

References

Atwater, L., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). The moderating effect of self-perception accuracy on predictor/leadership and leadership/performance relationships (Working Paper No. 90- 171). Binghamton: State University of New York, School of Management.

Avolio, B. & Bass, B. (1995). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Third Edition Manual and Sampler Set. Nebraska: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1993). Manual of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Blase, J. (2001). Empowering teachers: What successful principals do. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bologna Process – European Education Higher Area (2015). Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/

Cemalolu, N, (2011) Primary principals' leadership styles, school organizational health and workplace bullying. Journal of Educational Administration, 49(5), 495 – 512.

Drucker, P. (1955). The practice of management. London, UK: Pan Books.

Grossmann, R., Bauer, G. & Scala, K. (2015). Einführung in die systemische Organisations-entwicklung. S. 113, 114. Carl Auer, Heidelberg.

Herrmann, P. (2014). Einführung in das systemische Schulmanagement. Heidelberg: Carl Auer.

Internet World Stats. (2015). Usage and population statistics. Retrieved from http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz?Lazarowitz, R., (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: the mediate effect of school vision. Journal of Educational Administration, 48 (1), 7 – 30.

Malik, F. (2014). Führen Leisten Leben. Wirksames Management für eine neue Welt. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Mota, R. (2010). A descriptive analysis of leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University.

Ozaralli, N. (2003). Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness', Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24(6), 335-344.

Park, J. (2012). The effects of principal's leadership style on support for innovation: Evidence from Korean vocational high school change. Asia Pacific Education Review, 13(1), 89-102.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). Science and human behavior. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

U. S. Department of Education. (2004). What do we mean by 'innovation'? Retrieved by http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oii/about/definition.html

Van den Berg, R., & Sleegers, P. (1996). Building innovative capacity and leadership. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.) International

handbook of leadership and
administration (pp. 653-699). New York,
NY: Springer International.

About the Author(s)

Petra Heissenberger, Mag., PhD, is deputy head of the
department of educational management and leadership at
the University College of Teacher Education in Lower
Austria. Her current research interests include school
management, school quality, primary
education, communication and leadership, and human
resource management. She is the holder of Magister of
Philosophy (Master) and Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in
Educational Science, Special Needs Education and
Therapeutic Pedagogy from the University of Vienna; and a
Master of Science in School Building Leadership from Mercy
College, New York. She is involved with Project TEDCA
(Teachers' Education, Development and Career in Austria), a
professional biographical longitudinal study.

Nancy N. Heilbronner, Ph.D., is associate provost at
Mercy College in Dobbs Ferry, New York. Dr. Heilbronner
lectures internationally on topics related to gifted and science
education and is the author or co-author of a number of
books, including Think Data, Think Instruments, Let's Be
Scientists, and Ten Things Not to Say to Your Gifted Child,
One Family's Perspective, which was honored with the
Parent's Choice and Texas Legacy Awards

(This page intentionally left blank)