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ABSTRACT

This study employed a quantitative research design using a mail survey to explore leadership style in Islamic schools in the United States. The purpose of the study was to describe levels of transformational and transactional leadership of American Muslim principals. Correlational analyses were used to determine the relationship between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership and the relationship of demographic variables to perceptions of transformational leadership. Multiple regression analyses showed that none of the six demographic variables were significant predictors of the variance in principal- or teacher-reported use of transformational leadership.

Thirty-three principals responded to the MLQ 5X self-rating form and 143 teachers responded to the MLQ 5X other-rating form. Principals rated themselves higher than their teachers on transformational leadership and lower than their teachers on transactional leadership. Both principals and teachers ranked principals highest in Inspirational Motivation and lowest in Management-by-Exception Passive. Principals rated themselves as being more intellectually stimulating and less often using contingent reward. In schools where teachers were more congruent in their ratings of the principal, they tended to perceive the principals as more transformational than did teachers in schools where teachers were less congruent in their ratings. It appears that where principals are more consistent in their interactions with teachers, teachers have higher opinions of the principal as a transformational leader.

Both teachers and principals rated principals of American Muslim schools as fairly high in the use of both transformational and transactional leadership. Comparisons of these findings to
other research in the U.S. suggest that American Muslim principals exhibit leadership characteristics very similar to those of other U.S. principals.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

The tragic events of September 11, 2001, and the fear of another terrorist attack placed American Muslims in a difficult situation. The American Muslim community now receives a lot of attention from the American public, government, and media wanting to understand more about Muslims and Islam. The American Muslim community has a mission to fulfill which is to represent its perspective of the Islam religion and to defend its faith from a perceived assault. Islamic schools also should play an important role in relating the message that Islam is a peaceful religion. Islamic schools should defend their mission from the accusation of “raising little terrorists.” The overall image presented to the public by the media regarding the Islam religion had been positive. However, the American response since the inhuman act of September 11 impacted both domestic law and civil rights. Khan (2001) states that foreigners as well as citizens, particularly from the Arab and the Muslim World, are all being treated as suspects. Muslims in America are now at the mercy of the wisdom of American leadership. Many are being held for minor VISA violations and others are being interviewed unnecessarily, leading to stigmatization. Khan states that Muslims who own their own businesses are now losing clients and many others have lost their jobs. The environment of suspicion is taking a heavy toll on innocent Muslims whose quality of life plummeted after September 11th.
The attacks of September 11 brought about much attention to diversity and a multicultural society from the public, government, and media. There are talks against diversity, but this time, it is against everyone who is not white or African American. Many individuals fail to see the unique achievement of having a diverse society, where all contribute their best to the American society by living and celebrating their own traditions and cultures. Instead, they see diversity as a threat and a danger to the peace and safety of national security. An awareness of the mission of Islamic schools could bring about more understanding of Islamic culture in the United States.

Afridi (2001) points out in Muslims in America that between 6 and 8 million Muslim people live in the United States, making the Islam religion the second largest religion in the country. The many different backgrounds of more than 50 nations enhance the diversity of Muslims living in America. They came to the United States to become full participants in American democracy and freedom. Many Muslims admire America for its achievements in science and technology, democracy, human rights, respect for the rule of the law, and freedom of speech and religion. In the Muslim holy book, the Qur’an, all Muslims are enjoined to do good, avoid evil, and struggle to establish justice and order on earth. Khan (2001) documents in American Muslims that it is the destiny of American Muslims to demonstrate the relevance of Islamic values to the American society.

Khan (2001) states that the American Muslim community is a multicultural community because it contains immigrants from all over the world. However, according to a Congressional Quarterly Research report (April, 1993), about 40% of American Muslims are not immigrants. A research report from the BRIDGESTV web site (October, 2003) reveals that 7 million Muslim people live in the United States with the following breakdown: 24% African American, 26%
Arab American, 26% South Asian, and 25% all others. The diversity of the American Muslim community has the greatest impact on the American Muslim identity. American Muslims have been struggling to form their Islamic identity by building Islamic institutions such as mosques, Islamic centers, and Islamic schools. Today, there are over 1,500 Islamic centers and hundreds of Islamic schools in the United States. These play an important role in the formation of the Islamic identity.

When the focus in the Muslim community is on nationality and background and not religion, it is too difficult to reach an agreement on many different issues. Khan (2001) argues that when the focus is on religion, then the identity for everyone is the same; then the formation of Islamic identity as an American Muslim can be established. Islamic schools play an important role in preparing the new generation of American Muslims to grow up with more unified goals and interests to strengthen their community in general and their society at large.

Statement of the Problem

The mission of the Muslim American Society Council of Islamic Schools (MASCIS; 2004) in the United States is to establish an Islamic school system in North America that nurtures a balanced Muslim personality seeking to excel in every field of endeavor and to become an effective source of educational leadership and resources for Islamic schools. Some of the objectives of the MASCIS are: 1) review the curricula of Islamic schools, 2) develop unified curricula and textbooks that reflect both the authentic foundations and principles of Islam, as well as the modern educational methodologies and practices relevant to the North American environment, 3) develop an Islamic studies curriculum that is balanced, authentic, and dynamic in order to nurture a balanced Muslim personality excelling in every field of endeavor, and 4) develop an Arabic language curriculum and textbooks that are appropriate and relevant to
Muslim students in North America. The Islamic Foundation of North America aims to systematize and organize the methodology of effective Islamic education by making research available to Muslim educators. The foundation has organized learning materials and compiled lists of grade-appropriate subject matter for all grades from K through 12, covering Islamic studies, Arabic, and Islamic literature.

Beekun and Badawi (1999) describe leadership from an Islamic perspective as having two primary roles. The roles of a leader are those of servant-leader and guardian-leader. Servant-leaders are servants of their followers: they seek their welfare and guide them toward what is good. The idea of a leader as a servant has been part of Islam since its beginning. The example of the Prophet Muhammad emphasizes the second major role of the Muslim as guardian-leader: to protect his community against tyranny and oppression, to encourage Allah-consciousness and taqwa (the all-encompassing, inner consciousness of one’s duty toward Allah and the awareness of one’s accountability toward Him), and to promote justice.

The role of Islamic school principals as leaders for diverse schools of minority students is an important one. The effectiveness of the Islamic school principals’ leadership lies not only in their personal and professional characteristics, but also in how these principals understand their school culture. The principal must understand the values of the people they serve and how important these values are to them as a minority group. Hurst (1984) points out in Bubbles and Effective Management that principals can influence the school culture to represent a common purpose, shared vision, identity, and sense of community. The principals’ focus on building trust and supportive relationships, delegation, and empowerment enable them to emphasize the value and beliefs of the Islamic schools’ culture and to build ownership of the Islamic schools’ organizations.
Ramirez (1979) states in Cultural Democracy and the Multicultural Personality that the principal’s leadership in diverse schools like Islamic schools requires confidence, sensitivity, flexibility, and adaptability to deal with different ethnic groups, different opinions, different views and perceptions of others, and different situations. Principals for Islamic schools put forth a lot of effort in order to reach a consensus, develop decisions with an agreement under the challenging conditions of such diversity, and gather understanding in an atmosphere of mutual respect, cooperation, and equality of status. To accomplish this, principals must learn about themselves first and must then review their leadership behaviors and their perspectives on leadership.

Because there is no research on Islamic schools, this is an opportune time to explore the leadership of these schools. This research presents a descriptive study to the public about American Muslim principals’ perspectives on leadership. With this research study, I hope to develop an understanding of the American Muslim principals’ leadership style.

Conceptual Framework

Contingency Theories of Leadership

In Leadership in Empowered Schools, Short and Greer (2002) discuss different approaches to leadership. These approaches are briefly described here.

1) The trait approach considers leadership as one-way, generally directive or controlling. This approach focuses on individual personality traits that set the leader apart from the followers. There are five categories of traits: capacity of intelligence and judgment, achievement of knowledge, responsibility, participation, and status position.

2) The situational approach discusses leadership as contingent upon the situation.
3) The behavior, or style, approach focuses on leader behavior and involves the two dimensions: (1) consideration of human relationship and (2) efforts to organize work and tasks.

4) The contingency approach views leadership as a composite of responses to a situation and depends on a variety of approaches such as the leader’s personality, leader/member relationship, and group maturity.

The contingency approach theorists are divided on whether leaders can change situations to match their style (Feidler, 1969) or change their style to fit the situations (Hersey, 1979). Fred Fiedler developed the contingency theory which matches a leader’s style to the right setting. Leadership style is described as task motivated and relationship motivated (Northouse, 2004). The contingency theory suggests that a situation can be characterized by assessing three factors: 1) leader-member relations or the nature of the interpersonal relationship between leaders and followers; 2) task structure or the degree of specificity in work tasks; and 3) position power or the degree of power and authority invested in a leader’s position. The contingency theory stresses that leaders will not be effective in all situations.

There is no particular style of leadership that is appropriate for every situation. The contingency model incorporates the factors of personality, leadership style, and the nature of the situation. All the internal and external factors included in the contingency approach are relevant to many contexts, reflect the complexity of real situations, and fit best with the notion of leaders as the designers of social contexts. The individual should act relative to the situation and different situations demand different kinds of behavior from the leader. Developing attitudes, skills, and adequate approaches are necessary to respond appropriately to new circumstances.
Leaders become flexible and adaptable in their leadership responses to the changes of leadership demands.

In *Paradigms and Promises* (1986), Foster describes the Foster Political Model. It includes the idea that leadership is a special form of power, utilizing resources in order to achieve desired goals. Leadership has to do with conflict over resources. It occurs in relation to the follower’s motives, ideas, and wants. Transactional leadership, such as bartering, responds to physical and social needs, along with security issues and ego. Leadership is the exchange of services and the need for leaders and followers to serve their separate interests. Leaders and followers exchange needs and services in order to achieve separate goals. Leaders mobilize resources to satisfy the motives of the followers. Transformational leadership responds to esteem, competence, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. Leaders and followers are united in pursuit of higher level goals that are common to both. Leaders engage followers to higher levels of motivation and morality.

Foster’s (1986) Critical Model is based on shared cultures. Leadership requires continual challenges and reflections. Leadership empowers others to a higher motivation and morality. Leadership is a search for democratic and rational participation in social events. The essence of leadership of this kind is the desire and attempt to change the human condition. Leadership is a professional command of a body of knowledge that enables the leader to make informed judgments in response to unique situations and individual needs.

In *Reframing Organization* (1993), Bolman and Deal explained a framework for the strategies used by principals in reframing the school organization. Their model includes human resources, political, structural, and symbolic frames. Within the human resource frame, needs inside of the school organization should be addressed in a way that serves the school mission and
benefits all. Changes in schools will happen through people, not by changing them, but by matching the right person to the right job, and working with people, not doing things for them. Everyone in a school organization wants to feel accepted, respected, and cared for. The only way to accomplish this is to find out what the people need and to give them the right to be involved in decision making.

The political frame (Bolman & Deal, 1993) suggests that managing a group of people at different levels of seeking power will ultimately lead to conflict. The way to manage a political situation is to influence the organization by persuasion first and negotiation second. Also important is clarifying what people want, discovering areas of shared interests, and making decisions for the group.

In the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 1993), roles and policies should fit the school environment. The best way to implement them is by knowing people’s skills, clarifying responsibilities to them, clarifying what is expected from them, trusting them in the decision-making process, and then evaluating the outcome.

The symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 1993) celebrates school culture, shows the collaboration of its people, celebrates their accomplishments, and appreciates the work and effort of others. Recognizing the experiences of the past, communicating the vision, and addressing the hopes and values of the people will accomplish this.

Firestone and Wilson (1984) view the principal’s leadership role as one of analyzing a school’s culture and understanding one’s values, tasks, definitions, and commitments. Principals can shape the system of the school in many ways to specify the important task definitions and commitments. How can principals become active communicators of the culture? They can
provide an organized and ongoing flow of communication to ensure that these symbols are appropriately interpreted.

In *Advances in Educational Administration: Perspectives on Educational Reform* (1990), Thurston and Lotto and Sergiovanni (1990) emphasize that leaders’ responsibility is to facilitate the process of creating a new vision, helping individuals recognize the need for change, and understanding people’s need for space to work through periods of transition. Leaders are responsible for helping individuals to make commitment to change, modeling desired behavior, and creating an environment ready for change. Sagor and Barnett (1994), in *The TQE Principal: A Transformed Leader*, discuss that the vision for schools involves two dimensions: a reflective environment and degree of safety where individuals can rediscover what they really want, and a gathering of people together in a way such that their visions can be shared. This involves a deep level of trust and a mutual understanding of the differences that exist. A great deal of listening is also required.

The process of changing a school’s cultural norms and values is complex and ongoing. Johnson (1996) explained that complexity could provide a guide for development in education wherein creative solutions arise out of interaction under the conditions of uncertainty, diversity, and instability. The development of a school culture requires the examination of the following aspects: professional values, learning, collaboration, shared planning and leadership, a complete understanding of the forces both inside and outside the school, and an understanding of how leadership can be effective.

*Transformational Leadership Theories*

Northouse (2004) and Bass (1985) argue that transformational leadership motivates followers to do more than expected by: 1) raising followers’ levels of consciousness about the
importance and value of specified and idealized goals; 2) getting followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the team or organization; and 3) moving followers to address higher-level needs. Bass and Avolio (1994) developed a model of transformational and transactional leadership that incorporates seven different factors. These factors are:

1) Idealized Influence. This describes leaders who act as strong role models and do the right thing. These are leaders who are deeply respected by followers, who place a great deal of trust in them, and they provide vision and a sense of mission.

2) Inspirational Motivation. This describes leaders who communicate high expectations, motivate followers to become committed to shared visions, and use symbols and emotional appeals to focus on group effort to achieve more than they thought they would achieve.

3) Intellectual Stimulation. This describes leaders who stimulate followers to be creative and innovative, and to try new ways to deal with organizational issues.

4) Individualized Consideration. This describes leaders who listen carefully to individual needs, act as coaches and advisers when assisting individuals, use delegation, and help followers grow through personal changes.

5) Contingent Reward. This refers to leadership that focuses on the exchange process and obtains agreement on what needs to be done.

6) Management-by-Exception. This refers to leadership that involves corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. These leaders watch followers closely for mistakes and take corrective action.

7) Laissez-Faire Leadership. This represents the absence of leadership.
The factors of transformational and transactional leadership models are divided into three parts. Transformational leadership includes factors 1, 2, 3, and 4. Transactional leadership includes factor 5 and factor 6. Non-leadership includes factor 7.

Wilkes (1994) describes transformational leadership as incorporating the qualities of collegiality, motivation, and reflection. Foster (1989) believes that those who have been dubbed as exemplary leaders are able to accomplish things not exclusively by virtue of their individual attributes, but by the fact that they are able to take advantage of what might be called a “corridor of belief” that exists in their communities or constituencies at the time. Strodl and Johnson (1994) state that transformational leadership is human behavior that promotes cooperative actions and supportive environments. Responsibilities are shared, opportunities are perceived, and growth takes place. Leadership fosters development, community linkages, and personal growth among people who participate in community activities.

Bass and Avolio (1994) state that transactional leadership is concerned with the basic needs of followers and emphasizes the exchange between leaders and their followers. Transactional leadership is generally sufficient to maintain the status quo in schools. Transformational leadership is concerned with the performance of followers and with developing followers to their fullest potential. Transformational leadership is necessary to motivate others to more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible. Leithwood (1996) describes that transformational leadership entails a change in the purposes and resources and a change for the better in the leader-follower relationship. Transactional leadership fosters ongoing work by attending to the basic needs of the followers but leads to no or little change. Beekun and Badawi (1999) describe leadership in Islam as an active process that searches for opportunities to improve the status quo. The process of leadership in Islam involves the ability to
project the vision for everyone, to empower others, to model the way, and to encourage and motivate the followers.

Principals of Islamic schools should have personal and professional characteristics to enable them to understand their school culture and to deal with differences in minority students. These principals must understand the values of the people they serve and how important these values are to them as a minority group. The principals must emphasize the values and beliefs of the Islamic school culture and build ownership of Islamic school organizations. Transformational leadership provides a framework for school leaders to use when dealing with multicultural groups and their leaders. Leadership requires continual challenges and reflections. Leadership empowers others to a higher motivation and morality.

The characteristics of effective leaders according to Kouzes and Posner (1995) are honesty and competency, visionary, forward-looking, inspiration, intelligence, fair-mindedness, straightforwardness, and imagination. All of these characteristics of effective transformational leaders are remarkably Islamic characteristics. Plus, more characteristics of Islamic leaders such as strength of character, patience, humility, kindness and magnanimity, self-understanding, the willingness to seek consultation, equity and impartiality, modesty and simplicity, and willingness to abide by the same rules that apply to their followers can be added.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the issues of leadership from the perspective of American Muslim principals and from the teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s leadership style. I wanted to find out how American Muslim principals perceive the main characteristics of leadership in their minority school cultures and to what degree these principals demonstrate transformational leadership.
Principals face many challenges to which they must respond and their response must promote leadership. With the new millennium, the challenges facing American Muslim principals are many. These challenges require courage from these principals to take an original path to achieve their educational goals, to develop a better understanding of their mission, and to discover how to provide a better environment for our children.

Significance of the Study

It has become difficult for a person from a minority group to oppose what the majority agrees upon. This goes against what this great country was built on and against the reason why many people immigrated to the United States in the first place. My goal for this study was to develop public appreciation of Islamic schools and to develop better understanding and appreciation of the American-Muslim principal’s leadership in order to bring a greater understanding regarding Islamic culture. Because of the circumstances under which we live and because there is no research on Islamic schools, it is timely to present a descriptive study to the public about American-Muslim Principals’ perspective on leadership in their schools.

This research study may be one small step in enabling us to recognize the opportunities of our growing diversity, and to find common ground across our differences. This study should help American-Muslim principals to develop a better understanding of themselves, to discover the nature of their leadership styles, to find out to what degree they practice their Islamic leadership, and to provide a better environment for their schools. With research, we can increase our knowledge and raise the awareness of the people in different cultures and beliefs. As an educator, I hope this research will lead to leadership development that allows children to become good citizens and to operate effectively in a multicultural society.
Research Questions

The primary objective of this study was to capture the perspective of American-Muslim principals toward leadership and their teachers’ perceptions of their leadership style. The process of achieving this objective was through a questionnaire which was used to answer the following questions:

1) What are the demographic characteristics of American Muslim principals and their schools, including principals’ age, gender, degree, nationality or ethnicity, years of experience, native language, school level, and composition of the school board?

2) Do American Muslim principals exhibit transformational leadership (as determined through self-report and teacher-report)?

3) Is there a relationship between teacher and principal reports of the principal’s use of transformational leadership?

4) Where teachers within schools are more congruent in their views of principals’ use of transformational leadership, are teacher perceptions of principals’ leadership style more positive?

5) Are principal demographics related to principals’ self-reported use of transformational leadership?

6) Are principal demographics related to teachers’ perceptions of principal’s use of transformational leadership?

Overview of Methodology

A descriptive research study was designed to explore leadership style in Islamic schools in the United States. A mail survey was used to obtain data from administrators and teachers relating to the phenomenon of leadership in Islamic schools. School names were obtained from

Principals and teachers were then selected from the nine states with large numbers of Islamic schools. The states include: New York, New Jersey, California, Virginia, Florida, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, and Texas. The total number of Islamic schools in the nine states is fifty-seven schools. Principals responded to the demographics information survey and to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) self-rating form (Bass & Avolio; 1995). Teachers responded to the MLQ other-rating form. The survey was mailed to the principals of the schools. They were asked to complete the leader form questionnaires themselves and to distribute the ten packets of other-rater questionnaires to the designated teachers of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade for the elementary school level, and to science, social studies, language art, reading, and math teachers for the secondary school level. Each school will receive five to ten surveys for the teachers depending on the school level and one survey for the principal. Teachers were asked to mail the completed questionnaires in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelopes themselves, without returning the questionnaires to the administrators.

The research design is descriptive and correlational in nature. Descriptive data includes frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Correlational analyses were used to determine the relationship between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership and the relationship of demographic variables to perceptions of transformational leadership.

**Definitions of Terms**

Northouse (2004, p.170) and Burns (1978) distinguish between two types of leadership: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership refers to the exchanges that occur between leaders and their followers. Transformational leadership refers to
the process whereby an individual engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both leaders and followers. Beekun and Badawi (1999) describe that Islamic leadership refers to a process that focuses on the followers’ welfare, guides them, protects them, and promotes justice between them.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature covers research on transformational leadership. Also, it covers the connection between transformational leadership and Islamic values.

Descriptive Studies on American Principals’ Leadership Style

The MetLife (2003) Survey of The American Teacher described a study conducted by Harris Interactive, Inc. to examine school leadership. The survey explored the opinions of principals, teachers, parents, and students regarding school leadership. The study involved 800 public schools principals, 1,017 public schools teachers, and 1,107 parents of public schools students. Students in grades 3rd through 12th were interviewed. The results indicated that 78% of principals rated themselves as excellent at respecting people in school; in contrast, 36% of teachers and 34% of parents rated their principals as excellent at respecting people in school. Teachers believed that principals spent 37% of their time on reporting and 24% on motivation and guidance. However, principals declared that motivation of teachers and students was their top priority. The authors reported that principals, teachers, and parents agreed that motivating teachers and students to do their best was the key role of school leadership. Teachers believed test scores were most important to principals. Almost 90% of principals said their school was welcoming to parents but only 61% of parents shared that view. Ninety-three percent of principals were satisfied with the principal-parent relationship, but only 64% of parents declared such satisfaction. Ninety-seven percent of secondary school principals were extremely or
somewhat satisfied with the student-principal relationship, while only 6 in 10 students called the relationship satisfying. Forty-six percent of students saw their school as unsafe.

Bryant (1996) stated that mainstream organizational and management theory in America has subscribed to the idea that leaders must have an appropriate mix of task-oriented characteristics and people-oriented characteristics. Leaders must have a goal, a focus, a vision, and an objective. The two faces of leadership appear frequently in the leadership literature: leaders must make certain that people in the organization attend to the end-product and leaders will do better when they empower people who will move the organization toward the end-product. Researchers at Michigan State labeled these same leadership attributes as that of task-oriented behaviors and relationship-oriented behaviors (Likert, 1961).

Gates and Siskin (2001, pp. 164-182) developed a research study to describe the self-reported leadership style, attitudes, and practices of campus level administrators in Texas, using a random sample of 500 Texas school administrators. There are four styles of leading that are generated by the Hersey and Blanchard Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) Self/Other instrument. Hersey and Blanchard (1993) described these four styles of leading in the following manner: “Telling,” where the leaders provide instruction and monitor performance closely; “Selling,” where the leaders discuss decisions with followers and allow them opportunities to ask for clarification; “Participating,” where the leaders share and facilitate decision-making with followers; and “Delegating,” where the leaders allow responsibility for decisions and performance to be turned over to followers. Almost 7% of Texas principals surveyed were found to use “Telling” as their dominant style of leading. The majority of principals (71%) responded to the LEAD-Self questionnaire in a manner that indicated they used “Selling” as their primary style of leading. The remaining 22% were found to use “Participating”
as their dominant style of leading. None of the administrators were found to possess
“Delegating” as their major style of leading.

Krumm and Gates (2000) found in their study using the LEAD-Self instrument that
female principals possess significantly higher “Adaptability” scores; that is, they possess
knowledge, willingness, and ability to adjust appropriately their style of leading given the nature
of the followers and the task at hand. Male administrators were found to report significantly
higher “Telling” scores than female administrators. Administrators who possess a “Telling” style
of leading were found to receive lower adaptability scores than those who responded with a
“Selling” style. Administrators who selected a “Participating” style of leadership were found to
receive higher adaptability scores than those who responded with a “Selling” style. It appears
that when administrators become more experienced they also become more likely to embrace a
“Participating” style of leading.

Roesner and Cavin (1987) state that leadership style results from an adaptation to a
variety of forces, one being organizational structure. It is important for principals to know the
groups within the school and to select the appropriate style to lead them. Roesner and Cavin
(1987) conducted a research study that included 54 principals and 180 subordinates using the
Hersey and Blanchard (LEAD) Self/Other instrument. They found that principals of small
schools saw themselves as exhibiting “Telling” styles where the leaders provide instruction and
monitor performance closely. The style most used by secondary school principals was “Selling”
where the leaders discuss decisions with followers and allow them opportunities to ask for
clarification, and “Participating” where the leaders share and facilitate decision-making with
followers.
Brubaker and Lawrence (1987, pp. 72-78) conducted a survey on principals’ leadership roles. They suggest there are five roles principals have played:

1) **Principal Teacher**: the principal routinely engages in classroom teaching for a portion of each school day and is responsible for daily school duties;

2) **General Manager**: the principal spends the majority of time on clerical duties, relies upon common sense, and reacts to problems as they arise. The principal has the right to give and enforce orders to teachers, and implement the curriculum as mandated by the state and local school board;

3) **Professional and Scientific Manager**: the principal spends more time in the classroom supervising and evaluating instruction and using test data as a basis for planning and implementing. The principal is interested in efficiency and the use of time to meet management goals and objectives;

4) **Administrator and Instructional Leader**: the principal treats teachers as professionals, giving them significant input into staff hiring, scheduling, evaluation, procurement of materials, and selection of objectives and methods;

5) **Curriculum Leader**: the principal views the curriculum in very broad terms, believes the role of a principal is too complex to reduce to simple technical procedures, realizes that all tasks have an impact on what is learned, believes that the learning of adult educators is as important as the learning of students.

Brubaker and Simon (1987) found that 71% of those surveyed viewed their present leadership as administrators and instructional leaders and 13% as general managers. When asked which role the principals would like to assume, 64% chose to keep the same role (administrators and instructional leaders), 17% chose curriculum leader, and 16% chose professional and
scientific manager. Of the 370 respondents, a total of 60% categorized most North Carolina principals as general manager and the majority viewed the most desirable principal leadership style to be administrator and instructional leader.

Deering (1996) and Dei, James, Karumanchery, James-Wilson, and Zine (2000) use the term inclusion, which describes approaches to education with school populations that are diverse in terms of ethnicity and race. Salisbury and McGregor (2002) conducted a cross-site case study design to evaluate administrative and contextual characteristics of elementary schools in which inclusive educational practices were being promoted by the principal. The results indicated, in terms of the principal’s behavior, that high scores were evident across schools on the supportive dimensions in the areas of leadership, management, and governance. Principal behavior that was directive and restrictive was less likely. The authors suggest that principals of these schools share common personal attributes as leaders. They tend to be leaders who share decision-making powers with their staff, lead by example, extend the core values around inclusiveness and quality, and actively promote learning communities.

Keenan (2003) believes, based upon his experiences as superintendent in several school districts, that successful leaders can be categorized as one of two types of leaders: system leaders and personal leaders. System leaders have a direct and assertive leadership style understood throughout the organization to create and sustain a specific culture. The people surrounding them were the type of followers who best fit to their assertive style. The system leader’s style is similar to “leader-match” described by Northhouse (2001) because it proposes that effective leadership is contingent on matching a leader’s style to the right setting.

Personal leaders look at the needs of the culture in which they are involved and build programs around that culture. For example, they adapt programs to address the school’s diversity
of students. They recognize the strengths of their colleagues and continually seek paths toward
the improvement of all personnel. The personal leader’s style is closely aligned to the
“situational leaders” described by Hersey and Blanchard (1982) because it matches style to
situation. The author argues that the right person for a position of leadership is highly dependent
on the needs of the culture.

Chance and Lingren (1989) conducted a study of rural secondary schools in North
Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. A survey of day-to-day activities and a leadership
style questionnaire were mailed to all secondary school principals who have less than 150
students in their schools. Five hundred ninety-two questionnaires were mailed and 462 returned
(78%). The results indicated that 58% saw their primary responsibility as being an instructional
leader. Discipline (20%) and management (19%) ranked a distant second. The time spent on a
daily basis was as follows: 48.3% on general managerial duties, 11.5% on working directly with
teachers, 22.3% on disciplining students, and 6.8% on meeting with parents. The findings
identify three leadership styles: 1) task orientation; 2) climate orientation; and 3) concern for the
individual orientation. Task orientation leadership was the most often selected and climate
orientation and concern for the individual orientation were less often identified as preferred
styles. Female principals scored higher than male principals for task orientation, although both
were almost the same for concern for the individual. Female principals scored lower than male
principals for climate orientation. The study indicates that these principals perceived themselves
as instructional leaders but they spent the greatest portion of their day focusing on general
managerial duties. Concern for climate and individuals becomes lost in the daily tasks of
teaching, managing, disciplining, and attending to school-related activities.
Beyer and Ruhl-Smith (1996) conducted a survey to examine leadership style of 254 principals and assistant principals of elementary, middle, and secondary schools in the Texas Panhandle Region. The four domains of leadership as outlined by principals for changing schools were:

1) Functional leadership that includes information collection, problem analysis, judgment, organizational oversight, implementation, and delegation;
2) Programmatic leadership that includes instruction and learning environment, curriculum design, student guidance, staff development, measurement and evaluation, and resource allocation;
3) Interpersonal leadership that includes motivating others, oral and nonverbal expression, written knowledge, and sensitivity; and
4) Contextual leadership that includes cultural value, legal and regulatory application, policy and political influences, and public relations.

The response rate was 77.77%. The respondents agreed that functional leadership is important in arriving at solutions for comprehensive school dilemmas and that contextual leadership is important to enhance change. The need for strong interpersonal leadership appeared to be recognized by the respondents at all school levels. Elementary administrators were more positive with programmatic leadership than secondary administrators. The findings indicate that principals and assistant principals at all levels are moving away from traditional leadership styles.

Schmidt et al. (1998) conducted a three-year study to examine 43 beginning school administrators to determine what measurable and significant personality and leadership style changes occurred after three years in a new administrative position. All beginning administrators
completed both the 16 Personality Factor Inventory (16 PF) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MB). Twenty-five administrators were female, 32 were Caucasian, 9 were African American, and 2 Hispanic. Sixteen beginning school administrators assumed the position of principal, 14 became assistant principals, and 13 assumed central office positions. The results indicated that all administrators became more serious, sober, expedient, practical, exacting, tense, driven, and overwrought. African Americans and women were initially more tense, driven, and overwrought but showed less of a change than their counterparts. The leadership style of all beginning administrators became more thinking and judgmental and less feeling and perceptive. Over the three years personality changes for all beginning administrators shifted from a more democratic to a more bureaucratic or directive style with experience. They became more task-oriented and less people-oriented.

Hardin (1995) utilized responses of 34 principals selected from three districts (one urban and two rural) to determine the relationships between the principal’s leadership style and personality type. Twenty-two participants were principals of elementary schools, 8 participants were from secondary schools, and 4 were from K-12. The researcher used the self-scoring instruments of Leadership Behavior Analysis II (LBAII) for leadership style and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MB) for personality type. The results indicated that there was no relationship between the principal’s leadership style and personality type. The principals were evenly split between introversion and extraversion. More principals rated themselves as sensing, thinking, and judging rather than intuitive, feeling, and perceiving.

Several conclusions can be drawn from these studies of school leadership. First, principals tend to rate themselves differently than their followers rate them. This argues for using both self-report and other-report instruments in assessing school leadership style. Second,
leadership style changes over time and some studies suggest that it also varies by ethnicity and
gender. Hence, these factors (experience, ethnicity, and gender) also must be included in
empirical research on school leadership.

Transformational Leadership

Northouse (2004) and Bennis and Nanus (1985) asked 90 leaders basic questions such as:

- What are your strengths and weaknesses?
- What past events most influenced your leadership approach?
- What were the critical points in your career?

From the answers leaders provided to these questions, Bennis and Nanus identified four common
strategies used by leaders in transformational organizations. First, transforming leaders have a
clear vision of the future state of their organization and they play a large role in articulating this
vision. Second, transforming leaders are social architects for their organization; they create a
shape or form for the shared meanings individuals maintain within their organizations. Third,
transforming leaders create trust in their organization by making their own positions clearly
known and then standing by them. Trust has to do with being predictable or reliable even in
situations that are uncertain. Fourth, transforming leaders use creative deployment of self
through positional self-regard. Leaders know their strengths and weaknesses and they emphasize
their strengths rather then dwelling on their weaknesses.

Northouse (2004) and Tichy and DeVanna (1986, 1990) studied the transformational
leadership of 12 chief executive officers at large corporations. Tichy and DeVanna wanted to
find out how leaders worked under the challenging conditions brought about by rapid
technological changes, social and cultural changes, increased competition, and increased
interdependence with economies of other nations. The data from the interviews suggested that
leaders manage change in their organizations through a three-act process. Act 1 of this transformational process involves recognizing the need for change. Transformational leaders are change agents and they have the responsibility of pointing out to the organization how change in the environment could positively or negatively affect how the organization operates. Act 2 in the change process requires the creation of a vision. The vision acts as a conceptual road map for where the organization is headed in the future and what it will look like. Act 3 in transforming organizations involves institutionalizing changes. To do that, leaders need to break down old structures and establish new ones and they need to find appropriate followers to implement new ideas.

Ingram (1997) conducted a study to examine the relationship between inclusive schools and principals’ leadership behavior. The participants in this study were teachers who rated the leadership behaviors of their principals. The 72 teachers were selected from 15 public schools in Michigan from 10 districts involved in the inclusive educational programs for students with moderate and severe disabilities in regular classroom. Only 44 teachers returned the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire form (MLQ), for a response rate of 61%. The data provided evidence that principals in inclusive schools exhibit a greater degree of transformational than transactional leadership behaviors. Sixty-six percent indicated that their principals exhibited transformational patterns of behaviors “fairly often” and transactional patterns of behavior only “sometime”. The results supported the hypothesis that principals who are perceived to exhibit highly transformational behaviors have a greater impact on teachers’ motivation to perform beyond teachers’ original expectations and attempt to influence a change in attitudes, norms, or ways of thinking. Also, the results indicated that charisma was the only factor of the four transformational leadership factors that significantly contributed to the principals’ impact on
teachers’ motivation and that the factors of intellectual stimulation, inspiration, and individual consideration did not.

Chirichello (1999) conducted a study of six principals in schools that were defined as successful public elementary schools. The results indicated that each principal exhibited many of the characteristics of transformational leadership and may have exhibited some characteristics of transactional and cultural leadership. The preferred leadership style of those principals appeared to be transformational. In each of the six schools, teachers perceived themselves as more intimate or collegial than disengaged. The principals believed the teachers were also more intimate or collegial than disengaged. These finding supported Jensen’s (1995) quantitative research study that found a positive correlation between transformational leadership behaviors and school climates and between the sum of transformational leadership behaviors, and leadership outcome factors and school climates. Transformational principals create risk-free environments, inspire others to think differently within the context of a common vision, and make change meaningful by being supportive role models through coaching, listening, and acceptance.

Lampe et al. (1992) explored the relationship among leadership style, gender, and personality attributes of school principals and the work satisfaction of principals and staff in northeastern Wisconsin. The study included 86 principals (61 elementary and 36 secondary) and 194 teachers (122 elementary and 72 secondary) from 97 schools. The results indicated no relationship between personality style and leadership style. They found that principals perceive themselves differently than do their subordinate teachers relative to leadership style even when common sets of factors are used. Their data indicated high school teachers differed in the level of their perceptions of transformational leadership behaviors from elementary and middle schools teachers. The higher the level of the school, the higher the level of transformational behavior
attributed to their principal. High school teachers often perceived their principals to use autonomy and a laissez-faire leadership style. Females were more likely to communicate with one another openly, support one another more strongly in superior-subordinate relations, and generate more opportunities for transformational leadership behaviors than men.

Stone (1992) conducted a study to investigate transformational and transactional leadership in elementary and secondary school principals. The study involved a self-rating survey from 27 principals of elementary, junior high, and high schools in south central Minnesota and others-rating survey of 482 teachers who rated the 27 principal’s behaviors. Analysis of data collected from the self-rating Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) showed that the four factors of transformational leadership (Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration) were quite positive and that these principals displayed transformational leadership behaviors from “sometimes” to “fairly often.” Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation were rated higher than Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration. Also, analysis of data collected from the others-rating Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire showed that the majority of teachers perceived the two factors of transactional leadership, Contingent Reward leadership in their principals “sometimes” through “fairly often” and Management-by-Expectation in their principals “sometimes.” There was an average of .5 discrepancy score (on a 5-pont scale) for all seven factors. This indicates that a high level of disagreement exists between principal rating and teacher ratings. This group of principals consistently overrated or underrated themselves on all factors, especially in Idealized Influence, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by-Expectation, and Non-Leadership.
Evans (1996) conducted a study to measure transformational leadership in educational settings and to find other variables that may account for teachers’ reports of their principals’ transformational leadership. The study involved 18 principals and 398 teachers selected within a southwestern Michigan school district. Teachers responded to the Bass Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass and Avolio, 1990) and to the School Factors Questionnaire (Rosenholtz, 1989). Seventeen principals and 214 teachers responded to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire with an average 54% teacher return rate. The ethnicity of teacher respondents was 93.5% white, 4.1% African American, 1.6% Others, and 0.8% Hispanic. The ethnicity of principal respondents was 61.1% white, 33.3% African American, and 5.6% Hispanic. Throughout the 18 elementary schools, female teachers were 85.7% and 14.3% male teachers, female principals were 72.2% and 27.8% male principals. Principals’ years of service were 33.3% (0-2.5 years), 33.3% (over 2.5 years), and 33.3% (over 6.5 years). The results indicated that principals again self-rated themselves higher than did their teachers. Teachers ranked Inspirational Motivation first where principals ranked Idealized Influence first and Inspirational Motivation second. This suggests that teachers desire leadership that is inspirational and provides team spirit, enthusiasm, and optimism as they work toward vision more than leadership focussed on individualized attention for growth and achievement. All groups of individuals ranked Contingent Reward last. This suggests that teachers want more from leadership than just reciprocal interactions.

There was no difference in the mean transformational leadership score for principals reported by male versus female teachers nor was there any difference in the mean transformational leadership score assigned to male versus female principals. There was no difference in the mean transformational leadership score assigned by teachers of varying ethnic
Transformational leadership was found to have no significant correlation with the variable teachers’ years worked with the principal. Transformational leadership had a statistically significant positive low correlation with the variable Principals’ years of service ($r = 0.36$) and had a statistically significant negative low correlation with the variable school staff size ($r = -0.31$). This negative correlation indicates that smaller school staff sizes are associated with higher transformational leadership ratings.

Evans (1996) examined the relationship between principal’s use of transformational leadership strategies and the social organizational factors within the schools they led. The five social organizational factors were shared goals, teacher collaboration, teacher learning, teacher certainty, and teacher commitment. The two scales with the largest means, teacher commitment and teacher instructional certainty, were equal. All transformational and transactional factors were significantly correlated with the five social organizational factors. However, transformational leadership scores were correlated more strongly than transactional scores with higher ratings of organizational effectiveness. These findings suggested that principals exercising more transformational leadership were found in schools with higher levels of social organization reflective of collaborative/collegial environments and associated with effectiveness.

Transformational Leadership and Islamic Values

Kouzes and Posner (1995) indicated that the characteristics of effective leaders are honesty and competence, vision, forward-looking, inspiration, intelligence, fair-mindedness, straightforwardness, and imagination, strength of character, competence, intelligence, self-understanding, equity and impartiality, modesty and simplicity, and responsibility for their followers’ well-being. Beekun and Badawi (1999) argued that the characteristics of effective Islamic leaders are strength of character, patience, humility, kindness and magnanimity, self-
understanding, willingness to seek consultation, equity and impartiality, modesty and simplicity, willingness to abide by the same rules that apply to their followers, and responsibility for their followers’ well-being. Islamic leaders and followers are expected to practice Islamic behaviors which include justice and equity by leaders and followers alike, trust and responsibility, righteousness, struggle within oneself toward self-improvement, and keeping promises.

Northouse (2004) described transformational leadership as a process that incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership. Transformational leadership involves assessing followers’ motives to accomplish more than what is expected, creating and articulating a clear vision, acting as a good role model, and understanding and adapting the need of the followers. Beekun and Badawi (1999) described leadership in Islam as an active process. Leadership in Islam challenges the process by searching for opportunities both internal and external to change or improve the status quo. The process of leadership in Islam involves the ability to project the vision for everyone to see and pursue, to empower others for greater achievement, to model the way and be an example for the followers, and to encourage and motivate the followers to continue to make progress.

Beekun and Badawi (1999) and Murad (1996) stated that to carry out the role of leaders of Islamic organizations, leaders needs to mobilize followers by using a process to help the followers to develop themselves through *tazkiyyah* (growth). This process includes reaching out to everybody because every person requires exposure to the message of Islam, accepting the verbal commitment of others, using an incremental approach, allocating assignments according to each person’s capability, and exhibiting patience and understanding with followers. It is a process very similar to the intellectual stimulation factor of transformational leadership.
Barrie (2002) described in *A-Z Steps to leadership: from the Qur’an and words of the Prophet Muhammed* that there are characteristics necessary for leadership in Islam. These characteristics are as follows: ability to perform, bravery by not fearing the consequences of one’s decisions, calmness in order to make the right decision, dependability by being accessible at all times, exemplariness in conduct and actions, fairness by being so impartial that nothing influences one’s decisions except the facts, genuineness by being interested in one’s task, honesty in dealing and analyzing problems, initiative by using all opportunities even if it is minor, judgement by being alert all the time to enhance one’s power of correct and quick decisions, knowledge as the basic requirement of leadership, liberalism by consulting with his colleagues to reach a consensus, modesty in order to make things easy for every one, nobility based on the possession of excellent moral qualities, organization and delegation of authority to associates, personality that command the respect of followers, quality of performance, responsibility of one’s actions, sacrifice of leisure time in the interests of top quality performance, teamwork by making others work to complete acceptance of one’s leadership, understanding problems and the ability to explain it to the people, versatility by having the ability to fill in any position at any time, wisdom by promoting harmonious teamwork, youth by being fearless and feeling young, and zealous by having aggressive enthusiasm plus in-depth knowledge.

From the literature we know that transformational leadership involves similar characteristics such as having a clear vision and articulating this vision. Also, transformational leadership involves creating shared values that individuals maintain within their organizations and creating trust by being reliable even in situations that are uncertain. Transformational leaders act as strong role models, coaches, and advisers. Transformational leaders communicate high
expectations and motivate followers to achieve their full potential. We know that Islamic leadership involves projecting a shared vision for everyone to see, empowering followers to achieve their full potential, and motivating the followers to continue to improve. Islamic leaders act as exemplars to model the way for their followers. Islamic leaders demonstrate justice, equity, trust, and responsibility for their followers’ well being which are similar to transformational leadership factors.

We know a great deal about the leadership style of American principals and we know a great deal about the espoused leadership values of Islam. Unfortunately, we know very little about the leadership of American Muslim principals. Does it match the espoused leadership of Islam and does it resemble transformational leadership which is deemed to be effective in American schools?
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study of American Muslim principals employed a quantitative research design using a mail survey to explore leadership style in Islamic schools in the United States. A survey design is particularly useful in obtaining data from a large number of administrators and teachers relating to the phenomenon of leadership in Islamic schools.

Research Questions

The primary objective of this study was to capture the perspective of American-Muslim principals toward leadership and their teachers’ perceptions of their leadership style. The process of achieving this objective was through a questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to answer the following questions:

1) What are the demographic characteristics of American Muslim principals and their schools, including principals’ age, gender, degree, nationality or ethnicity, years of experience, native language, school level, and composition of the school board?

2) Do American Muslim principals exhibit transformational leadership (as determined through self-report and teacher-report)?

3) Is there a relationship between teacher and principal reports of the principal’s use of transformational leadership?

4) Does this relationship affect the follower’s perspective of leadership styles?

5) Are principal and school demographics related to principals’ self-reported use of transformational leadership?
6) Are principal and school demographics related to teachers’ perceptions of principal’s use of transformational leadership?

Participants

Population

Principals and teachers were identified from a population of 57 Islamic schools in the United States. The names of 72 schools were obtained from the web site of Islamic Foundations of North America. From this population, all principals from nine states were selected. The researcher learned that fifteen of these schools had closed; either the initial contact letter was returned or the phone number had been disconnected. Teachers from the 57 schools were selected based on their grade level or subject area of teaching.

Sample

Principals and teachers were selected from the nine states with large numbers of Islamic schools. These states were: New York, New Jersey, California, Virginia, Florida, Missouri, Illinois, Michigan, and Texas. The total number of Islamic schools in the nine states was 57. Principals responded to the demographics information survey and to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) self-rating form (Bass & Avolio; 1995). Teachers responded to the MLQ other-rating form. The survey was mailed to the principals of the schools. The researcher contacted 57 Islamic schools in these states; the acceptable return rate was targeted at 70% of the selection. Principals were asked to complete the leader form questionnaires themselves and to distribute the ten packets of other-rater questionnaires to the designated teachers of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade for the elementary school level, and to science, social studies, language art, reading, and math teachers for the secondary school level. Each school received five to ten surveys for the teachers, depending on the school level, and one survey for the principal. This
was done to avoid sample bias if the principal selected which teachers to use. Teachers were asked to mail the completed questionnaires in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelopes themselves, without returning the questionnaires to the administrators. Teachers responded anonymously and returned the questionnaires directly to the researcher in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. All principal responses were confidential. Principals’ names were used only for tracking purposes in order to follow up with non-responding schools. All individual and school names were deleted in the reporting of results and eliminated from data files.

Instrumentation

This study used a survey technique that targets the perceptions and responses of the participants to explore their leadership style. Two instruments were used to collect information for this study:

1) Demographic survey which includes information about principals’ age, gender, degree, nationality or ethnicity, years of experience, native language, and information about school level, and composition of the school board;

2) The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995), which includes: a) Self-rating Form, and b) Rater Form (other).

Principals responded to the demographics survey and the MLQ 5X self-rating form. Teachers responded to the MLQ 5X other-rating form. The questionnaires were administered to obtain a profile of perceptions of the leadership effort in Islamic schools.

The MLQ 5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995) is a leadership style questionnaire related to nine leadership domains described as follows:

1) Idealized Influence Behavior describes leaders who act as strong role models and do the right thing. The behaviors of charismatic leaders refer to idealized influence behavior.
2) Idealized Influence Attributed describes leaders who are deeply respected by followers, who place a great deal of trust in them, and who provide vision and a sense of mission that have a great deal of impact on followers.

3) Inspirational Motivation describes leaders who communicate high expectations, motivate followers to become committed to shared visions, and use symbols and emotional appeals to focus on group effort to achieve more than they thought they would achieve.

4) Intellectual Stimulation describes leaders who stimulate followers to be creative and innovative, and to try new ways to deal with organizational issues.

5) Individualized Consideration describes leaders who listen carefully to individual needs, act as coaches and advisers when assisting individuals, use delegation, and help followers grow through personal changes.

6) Contingent Reward refers to leadership that focuses on the exchange process and obtains agreement on what needs to be done.

7) Management-by-Exception Active focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels.

8) Management-by-Exception Passive refers to leadership that involves corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. These leaders watch followers closely for mistakes and take corrective action after problems have become serious.

9) Laissez-Faire Leadership represents the absence of leadership.

The factors of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X are divided into three parts. The first part – transformational -- includes the factors Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized
Consideration. The second part – transactional -- includes the factors Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception-Active, and Management-by-Exception-Passive. The third part includes only the Laissez-Faire factor. Also, the survey includes factor 10 of Effectiveness, factor 11 of Extra effort, and factor 12 of Satisfaction. This questionnaire consists of 41 statements. Respondents are asked to respond to each statement with one of five choices: Not at All, Once in a While, Sometimes, Fairly Often, Frequently, and Always.

Validity

Hoover et al. (1991) tested the validity of Bass’s leadership theory in general K-12 settings; the results showed the MLQ has strong validity and reliability for the overall transformational and transactional leadership constructs. The nine factors represent an attempt to define precisely the constructs associated with leadership style and behaviors that constitute what Avolio and Bass (1991) have labeled a “full range” of leadership, including behaviors and attribution items that can distinguish charismatic from transformational leadership. Bass and Avolio (2000) describe that the MLQ 5X is composed of behavioral items for all of the leadership scales, except Idealized Influence (formerly called Charisma). Since Idealized Influence can be viewed as both a behavior and an attribute linked to the relationship of leader and follower, a fifth transformational scale was included in the survey to capture these non-behavioral and/or impact items. Also, items continued to be included dealing with outcomes for followers such as extra efforts, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction with leader.

Reliability

King (1989) conducted a test of reliability computing Cronbach alphas for each of the independent leadership factors. With the exception of two factors, management-by-exception (0.59) and contingent reward (0.68), reliability coefficients were acceptable, ranging from 0.70
to 0.96. Bass and Avolio (2000) state that reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94. All scale reliabilities were generally high, exceeding the standard cut-off for internal consistency recommended in the literature. Estimates of internal consistency were above .70 for all scales except for active management-by-exception and contingent reward.

Procedure

The survey was mailed to the principal of the school, to the teachers of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade for the elementary school level, and to science, social studies, language art, reading, and math teachers for the secondary school level. Each school received five (for elementary schools) to ten (for K-12 and high schools) surveys for the teachers one survey for the principal. The survey was mailed on January 10, 2005. After two weeks, a follow-up postcard was mailed to all participants. In February 2005, principals who had not responded were contacted by phone and asked to participate. The researcher visited some of the schools to explain the purpose of the study and collect teacher data.

Research Design

The research design was descriptive and correlational in nature. Descriptive data included frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Descriptive statistics were given for each sub-scale from the MLQ principal-report and teacher-report, as well as for demographic data. Pearson $r$ correlations were used to determine the relationship between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine if the principal and school demographics relate to principals’ self-reported use of transformational leadership and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ use of transformational leadership. Multiple regression was used to explain the amount of variance ($R^2$) in the criterion
variable attributable to the predictor variables. The level of significance ($p$-value) used for all statistical tests was .05 or less.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program was used to analyze the collected data. For each participant, the MLQ measured leadership data on nine sub-scales. The score for each sub-scale was determined by using the mean of the responses for the items within each sub-scale on the questionnaire. Five are sub-scales of transformational leadership, three are sub-scales of transactional leadership, and there is one non-leadership or laissez-faire sub-scale. Answers to the research questions were determined through the following procedures:

1) What are the demographic characteristics of American Muslim principals and their schools, including principals’ age, gender, degree, nationality or ethnicity, years of experience, native language, school level, and composition of the school board? Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations for continuous variables, and frequencies for categorical variables, were used to answer research question 1.

2) Do American Muslim principals exhibit transformational leadership (as determined through self-report and teacher-report)?

For each factor, descriptive statistics for MLQ principal-report and MLQ teacher-report, including means and standard deviations, were given.

3) Is there a relationship between teacher and principal reports of the principal’s use of transformational leadership?

Pearson $r$ correlations determined the relationship between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership.
4) Where teachers within schools are more congruent in their views of principals’ use of transformational leadership, are teacher perceptions of principals’ leadership style more positive? Principals and teachers will not always agree on the type of leadership exhibited by the principal. This question seeks to determine if there is greater congruence in leadership style perception when the principal is more transformational. To make this determination, the standard deviation scores on teachers perceptions of principals’ transformational leadership within schools were divided into three equal groups (0=lowest standard deviation, most congruent; 1=middle level, congruent; 2= highest standard deviation, incongruent). The teacher perceptions of principals’ leadership styles were correlated to the congruence group assignment, (0, 1, or 2). It was hypothesized that lower level congruence groups would have higher perceptions of their principals’ use of transformational leadership characteristics (i.e., there will be a significant negative correlation).

5) Are principal demographics related to principals’ self-reported use of transformational leadership?

Multiple regression analysis was used to indicate if principal demographics are significant predictors of the variance in principal-reported use of transformational and transactional leadership.

6) Are principal demographics related to teachers’ perceptions of principal’s use of transformational leadership?

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine if the principal demographics are significant predictors of the variance in teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational and transactional leadership.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This research presents a descriptive study to the public about American Muslim principals’ and their teachers’ perspectives on leadership. The study of American Muslim principals is an opportunity to explore the leadership of Islamic schools in the United States. The research design is descriptive and correlational in nature. Descriptive data includes frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Correlational analyses were used to determine the relationship between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership and the relationship of demographic variables to perceptions of transformational leadership. The study employed a quantitative research design using a mail survey to explore leadership style in Islamic schools in the United States. This chapter represents the results of the data analysis employed in this study to answer the six research questions.

Participants

Respondents

Principals and teachers were selected from the nine U.S. states with the largest numbers of Islamic schools. The states included: New York, New Jersey, California, Texas, Florida, Missouri, Illinois, Virginia, and Michigan. The total number of Islamic schools in the five states was 57. The survey was mailed on January 2005 to the principals of these schools with an attached letter explaining the primary objective of this study which was to capture the perspective of American Muslim principals and their teachers toward leadership. The goal of the study was to develop an understanding of the American Muslim principal’s leadership style. A
follow-up letter was mailed to each principal and a follow-up call was made every other week after the letter was sent to remind the principals to respond.

The principals were asked to sign and return the consent form, to complete the leader form and background questionnaires themselves, and to distribute the five packets of other-rater questionnaires to the designated teachers. Teachers were asked to mail the completed questionnaires in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelopes themselves, without returning the questionnaires to the administrators. From the 57 schools surveyed, 45 schools (79%) responded. Twelve of the respondent schools (21%) were excluded from the research sample because they did not provide sufficient data. In order to be included, a minimum of three teachers and the principals had to respond. Thirty-three schools (58%) submitted usable responses with both teacher and principal data and were included in the research sample. (See Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total schools contacted</th>
<th>Schools closed or not K-12</th>
<th>Eligible schools</th>
<th>Schools that did not provide sufficient data</th>
<th>Schools refused to participate</th>
<th>Schools that did not respond</th>
<th>Schools with usable responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* School submitted less than 3 teacher responses or no principal response.

Research Question 1

What are the demographic characteristics of American Muslim principals and their schools, including principals’ age, gender, degree, nationality or ethnicity, years of experience, native language, school level, and composition of the school board?
School Demographics

Descriptive statistics include means and standard deviations for continuous variables: the number of school board members, and frequencies for categorical variables: school level and composition of the school board. With regard to school level, 28.1% of principals served in elementary to high school levels, 25.0% of principals served elementary to middle school levels, and 25.0% of principals served elementary school levels. The mean average of Islamic schools board members was 7. The composition of Islamic schools board shows that 15 of the Islamic schools (55.6%) had appointed board members and 9 Islamic schools (33.3%) had elected board members. The demographic characteristics of school level, the number of the school board members, and composition of the school board are represented in Tables 2 through 4.

Table 2
School Level of Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior-High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary to Middle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary to Joiner High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary to High School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

School Board Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The percentages are determined based on all respondents in the study whereas the valid percentages are determined using only non-missing responses to the item.

Table 4

Number of School Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Responded</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.379</td>
<td>3.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Demographics

From the 45 schools that responded, 38 principals returned the demographics information survey and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) self-rating form (Bass & Avolio; 1995). Only 33 of the principals’ responses were used because these principals had at least three teachers responding from their schools. The response rate for the 33 principals was 58%. From the 33-principal sample, male principals (53.1%) were slightly more prevalent than female principals (46.9%). Principals’ responses regarding their native language varied as follows: English (37.5%), Arabic (37.5%), and Urdu (18.8%).

The majority of American Muslim principals listed their age range between 41-50 years (46.9%). The years of teaching experience for American Muslim principals were most frequently cited as between 11-15 years (36.4%) and 6-10 years (33.3%). The most frequently indicated ranges in years of administrative experience for American Muslim principals were between 6-10 years (45.5%) and 0-5 years (42.4%). The majority of American Muslim principals (51.5%) held
a master’s degree; (33.3%) earned a doctoral degree. The average number of years for an American Muslim principal to serve in the same school was less than 6 years. The summarized descriptive statistics for the demographics of American Muslim principals are represented in Tables 5 through 12.

Table 5  
*Gender of Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6  
*Native Language of Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
*Ethnic Background of Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American (no other specification)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
*Age of Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Interval</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
*Years Teaching Experience of Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Interval</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-up years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

*Years Administrative Experience of Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

*Degree Currently Held by Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

*Number of Years in the Present School for Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Responded</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.811</td>
<td>4.486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Participants

From the 45 schools responding, 161 teachers returned the MLQ other-rating form out of the 255 teacher surveys that were mailed to their principals. Within the 33 schools used in the sample, 143 of the teachers’ responses were usable (again because each school had to have at least three teachers and the principal respond). The exact teacher response rate is not known because each principal was asked to distribute the questionnaires to core subject teachers and the number of such teachers varied by school. The number of teachers responding by school was
three to eight depending on the school level, with high schools and K-12 schools typically having more respondents.

Research Question 2

Do American Muslim principals exhibit leadership (as determined through self-report and teacher-report)? Principals responded to the MLQ 5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995) self-rating form and teachers responded to the MLQ 5X other-rating form. The questionnaires were administrated to obtain a profile of perceptions of the leadership effort in Islamic schools. The MLQ 5X is a leadership style questionnaire related to nine leadership domains as follows: Idealized Influence Attributed, Idealized Influence Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception Active, Management-by-Exception Passive, and Laissez-Faire Leadership. The factors of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X are divided into three parts. The first part – transformational -- includes the factors Idealized Influence-Attributed, Idealized Influence-Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. The second part – transactional -- includes the factors Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception-Active, and Management-by-Exception-Passive. The third part includes only the Laissez-Faire factor. Also, the survey includes factor 10 of Effectiveness, factor 11 of Extra effort, and factor 12 of Satisfaction. This questionnaire consists of 45 statements. Respondents were asked to respond to each statement with one of five choices: Not at All (0), Once in a While (1), Sometimes (2), Fairly Often (3), Frequently or Always (4). For each factor, there were descriptive statistics for MLQ principal-report and MLQ teacher-report, including means and standard deviations.

The mean transformational leadership score by the principals (3.4394) was higher than the mean transformational leadership score by the teachers (3.0652). The mean transactional
leadership score by the principals was lower than the mean transactional leadership score by the teachers (2.1002 versus 2.2416, respectively); both scales are rated from 0-4. The teachers’ report of principals’ effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction were less than the principals’ report of their effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction (3.07, 2.86, and 3.15 versus 3.32, 3.18, and 3.42, respectively). (See Tables 13 and 14).

Table 13
*Descriptive Statistics for Each Sub-Scale of the MLQ -- Principal Report*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number responded</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Attributed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.414</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Behavior</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.439</td>
<td></td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Active</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.258</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Passive</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire Leadership</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td></td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td></td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td></td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.424</td>
<td></td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 indicates that, overall, the principals in this study tended to demonstrate transformational leadership style hovering around 3 (“Fairly often”). Transactional leadership style was rated around 2 (“Sometimes”), and the Non-leadership style, often termed “laissez-faire,” was somewhere between 0 (“Not at all”) and 1 (“Once in awhile”). The ranking for the transformational and transactional factors in the self rating MLQ 5X showed that principals ranked Inspirational Motivation first and Management-by-Exception Passive last. Principals rated themselves higher in intellectual stimulation than contingent reward.
Table 14
Descriptive Statistics for Each Sub-Scale of the MLQ -- Teacher Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number Responded</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Attributed</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.245</td>
<td>3 .729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Behavior</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>2 .630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>1 .653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>5 .790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>6 .900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>4 .723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Active</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.548</td>
<td>7 .903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Passive</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>8 .862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire Leadership</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.073</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 indicates that, overall, the teachers’ reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership style in this study rated closer to 3 (“Fairly often”), and transactional leadership style was somewhere between 2 (“Sometimes”) and 3 (“Fairly often”). The ranking for the transformational and transactional factors in the other rating MLQ 5X showed that teachers ranked Inspirational Motivation first and Management-by-Exception Passive last. Teachers rated their principals higher in contingent reward than intellectual stimulation.

Research Question 3

Is there a relationship between teacher and principal reports of the principal’s use of transformational leadership? Pearson r correlations were used to determine the relationship between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership. There was no significant relationship between the teachers’ report of principals’ transformational leadership and the principals’ report of transformational leadership ($r = -.285, p > .05$).
There was a significant moderate negative correlation (-.3 to -.7) between the teachers’ rating of principals’ transformational leadership and the principals’ rating of their own individualized consideration \((r = -.346, p < .05)\). This indicates that when principals perceive they give teachers high individualized consideration, teachers express low ratings of the principals’ transformational leadership. Also, there was a significant moderate negative correlation between the principals’ rating of their own transformational leadership and the teachers’ rating of principals’ intellectual stimulation \((r = -.351, p < .05)\). This indicates that when principals perceive high ratings of their own transformational leadership, the teachers express low ratings of principals’ intellectual stimulation.

There were only two moderate positive correlations -- between the teachers’ report of idealized influence attributed and the principals’ report of extra effort \((r = .403)\), and between the teachers’ report of satisfaction and the principals’ report of extra effort \((r = .351)\). This indicates that when principals report exerting greater extra effort, teachers report higher ratings of the principals’ use of idealized influence attributed and greater satisfaction. These relationships are reported in Table 15.
### Table 15

**Correlations Between Principal Self-Rating and Teacher Other-Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal self-rating</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Transf</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MBE-a</th>
<th>MBE-p</th>
<th>Transac</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Eff</th>
<th>ExtEff</th>
<th>Satis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>-.351*</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>-.376*</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.465**</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.346*</td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>-.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transf</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.351*</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBE-a</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBE-p</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.345*</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transac</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eff</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtEff</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.403*</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.351*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satis</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01; **p<.001

**Note:**
- IIB = Idealized Influence Behavior
- IIA = Idealized Influence Attributed
- IM = Inspirational Motivation
- IS = Intellectual Stimulation
- IC = Individualized Consideration
- Transf = Transformational Leadership
- CR = Contingent Reward
- MBE-a = Management-by-Exception Active
- MBE-p = Management-by-Exception Passive
- Transac = Transactional Leadership
- LF = Laissez-Faire Leadership
- Eff = Effectiveness
- ExtEff = Extra Effort
- Satis = Satisfaction
Research Question 4

Where teachers within schools are more congruent in their views of principals’ use of transformational leadership, are teacher perceptions of principals’ leadership style more positive? Principals and teachers will not always agree on the type of leadership exhibited by the principal. This question seeks to determine if there is greater congruence in leadership style perception when the principal is more transformational. To make this determination, the standard deviation scores on teachers’ perceptions of principals’ transformational leadership within each school were computed and divided into three approximately equal variability groups (0=lowest variability, most congruent; 1=middle variability, somewhat congruent; and 2= highest variability, incongruent). The variability scores of these three groups were compared to principals’ use of each leadership dimension using Pearson r correlations. The teacher perceptions of principals’ leadership styles were correlated to the variability assignment (0, 1, or 2). It was hypothesized that lower level variability groups would have higher perceptions of their principals’ use of transformational leadership characteristics (i.e., there would be a significant negative correlation between variability in teacher ratings and teachers perceptions of principals’ use of more positive leadership styles).

Using the range of standard deviations in teachers’ ratings of principals’ transformational leadership within each school, schools were rated as having 0=highly congruent teachers (SD = .04 to .39), 1=Congruent teachers (SD = .41 to .56), or 2= incongruent teachers (SD= .59 to 1.08). Forty-four teachers (31%) were identified as highly congruent teachers, 39% as congruent teachers, and 30% as incongruent teachers. The more congruent the teacher ratings of the principal’s transformational leadership, the higher the teachers perceived the principal in terms of all transformational leadership dimensions and all transactional leadership dimensions (except
management-by-exception -passive), effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. The negative correlation between congruence and laissez faire or non-leadership suggests that in schools where teachers rated principals similarly, they perceived their principals as less laissez faire.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership dimensions</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Attributed</td>
<td>-.372</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Behavior</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>-.395</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.390</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>-.311</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Active</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Passive</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire Leadership</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 5

Are principal and school demographics related to principals’ self-reported use of transformational leadership? Multiple regression analysis was used to determine if the independent variables (gender, age, years teaching experiences, years of administration experience, years in present school, and degree) are significant predictors of the variance in principal-reported use of transformational leadership. There were no significant predictors. An adjusted $R^2$ of .079 indicates that only 7.9% of the variance in transformational leadership can be explained by the independent variables. See Table 17.
Table 17
Regression Summary Table for Effects of Demographic Variables on Principals’ Perceptions of Their Use of Transformational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching experience</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years administrative experience</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the present school</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree currently held</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .079$

Research Question 6

Are principal and school demographics related to teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s use of transformational leadership? Multiple regression analysis was used to determine if the independent variables (gender, age, years teaching experiences, years of administration experience, years in present schools, degree, and school level) are significant predictors of the variance in teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s use of transformational. The linear regression equation was not statistically significant ($F_{(6, 24)} = .579, p = .744$; adjusted $R^2 = -.092$). See Table 18.
Table 18
Regression Summary Table for Effects of Demographic Variables on Teachers’ Perceptions of Principals’ Use of Transformational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching experience</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years administrative experience</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the present school</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = -.092

Summary

In summary, the descriptive data collected using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire on the 33 Islamic schools suggest that:

1. Principals rated themselves higher than their teachers on transformational leadership and lower than their teachers on transactional leadership;

2. Although teacher and principal ratings were similar, teachers rated their principals less effective than principals rated themselves, which corresponded to lower teacher ratings regarding their satisfaction with their principals’ leadership; and

3. Both principals and teachers ranked principals highest in Inspirational Motivation and lowest in Management-by-Exception Passive. Even so, principals observe themselves as being more intellectually stimulating than less often using contingent reward;

The results of Pearson r correlations between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership indicate that when the principals rate themselves higher on
giving individual personal attention (Individualized Consideration), the teachers rate the principal lower in use of transformational leadership. Also, when the principals rate themselves higher on transformational leadership, the teachers rate them lower on challenging others and encouraging new ideas (Intellectual Stimulation). When the principals put extra effort beyond the ordinary tasks, the teachers express that their principals are deeply respected and trusted (Idealized Influence Attributed), which is also related to higher teacher satisfaction with their principal’s leadership style.

With regard to the level of agreement between teachers and principals on principals’ leadership styles, the results of Pearson $r$ correlations between the three equal variability groups and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership indicate that the more variation between the teachers perceptions of their principals, the lower the teacher rating of their principal’s transformational leadership.

Finally, none of the six principal demographic variables (gender, age, years teaching experience, years of administration experience, years in present schools, and degree) were related to transformational leadership as reported by the principals or by the teachers.
The purpose of this study was to describe leadership in American Muslim schools from the perspectives of principals and their teachers. The goal was to explore the leadership of Islamic schools in the United States in order to help American Muslim principals develop a better understanding of themselves and teachers’ views of their leadership styles. The researcher’s assumption was that there is a similarity between the main characteristics of transformational leadership and Islamic leadership. Therefore, it was reasoned that American Muslim principals, as leaders for diverse schools of minority students, would demonstrate high levels of transformational leadership.

The research presented a descriptive study about American Muslim principals and their teachers’ perspectives on leadership. A quantitative research design was employed using a mail survey to leaders of Islamic schools in nine U.S. states. This chapter presents a discussion of the results, conclusions, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.

Characteristics of Principals and Schools

Because the purpose of this study was to describe the leadership of American Muslim schools, comparisons are drawn to results from other studies of principals in U.S. schools, including three studies that also used the MLQ. This allows the reader to determine, at least to some extent, whether Muslim leaders are perceived differently by their teachers. Six studies were
found to use for comparison purposes. There is no attempt to compare the results statistically. Rather, data from these studies are presented only for descriptive purposes. The three studies that used the MLQ included 1) Ingram’s (1997) study of 44 teachers from 23 schools in Michigan; 2) Evans’s (1997) study of 18 principals and 214 teachers, also from schools in Michigan; and 3) Stone’s (1992) study of 27 principals and 482 teachers in Minnesota. Three other studies are used for demographic companions only. They are: 1) Mannion’s (1998) study of 33 principals, 2) Hardin’s (1995) study of 34 urban and rural principals, and 3) Brubaker and Simon’s (1987) study of 370 principals.

In this study, the sample of 33 principals was composed of 53.1% males and 46.9% females. There were approximately equal numbers of males and females in the present study. While there were slightly more males, Stone’s (1992) research included slightly more females. In the Stone (1992) study, gender demographics showed that from a group of 27 principals, 44.4% were males and 55.6% were females. The percentage of female principals was higher than male principals in other MLQ research as well.

The principals’ ethnicity differed in this study from other research as might be expected for American Muslim schools. In Evans’s (1996) research, for example, one third of the principals were African-American whereas the present study found just over ten percent of principals to be African-American. Unlike other studies, one third of the principals in this study were Arab. The principals’ background ethnicity was as follows: American (27%), Arab (33%), Asian (20%), African-American (13%), African (3%), and Pacific Islander (3%). Evans (1996) found that the ethnicity of principals varied as follows: White (61.1%), African-American (33.3%), and Hispanic (5.4%).
The majority of American Muslim principals listed their age range as between 41-50 years (46.9%). Hardin (1995) utilized responses of 34 principals selected from three districts (one urban and two rural). The age range for urban principals was from 34 to 59 with a mean age of 51, while the rural principals ranged in age from 33 to 58 with a mean age of 47.

The years of teaching experience for American-Muslim principals were most frequently cited as between 11-15 years (36.4%) and 6-10 years (33.3%). The most frequently indicated ranges in years of administrative experience for American-Muslim principals were between 6-10 years (45.5%) and 0-5 years (42.4%). Brubaker and Simon (1987) presented a study of 370 North Carolina principals. Of these, 167 principals (45%) had 11 or more years’ experience as a principal, while 120 principals (32%) had 0-5 years of experience, and 83 (22%) had 6-10 years of experience. Thus, principals in their study were slightly more experienced administrators than principals in American Muslim schools.

In the present sample of 33 American Muslim principals, 51.5% held a master’s degree and 33.3% held a doctoral degree. These principals tended to hold more advanced degrees than principals in the Mannion (1998) study. The credentials of that group of 451 principals included 16.18% with a bachelor’s degree, 77.16% with a master’s degree, 2.88% with a doctoral degree, and 3.32% with advanced certification. Although principals of American Muslim schools were more likely to hold the doctorate, no information was collected about whether the degree was in education or a related field. Thus, it would be erroneous to conclude that they were more qualified than principals from the Mannion study.

The average number of years an American Muslim principal served in the present school was less than six. This finding is similar to that of Evans (1996) who found that two thirds of
principals had 6.5 or fewer years experience in their present schools. Muslim female principals tended to stay longer than male Muslim principals in their current schools.

**Transformational Leadership and Transactional Leadership**

In this study, the mean average scores of all the factors in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 5X for principals were higher than the mean average scores of all the factors for teachers except in the categories of Management-by-Exception Active, Management-by-Exception Passive, and Laissez-Faire Leadership. The principals self-rated themselves higher in transformational leadership than did their teachers and, conversely, the teachers rated their principals higher in transactional leadership than did the principals. The mean transformational leadership score of principals of 3.4 was higher than the mean transformational leadership score of 3.1 for teachers. The mean transactional leadership score of principals was 2.1 which was only slightly lower than the mean transactional leadership score of 2.2 for teachers.

These findings are consistent with the research of Stone (1992) and Evans (1997). Both researchers reported that principals rated themselves higher on transformational leadership than did their teachers. Although Evans did not report transactional leadership scores, Stone’s findings agreed with this study that teachers rated their principals higher in transactional leadership than their principals rated themselves.

American Muslim principals in this study perceived themselves slightly lower in transformational leadership (mean of 3.4) than the principals’ rating in Evans’s (1997) study (mean of 3.5) and slightly higher than the principals in Stone (1992) study (mean of 2.9). The teachers, however, rated American Muslim principals’ transformational leadership (mean of 3.1) higher than the teachers’ rating of principals’ transformational leadership in the Ingram (1997; mean of 2.96), Stone (1992; mean of 2.68), and Evans (1997; mean of 2.68) studies.
American Muslim principals perceived themselves higher in transactional leadership (mean of 2.1) than the principals in Stone’s (1992; mean of 1.9) research. The teachers expressed a higher rating of American Muslim principals’ transactional leadership (mean of 2.2) than the teachers’ rating of principals’ transactional leadership in the Ingram (1997; mean of 2.04) and Stone (1992; mean of 2.05) studies.

These findings indicate that there are small differences between the way that American Muslim principals and principals in other studies rate themselves. The largest differences were in teacher perceptions. Teachers in American Muslim schools rated their principals about one to three tenths of a point higher in transformational leadership and about one to two tenths of a point higher in transactional leadership.

Leadership Dimensions of Transformational and Transactional Leadership

The rank order for the transformational and transactional factors in the MLQ 5X for principals and teachers in this study were the same. Principals and teachers ranked the transformational factor of the MLQ 5X, Inspirational Motivation, first, and the transactional factor, Management-by-Exception Passive, last. These findings suggest that both teachers and principals believe that leadership is inspirational, providing team spirit, commitment to shared vision, enthusiasm, and optimism more than involving corrective action, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement.

The principals rated themselves higher in intellectual stimulation than contingent reward, but teachers rated their principals higher in contingent reward than intellectual stimulation. This finding suggests that principals in this study perceive themselves as leaders who are intellectually stimulating, who encourage teachers to try new ways and to challenge old assumptions and practices more than using contingent reward interactions. But teachers
expressed a view of principals’ leadership as an exchanging of reward and performance relationship more than intellectually stimulating for teachers.

The rank order of transformational and transactional factors were consistent with Stone’s (1992) findings. According to Stone, principals consistently overrated themselves on Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Individualized Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation, and Contingent Reward. The principals consistently underrated themselves on Management-by-Expectation and Non-Leadership. Both principals and teachers in Stone’s study rated themselves lower on Intellectual Stimulation and lower on Contingent Reward than American Muslim principals and teachers.

The findings of this study differed from the Evans’s (1996) findings in rank ordering. The principals in Evans’s research again rated themselves higher than their teachers did in all transformational and transactional leadership factors, but the teachers ranked Inspirational Motivation first while the principals ranked Idealized Influence first and Inspirational Motivation second. Both groups ranked Contingent Reward last. Unlike in the Stone (1997) study, the principals in Evan’s study rated themselves higher on Intellectual Stimulation and lower on Contingent Reward than American Muslim principals rated themselves. The teachers rated their principals about the same on Intellectual Stimulation but considerably lower on Contingent Reward than the teachers in this study rated American Muslim principals.

Relationship between Principal and Teacher Reports of Principals’ Use of Transformational Leadership

Pearson r correlations were computed to determine the relationship between principal and teacher reports of principals’ use of transformational leadership. The findings suggest that when principals rated themselves high on individualized attention for growth and development (Individualized Consideration), teachers expressed low ratings of their principals’
transformational leadership. It may be that principals perceive themselves as giving individualized consideration but perceptions of such attention are attenuated by many developmental and situational variables such as a leader’s approach to pressure, delegation, and persuasion to fulfill school goals and objectives, as well as the differing potential and needs of individual teachers. Liontos (1992) stated that transformational leaders can only foster teacher development and growth (Individualized Consideration) if their teachers internalize goals for professional growth and are strongly committed to a school mission. Transformational leaders can stimulate teachers to find new ways to solve problems effectively and to engage in new activities by putting forth “extra effort” to go beyond ordinary tasks. These principals believe that a group can develop better solutions than the principal can alone. The data provide evidence that when principals demonstrate extra effort beyond the ordinary, teachers rated their principals high in idealized influence attributed (respect, trust, and articulating a vision) and teachers expressed greater satisfaction.

Congruence of Teachers’ Perceptions of Principals’ Transformational Leadership

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant negative correlation between variability in teachers’ ratings and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ use of more positive leadership styles. The findings supported this hypothesis. When teachers within schools had higher variability in their views of principals’ leadership, teachers had lower perceptions of their principals’ use of transformational leadership characteristics. Twelve schools were identified as having teachers with low levels of variability in their ratings these schools also had higher levels of transformational leadership practices. Ten schools were identified having teachers with high levels of variability in then ratings they tended to have principals perceived as exhibiting lower levels of transformational leadership.
Yammarino and Bass (1990) discussed the issue of variability between self-ratings and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership styles related to the issue of effective leadership. Those leaders who generated higher levels of agreement with follower ratings tended to be the most successful in organizations with respect to promotion and advancement rates. Stone (1992) argued that a high level of disagreement between principal self-ratings and teacher ratings warrants attention to congruence between the leaders’ perceptions and their followers.

To understand how the level of teachers’ agreement within schools can predict the kind of principal leadership style, we need to understand the characteristics that influence the development of the teachers’ perceptions, the categories of teachers’ expectations, and what the term “effective leaders” means to teachers. Jantzi and Leithwood (1995) stated that to explain how teacher perceptions of transformational school leadership are formed, we need to know the characteristics that influence the development of the teachers’ initial school leader prototypes. School level, teachers’ gender, teachers’ age, and teachers’ years of experience are characteristics that influence the development of significantly different leader prototypes. Martin (1993) also discussed what influences teachers’ perceptions of their principals. He agreed that the leaders’ actions have an impact on the followers that is moderated by follower characteristics, expectations, and needs. Followers hold expectations about the ideal leader prototype that is heavily influenced by cultural values, about the tangible benefits that the follower hopes to attain in any exchange with the leader, and about the emotional needs which strongly affect their responses to the leader. When the leaders’ actions are seen as consistent with the followers’ prototype, the followers see that person as a leader. When the leader is seen as fulfilling expectations about goal-related activities, the person is seen as an effective leader. When the leader satisfies the follower’s personal emotional needs, follower loyalty and
commitment are elicited. The more intense the needs of the followers, the more intense and deeply felt is the relationship between follower and leader.

Principal Demographic Characteristics and Transformational Leadership

The principal demographic characteristics of gender, age, years of teaching experience, years of administrative experience, years in present school, and degrees obtained were found not related to transformational leadership as reported by the principals or by the teachers in this study. There was no significant contribution of any of the six variables to American Muslim principals’ use of transformational leadership. There was no difference between male and female principals on teachers’ ratings of transformational leadership but there was a significant positive low correlation between the variable of principals’ years of service and gender, indicating that female American Muslim principals had more years in their present schools than male principals.

These findings are consistent with Evans’s (1997) findings indicating that there was no difference in the mean transformational leadership score assigned to male versus female principals. Evans, however, did find that transformational leadership had a statistically significant positive low correlation with the variable principals’ years of service and a statistically significant negative low correlation with the variable of school staff size.

Conclusion

This study has provided a detailed analysis of the data obtained from the use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 5X with 33 principals and 143 teachers from Islamic schools throughout the United States. Analysis of responses to the MLQ 5X self-rating by the principals and other-rating by the teachers revealed that there was variation between the way principals view their own leadership and the teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s leadership. Principals perceived themselves more as transformational leaders who display
conviction, emphasize trust, articulate an appealing vision of the future, take a stand on difficult issues, present their most important values, emphasize the importance of purpose and commitment, challenge followers with standards, talk optimistically with enthusiasm, question old assumptions, stimulate in others new perspectives and ways of doing things, encourage the expression of reason, and consider their individual needs, abilities, and aspirations. Teachers viewed their principals more as transactional leaders who engage in a constructive path-goal transaction of reward for performance, clarify expectations, monitor performance, take corrective actions, and enforce rules to avoid mistakes.

Principals and teachers were congruent in giving the leadership factor inspirational motivation the highest score which indicates that both teachers and principals acknowledged the importance of inspirational leadership that promotes optimism with enthusiasm, articulates commitment to a shared vision, and encourages what needs to be done. Both principals and teachers agreed on scoring management-by-exception passive the last factor which indicates that this kind of leadership that involves corrective action, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement is less often used in Islamic schools. American Muslim principals perceived themselves as leaders who intellectually stimulate teachers to encourage the expression of new ideas and to challenge old assumptions and practices more so than using contingent reward interactions. Teachers viewed their principals as leaders who arrange mutually satisfactory agreements, exchange reward for performance, and negotiate for resources more than intellectually stimulating teachers to new challenges.

Agreement among teachers’ rating of their principals was related to teacher perceptions of the principals’ effectiveness; however, effective leadership is likely the result of the confluence of a number of factors. Principals were considered to be effective leaders when they
generated high levels of agreement within teachers’ ratings. In this study, highly congruent teachers perceived their principals as using more transformational leadership which tends to be the most effective leadership style. Transformational leaders act as strong role models, coaches, and advisers. Transformational leaders communicate high expectations, build consensus for shared goals and motivate followers to achieve their full potential.

This study supports the contention that Islamic leaders do act as exemplars to model the way for their followers. Islamic values include justice, equity, trust, and responsibility for the followers’ well-being which are similar to transformational leadership factors.

Limitations

This study was based on findings from a survey sent to a large number of Islamic schools across the United States. There are items in the testing instrument that required analysis of one’s own or one’s employer’s job performance. Therefore, the findings may be limited in that they result from perceptions of behavior rather than actual behavior.

A low response rate could limit internal validity as well as generalizability of the findings. It was expected that the actual response rate would meet or exceed 70% of those sampled, yet the actual response rate was only 58%. Although anonymity for teachers and confidentiality for principals was guaranteed in order to help alleviate any trepidation about participating, fear of discrimination after the attacks of 9/11 may have reduced some principals’ and teachers’ willingness to participate.

Implications for Practice

As an American Muslim principal, I believe that we need to be more aware of the issue of teachers’ perceptions of leadership and the factors that influence the development of these perceptions. From these findings we learned that there is a positive relationship between
effective leadership and the level of teachers’ congruence within the school. We need to learn how principals’ actions impact teachers’ expectations and needs. We need to investigate how cultural values influence teachers’ expectations of their principals’ leadership. As Islamic leaders, it behooves us to study theories of leadership, especially transformational leadership, which appears to be well aligned to Islamic principles. As such, we as principals must encourage motivation and growth of teachers. This study has direct implications for practice; five of these practices are as follow:

1. In their search for more effective practices, principals need to engage in more self-reflection about basic concern for teachers. Conclusions can be drawn from this study, Stone (1992), and Evan (1997) that principals tend to view themselves differently than their teachers view them. To find why principals view themselves differently than their teachers, principals should reflect on the level of supportive behavior they use with their teachers. Self-reflection is a positive process that can bring many issues and problems to light. Principals should respect the professional competence of their teachers and exhibit professional and personal interest in each teacher. Principals should listen and be more open to teacher suggestions to be more familiar of their teachers’ views of leadership. Through regular staff meetings with two-way communication, principals might find more effective and efficient ways to share information and to help staff in their roles as shared decision makers.

2. Principals need to ensure that all teachers are receiving the kinds of attention they need in order to meet their personal goals. The level of variability among teacher perceptions of principal leadership might indicate that principals interact differently with different teachers or that teachers have different needs and expectations of the principals.
Principals need to know what individual teachers expect of them and how to integrate those expectations with school goals. To do so, principal behaviors would include discussing priority, delegating responsibility, providing resources, and continuous examination of staff commitment. Principals need to be aware that they should not only be an effective leader in accomplishing schools goals and objectives, but they also need to earn teachers’ trust and loyalty through willingness to “go the extra mile” to work with their teachers. Through teachers, school goals are accomplished more quickly and more effectively. Further, principals should support teachers’ collegial behavior by providing opportunities for increased professional interactions and building a strong network of social support among teachers.

3. Principals need to examine their leadership role and time spent on daily responsibilities. Conclusions can be drawn from this study and Stone (1997) that teachers tend to rate their principals higher as transactional leaders and lower as transformational leaders than their principals rated themselves. Most of the daily responsibilities for principals include general managerial duties, disciplining students, meeting with or phoning parents, and teaching or working with teachers. All of these are more task-oriented activities to get the job done. Even with these overwhelming responsibilities, principals should spend enough time on transformational behaviors and put forth more effort on their own and teachers’ professional growth. To free time for these more rewarding leadership behaviors, principals should learn how to delegate administrative responsibility to teachers and empower teachers to become leaders. Principal needs to help their teachers grow professionally by engaging them in collaborative planning and discussions to increase teachers’ understanding of the principal’s role.
4. American Muslim principals might examine the characteristics of transformational leadership and how they align with Islamic values. American Muslim principals could use the language of transformational leadership that the general public understands to talk about their Islamic leadership principles. With research, American Muslim principals could help bring their Islamic values into the mainstream and garner respect from a larger group. Transformational leadership involves assessing followers’ motives to accomplish more than what is expected, creating and articulating a clear vision, acting as a good role model, and understanding and adapting the need of the followers. These behaviors are very closely aligned to leadership in Islam which involves the ability to project the vision for everyone to see and pursue, to empower others for greater achievement, to model the way and be an example for the followers, and to encourage and motivate the followers to continue to make progress.

5. Principals need to know how cultural values influence teachers’ expectations of their leadership by engaging teachers in discussions about their cultural values, gender differences, educational experiences, the ideal leader prototype, diversity, and collaboration. Such dialogue is particularly important in American Muslim schools where both the teacher and studies populating are very diverse in terms of native language, religion, and values. Many countries of origin are represented by practicing Muslims in the United States. Each brings a unique perspective and unique differences.

Recommendations for Research

No previous research on Islamic school leadership was found; therefore, this study has added to the knowledge base about leadership in Islamic schools in the United States. The
following recommendations are suggested for future research to help us expand our knowledge of the American-Muslim principal’s leadership:

1. Conduct studies that examine the relationship between transformational leadership and demographic characteristics of teachers in Islamic schools. To protect teacher anonymity, no demographic data were collected from teachers in this study. How teacher gender, ethnic background, years of experience, and ethnicity interact with principals’ demographic characteristics to influence teacher perceptions might be considered in future research.

2. Conduct in-depth interviews with principals and teachers within schools to investigate the differences between actual and desirable leadership inside Islamic schools. Such qualitative research would add rich contextual meaning to our understanding of teachers’ perceptions of their principals.

3. Conduct studies that investigate the influences of cultural values on teachers’ perceptions of effective leaders and teachers’ expectations from effective leaders. The relationship between Islamic values, in particular, and transformational leadership and merits further exploration. Both espouse similar behaviors which might be investigated.

4. Conduct studies that investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and some measurement of students’ academic achievement. The most fruitful research would identify those specific leadership behaviors that influence student performance, especially performance in multicultural settings.
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