JET
The Journal of Effective Teaching
an online journal devoted to teaching excellence

The Relationship Among Transformational Teaching and Student Motivation and Learning

Aaron Noland[1a] and Keith Richards[b]
[a]*James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 22807*
[b]*East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina 27858*

Abstract

Transformational leadership is a well-documented and validated leadership perspective studied in management and organizational contexts that has recently been applied to the instructional context. The current study predicted a positive relationship between teacher transformational leadership and learning, and motivation. A population of 273 college students was surveyed and these hypotheses were supported. Transformational leadership significantly predicted student state motivation, learning indicators and affective learning. The study ends with an analysis of the transformational leadership model in the instructional context, and directions for future research extending the application of the transformational leadership model in the classroom.

Keywords: Transformational leadership, student learning, motivation.

Instructional communication and leadership are two areas of interest for communication scholars. Instructional communication research examines the effects of different predictor variables (immediacy, clarity) on student outcomes such as satisfaction, learner empowerment, learning, motivation, and student affinity for the instructor. Leadership communication research typically investigates the communication behaviors or practices that yield positive outcomes in an organizational or group context. This study seeks to substitute the teacher – student relationship for the leader – follower relationship in an attempt to test the relationship between transformational leadership and student motivation and learning. Additional research in this area is needed in order to increase the usefulness of the transformational teaching construct as it has not been heavily researched, especially amongst older students (Beauchamp, Barling, & Morton, 2011).

Richmond and McCroskey (1992) asserted the classroom as an organization aiming for learning and sharing interdependent relationships, positioning the teacher as the leader. As instructional leadership scholars have demonstrated, a teacher functions as a leader in the classroom (Chory & McCroskey, 1999; Harvey, Royal, & Stout, 2003; Luechauer &

[1] Corresponding author's email: nolandax@jmu.edu.

Shulman, 1996; Pounder, 2008a; Pounder, 2008b). They are responsible for more than teaching as they act as experts, increase interest in the subject, and serve as role models for their students (Bogler, Caspi, & Roccas, 2013). Research, (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011; Chory & McCroskey, 1999, Kearney & McCroskey, 1980; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1992) has examined the relationship between teacher management or leadership style and student outcomes, validating the study of organizational theories within the instructional context. Facilitating learning, managing conflict, disseminating information, allocating resources, empowering learners, motivating students, and aiming for high marks in student satisfaction are all analogous to basic principles of leadership contextualized in organizational settings (Chory & McCroskey, 1999). The current study will extend the research and offer insight on the effects of a specific leadership theory - transformational leadership - on student outcomes.

Pounder (2003) hypothesized transformational leadership as an applicable theory for the instructional context. His research and subsequent studies found positive outcomes associated with teacher transformational leadership including, the development of student capability to use ideas and information, development of student ability to think critically and assess ideas, and development of student ability to critically examine a situation and generate novel approaches to solving the problem (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010; Pounder, 2008a; Pounder, 2008b; Pounder, 2003). Transformational leadership has enjoyed many applications in the instructional context in recent years. These applications include critical pedagogies of transformational teaching and learning (Mitra, 2013), transformational assessment practices (Pounder, 2008a) and transformational leadership at the administrative level in educational organizations (Forward, Czech, & Allen, 2007). All of these are viable applications of this robust theory; however, this paper will strictly focus on transformational leadership as an instructional leadership style and subsequent impacts on student outcomes.

Transformational leadership has its roots in the theory of transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio (1990) distinguish transactional leaders from transformational leaders. In this model transactional leaders are those leaders who influence followers by "setting goals, clarifying desired outcomes, providing feedback, and exchanging rewards for accomplishments" (Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002, *p*. 735). Transformational leaders, on the other hand, are leaders who wield influence additionally by "broadening and elevating followers' goals and providing them with confidence to perform beyond the expectations specified in the implicit or explicit exchange agreement" (Eden et al., 2002, *p*. 735).

Additionally, the transformational leadership model incorporates a charismatic element facilitating the influence exerted by leaders (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991). Transformational leadership is often studied by analyzing the impact transformational leadership has on workplace outcomes. Outcomes such as, empowerment, innovation, creativity, team performance, motivation, morality, and performance are all positively correlated with transformational leadership in the workplace (Eden, et al., 2002; Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003). However, an emerging area of research is concerned with applying transformational leadership to an instructional context (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010; Harvey et al., 2003; Luechauer & Shulman, 1996; Pounder 2003).

Harvey et al. (2003) substituted the leader/teacher and subordinate/student relationships successfully in a study of student outcomes. They found a positive relationship between teacher's transformational leadership and student satisfaction with the instructor, student report of instructor performance, and student respect for the instructor. Research has suggested that transformational leaders attempt to develop subordinates' ability to think critically and independently, be creative, and obtain a variety of perspectives on a problem before arriving at a solution (Bogler, Caspi, & Roccas, 2013; Pounder, 2003). Pounder (2003) posited that these goals are similar to those desired in the instructional context. If teachers can strengthen motivation and affect for the class and instructor as transformational leadership would indicate then transformational teaching practices are well suited to positively impact student learning (Rodriguez, Plax & Kearney, 1996).

The purpose of this study is to examine transformational leadership in the instructional context, seeking to explore a potential positive relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student outcomes. It will focus on three student outcomes: 1) student motivation, 2) affective learning and 3) learning indicators among college students. First, we will examine the transformational leadership model followed by an analysis of the outcome variables (student motivation, student learning and learner empowerment).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership research examines outcomes of effective transformational leadership (cohesion, performance, employee satisfaction, innovation, organizational commitment, and follower development) in a variety of contexts (military, corporate, emergency response, and a few in the educational sector) (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010; Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004; Eden et al., 2002; Pillai & Williams, 2004; Pounder, 2003)

Transformational leaders exert influence similar to transactional leaders – "setting goals, clarifying desired outcomes, providing feedback, and exchanging rewards for accomplishments" (Eden et al., 2002, p. 735). This type of social influence is used to motivate, empower, foster creativity and critical thinking, and improve engagement (Eden, et al., 2002). Transformational leaders go beyond task influence and attempt to build follower confidence, commitment and elevate follower goals so they can perform beyond expectations (Bass, 1985; Castro, Perinan, & Bueno, 2008; Pounder, 2006). Transformational leadership encompasses an element of charisma, a distinction from the transactional leadership model (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Transformational leadership is composed of the four I's: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence (Avolio et al., 1991). To fully understand transformational leadership we must carefully analyze each of the 4 I's.

First, individualized consideration is concerned with treating members of a team or group as individuals, not just as members of a team or group. Through individualized consider-

ation the individual is not seen as merely a means to achieving a goal, but an instrumental part of that goal (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011). The leader spends time getting to know the follower personally including his or her personal goals, strengths, and developmental needs in an effort to meet the needs of that particular individual (Dionne et al., 2004; Walumbwa, Peng, Lawler, & Kan, 2004). The individualized consideration component is often equated to a mentor mentee relationship. As Avolio et al. (1991) suggested, a mentor learns the strengths and weaknesses of his or her student and helps boost confidence and abilities.

Another metaphor useful in explaining individualized consideration is a personal advocate. The leader makes sure followers have access to the resources necessary for them to achieve their goals. This can take the form of negotiation, removing potential problems, or facilitating conflict resolution.

Second, intellectual stimulation focuses on promoting careful problem solving, novel ways of thinking, intelligence building, and questioning previously held assumptions (Bass, 1985; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011; Dionne et al., 2004; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003; Pounder, 2003). Transformational leaders work extensively to help followers adopt new ways of thinking about "old" problems, change the way they think about all types of problems, and search for creative problem-solving techniques (Avolio et al., 1991; Bass, 1985; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009). Intellectual stimulation helps to maintain a motivated, excited, positive, and enthusiastic team of followers who are constantly challenging the "status-quo" (Pounder, 2008b). An intellectually stimulated team has the potential for higher levels of performance (Dionne et al., 2004).

Intellectual stimulation is not always one-way; bottom-up influence is common with open teams and subsequently leads to transformational learning opportunities for students in decentralized courses (Mitra, 2013). For example, if a student proposes an activity to help the class grasp an issue, a transformational teacher would willingly embrace the idea as it helps benefit the class. Students appreciate openness and some even enjoy being challenged to reach their potential (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010). When challenged they are more likely to have an intrinsic motivation for learning (Bolkan, Goodboy, & Griffin, 2011).

Third, inspirational motivation involves formulating, articulating, and sharing a vision or goal for the team through shared symbols or emotional arguments and an overall sense of optimism and enthusiasm (Kark et al., 2003; Pounder, 2003). The inspirational leader is able, through honed communication skills, personal charisma, role-modeling, and personal accomplishments, to inspire others to act in accordance with the shared vision (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Pounder, 2006). The leader fosters a sense of worth, confidence, and opportunity (Avolio et al., 1991). They communicate their expectations which exceed the minimal standards in hopes of energizing the individuals they are leading (Morton, Keith, & Beauchamp, 2010). Follower development is an important aspect of inspirational motivation. Research has suggested that the effectiveness of inspirational motivation is contingent on its interplay with individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation (Dionne et al., 2004; Pounder, 2003). Inspirational motivation occurs when

individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and the behavioral aspects of inspirational motivation occur simultaneously increasing the feelings of opportunity and value (Avolio et al., 1991).

Fourth, idealized influence is the charismatic element of transformational leadership. The transformational leader is able to develop extensive personal rapport and influence among followers by treating them with respect, trusting them, showing confidence in them, and viewing them as individuals (Avolio et al., 1991). Idealized influence consists of leader behaviors that instill pride in followers. These behaviors often foster a sense of associational pride between leaders and followers. Pride stems from the leader's optimism, and allows the working environment to operate positively (Dionne et al., 2004). Increased respect, admiration, and an increased desire to emulate the leader will result if the leader effectively actualizes idealized influence (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Pounder, 2008a; Pounder 2006). Often, idealized influence is seen as an appropriate precursor to the other three "I's" as it facilitates a shared vision. Idealized influence can be seen as "setting the table" for transformational leadership to be effective.

To summarize, the four I's of transformational leadership, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence, together make up a transformational leader. The 4 I's offer a prescription and a description; that is, they paint the image of a transformational leader, but also prescribe the necessary behavioral components.

Transformational leadership behaviors exhibited by teachers should have positive relationships with student satisfaction and learning. Research in the organizational context has demonstrated that transformational leaders empower followers and increase their motivation (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010; Pillai & Williams, 2004; Pounder, 2003). One way that they do this is through transforming the work environment and teachers have this same ability with their classrooms (Bolkan, Goodboy, & Griffin, 2011). Additionally, Pillai and Williams (2004) found transformational leadership positively associated with follower performance. Using transformational leadership in the educational setting could increase student learning and better prepare them to enter the work force (Beauchamp et al., 2011). Instructors can use the four dimensions of transformational leadership to improve their relationship with their students and to promote learning and personal growth (Slavich & Zimbardo, 2012).

Student Motivation

Student motivation has been the subject of instructional communication studies as an outcome variable (Frymier & Shulman, 1995; Jaasma & Koper, 1999; Richmond, 1990). Motivation is also identified as an important mediating variable between instructor behaviors and student learning (Jaasma & Koper, 1999). Many instructional variables impact student motivation including teacher immediacy and teacher style (Frymier, 1993).

Student motivation exists as a state or a trait (Frymier & Shulman, 1995). State motivation is dependent on situation, time, and other variables. It is the motivation a student

feels for a specific course, task, or subject area at a specific time (Frymier & Shulman, 1995). Trait motivation, however, is a more longstanding attribute that refers to a student's motivation in regard to a specific task (Frymier & Shulman, 1995). The distinction between the two is especially important as it positions the teacher to impact student's state motivation through behavior. Students have shared some of the ways that teachers can have an impact and they are to increase inspirational motivation, enthusiasm and their activity level within the classroom (Morton et al., 2010).

Richmond (1990) suggested classroom interactions as the "primary means by which motivation can be increased." Her research hypothesized a mutually causal relationship between motivation and learning. That is to say, students who are motivated learn more, and as students learn more they become more motivated (Richmond, 1990). Though Richmond (1990) did not find outright support for this hypothesis, it was found that motivation and learning are likely to reciprocally increase. These conclusions give the teacher an immense opportunity to positively influence student outcomes; therefore a teaching style most able to capitalize on this opportunity is of great importance. Bolkan, Goodboy and Griffin (2011) found that if teachers are able to influence the intrinsic motivation of the students then they are more likely to increase their knowledge through deep learning rather than simply taking a rote learning approach. This type of influence can occur when teachers are intellectually stimulating which occurs through interactions where they challenge the students (Bolkan, Goodboy, & Griffin, 2011).

Richmond (1990) differentiated between compliance and motivation imploring instructors to motivate students. Compliance is doing something because someone else wants us to do it; whereas, motivation, is doing something because we desire to do it. Effective teaching is concerned with increasing motivation, not on compliance gaining (Richmond, 1990). Richmond's vision of motivation is indicative of transformational leadership in the classroom. Seeking compliance is a transactional approach, but motivating students is transformational. Pounder (2003) illustrated the motivating impact of a transformational teacher. The intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration elements of transformational leadership are components to student motivation (Pounder, 2003). Morton et al. (2010) found students reporting these factors. Students mentioned the importance of intellectual stimulation and the absence of such stimulation greatly decreased interest in the subject, others mentioned increasing their efforts when the teacher paid attention to them as individuals (Morton et al., 2010). Students reported that they worked harder in physical education classes to the level that their teachers were inspirationally motivating. A direct increase in self-motivation was found when students recognized that their teachers were using transformational techniques (Morton et al., 2010; Pounder, 2009). These techniques led the students to say they had increased motivation, enjoyment and that they were more satisfied with their teacher. As a result the following hypothesis is offered:

> H1: Teacher transformational leadership will have a significant positive relationship with student state motivation.

Student Learning

Student learning is a multidimensional construct. According to Bloom (1956), student learning can have many faces: cognitive, affective, and/or behavioral. In Bloom's (1956) taxonomy an explanation for each of these aspects is offered. Affective learning is described as the cultivation of a positive or negative attitude toward learning in a particular context, cognitive learning is described as understanding and retaining information. (Bloom, 1956). Research extending Bloom's taxonomy has asserted these three dimensions are interrelated components of learning (Kelley & Gorham, 1988).

Cognitive learning can be defined as the reception, retention, transference, and application of knowledge (Messman & Jones-Corley, 2001). Rodriguez et al. (1996) hypothesized cognitive learning as an input-output process. Their study hypothesized cognitive learning as a process of inputs (motivation, affective learning, and immediacy) that together helped yield cognitive learning; however, measuring cognitive learning has proven difficult. The learning indicators measure is designed to analyze behaviors that indicate a student is learning such as study time, discussing material with friends and thinking about content (Frymier & Houser, 1999).

In addition to cognitive learning, student attitudes are an important consideration for instructional communication scholars. Affective learning is the sphere of learning concerned with the beliefs and attitudes a student holds about a specific task or subject area (Rodriguez et al., 1996). Sidelinger and McCroskey (1997) define affective learning as "the development of positive attitudes toward a subject matter being studied," (p. 2).

Affective learning is a unique construct particularly significant to the instructional communication literature because student affect offers the teacher a great opportunity to influence student learning. Sorensen (1989) suggested that teacher communication skills, such as delivery, immediacy, clarity and organization, have an immense possibility of increasing student affective learning. The importance of affective learning becomes increasingly evident when it is seen as mediator to cognitive learning (Rodriguez et al., 1996). Student affect often contributes to cognitive learning because student interest, motivation, and involvement heighten as affective learning increases (Rodriguez et al., 1996). As a result, the teacher has an opportunity to impact cognitive learning through affective learning.

Transformational leadership is focused on articulating and adopting a shared vision. A *shared* vision implies both the leader and the followers ascribe to it with enthusiasm and optimism (Pounder, 2006; Walumbwa et al., 2004). This is similar to the goal of affective learning (Kark et al., 2003). As a result transformational teachers are well positioned to encourage student learning. A transformational teacher has a variety of goals they seek to accomplish with their students some of which are to improve knowledge, learning abilities and student thoughts about learning (Slavich & Zimbardo, 2012). Ideally students will increase their desire to learn and their ability to take in new information while having positive attitudes, values, and beliefs about learning (Coppola, 2013). When students recognize the transformational leadership style they are more engaged in the class-

room and with their instructor (Bogler, Caspi, & Roccas, 2013; Pounder, 2009). Increasing knowledge in how transformational leadership influences student behaviors is important because of the potential for learning to create a quality education (Bolkan, Goodboy, & Griffin, 2011).

H2: Teacher transformational leadership will have a significant positive relationship with student learning.

Method

Participants

Students at a large undergraduate university in the south were recruited through email to participate in the study. The email contained a link to a secure online anonymous survey and was distributed in the tenth week of the semester. If they chose to participate they clicked on the link and were given the direction to think about the teacher of their first class of the week when they answered all of the questions. This was done so that a variety of teachers and courses would be included in the sample. The survey took between fifteen and twenty minutes to complete. The research was approved by the institutional review board (IRB) and the only requirement for participation was that each student was at least eighteen years old.

The population contained a total of 302 surveys with 273 (90.4%) participants fully completing the survey. The sample after data was cleaned consisted of 90 males (33%) and 183 females (67%). The average age of the participants was just under 19 years old (M=18.75, SD=1.11). The gender of the teacher was collected and 169 had male professors (69.2%) while 84 had female professors (30.8%).

Measures

Transformational Leadership: Teacher transformational leadership was operationalized in this study using a modified condensed Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire version 6s (MLQ) developed by Bass (1990). This original scale is a self-report leadership diagnosis tool that consists of 21 items measuring the leaders' leadership style. It consists of four subscales measuring the elements (individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence) of transformational leadership, as well as, transactional leadership and laissez – faire leadership. The original scale was modified from self-report to other – report so that students evaluated their teachers' leadership style. The original scale uses "I" as the subject and then follows with a stem indicating a leadership behavior. In the modified version, the "I" is changed to "My teacher" in order to allow for a descriptive other report scale. Because laissez-faire leadership did not apply to any of the planned analyses it was dropped to shorten the overall measure. This modification resulted in an 18 item measure.

The MLQ has been utilized extensively in academic research and organizational training and development and is considered a valid measure (Jung et al., 2003). Previous alpha

reliabilities from academic research have been around .90 (Eden et al., 2002; Harvey et al., 2003). Alpha reliability for this study was .93 with $M = 63.10$, $SD = 12.01$. The subscale reliability for idealized influence was .88 with $M = 11.33$ $SD = 2.66$; the alpha reliability for inspirational motivation was .72 with $M = 10.70$, $SD = 2.34$; the alpha reliability for individualized consideration was .76 with $M = 9.48$ and $SD = 2.60$; and the alpha reliability for intellectual stimulation was .81 with $M = 10.92$, and $SD = 2.40$.

Student Learning: Student learning was operationalized both affectively and cognitively. Respondents were asked to report on their attitudes regarding the course, the instructor, and the content using the revised affective learning scale developed by Mottet and Richmond (1998). The measure employed in this study is based on earlier affective learning scales (Andersen, 1979; Gorham, 1988), but an expanded version of the scale was introduced and validated by Mottet and Richmond (1998). The original version of the revised scale put forth by Mottet and Richmond (1998) had eight sub – constructs. The scale in the current study consists of five sub-constructs of the original eight sub – constructs each made up of four items. The additional three sub – constructs were omitted based on previous research deeming the three additional constructs redundant (Weber Martin, & Patterson, 2001).

The five sub-constructs each consist of four items that represent student attitudes about the course, four items about student appreciation about course content, four items about "real life" application of content, four items regarding student attitudes about the instructor, and four items evaluating the likelihood of taking another course with the same teacher. Each sub-construct is measured with four bi-polar adjectives (good/bad, worthless/valuable, fair/unfair, positive/negative or likely/unlikely, impossible/possible, probable/improbable, would/would not) (Mottet & Richmond, 1988).

Previous alpha reliabilities for affective learning scales have been above .90 (Frymier & Houser, 2000; Weber et al., 2001). Reliability for the affective learning scale in this study was .96 with $M = 89.42$ and $SD = 19.39$.

A second measure of student learning, the revised learning indicators scale as developed by Frymier and Houser (1999), investigated student behaviors that indicate learning. By using the learning indicators measure students not only reported on their attitudes, but they reported on behaviors indicative of student learning.

This learning indicators measure consists of seven items addressing learning activities anchored by 0 (never) to 4 (very often) (Fymier & Houser, 1999). The learning activities include: I like to talk about what I'm doing in this class with friends and family; I explain course content to other students; I think about course content outside the class; I see connections between the course content and my career goals; I review the course content; I compare the information from this class with other things that I have learned; and I feel I have learned a lot in this class. Frymier and Houser (1999) reported an alpha reliability of .85 in their initial application of the scale. Reliability for the learning indicator scale in this study was .86 with $M = 26.10$ and $SD = 5.22$.

Student Motivation: Student state motivation was operationalized in this study by the score on Richmond's (1990) motivation scale using five 7-step bipolar adjectives (motivated/unmotivated, excited/bored, interested/uninterested, involved/uninvolved, dreading it/looking forward to it) to evaluate students' motivation in regards to the course and instructor. Previous alpha reliabilities have been above .80 (Frymier & Houser, 2000; Frymier, Shulman, & Houser, 1996; Richmond, 1990). The reliability for the motivation scale in this study was .96 with $M = 21.80$ and $SD = 8.13$.

Results

Hypothesis one predicted a positive relationship between transformational teaching and student state motivation and was tested using Pearson's correlation. Transformational teaching was significantly related to student state motivation, $r = .53$, $n = 255$, $p < .01$.

A multiple regression was performed to determine the amount of variance each of the 4 I's had explained in student state motivation. The predictor variables in this regression were inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, idealized influence, and intellectual stimulation with student state motivation as the criterion variable. Transformational teaching explained a significant amount of variance in student state motivation, $R^2 = .282$, $F(1, 254) = 99.22$, $p < .01$. An analysis of beta weights provided more precise information about variance in student state motivation. Individualized consideration ($\beta = .23$, $p < .01$) and inspirational motivation ($\beta = .21$, $p < .05$) were the only two elements of transformational teaching to explain significant variance in student state motivation.

Hypothesis two predicted a positive relationship between transformational teaching and student learning. To test this hypothesis student learning was operationalized affectively and by behavioral indicators of student learning. Transformational teaching was significantly related to student affective learning $r = .69$., $n = 254$, $p < .01$.

A multiple regression was used to determine the amount of variance explained by each of the 4 I's. Transformational teaching significantly predicted student affective learning, $\beta = .69$, $t(252) = 6.03$, $p < .01$. Transformational teaching also explained a significant amount of variance in affective learning, $R^2 = .48$, $F(1, 254) = 233.27$, $p < .01$. All of the 4 I's showed significant correlations with student affective learning with idealized influence $r = .64$, $p < .01$, inspirational motivation $r = .62$, $p < .01$, individualized consideration $r = .60$, $p < .01$, and intellectual stimulation $r = .63$, $p < .01$.

Transformational leadership was significantly related to student indicators of learning $r = .50$, $n = 248$, $p < .05$. In order to determine the variance explained by each of the 4 I's a multiple regression was performed. Transformational teaching significantly predicted student learning indicators $\beta = .69$, $t(246) = 9.81$, $p < .01$. Transformational teaching also explained a significant amount of variance in student indicators of learning, $R^2 = .25$, $F(1, 254) = 80.56$, $p < .01$. Multiple regression was used to determine the variance explained by each of the 4 I's had in student learning indicators. Intellectual stimulation ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$) and individualized consideration ($\beta = .21$, $p < .05$) were the only two

elements of transformational teaching to explain significant variance in student indicators of learning.

Discussion

Instructional communication scholars investigate novel ways to transmit information, engage students, empower learners, increase motivation, and improve learning. A transformational approach to teacher leadership can provide the necessary tools to achieve these broad goals. Transformational teaching continues to develop, especially in regards to use in higher education, and with the information gathered in the current study it appears to be an appropriate and effective model for classroom instruction. Further research will need to be conducted in order to bolster the model.

This study sought to examine the relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student outcomes, particularly, student motivation and student learning. The hypotheses of this study suggested a positive relationship between teacher transformational leadership and these outcome variables. Both of the hypotheses were supported significantly.

Transformational leadership played an important role in the motivation of the students in the classroom. This is an important finding because motivation has been found to be related to student learning. Teachers have a direct impact on student motivation and therefore learning (Jaasma & Koper, 1999; Richmond, 1990). Pounder (2003) found that that individualized consideration was an aspect of transformational leadership and the current study confirmed this finding. Students want their teacher to help them develop as a person, let them know how they are doing in class and to help those who seem to have been rejected. Taking the time to interact with students on an individual basis could be accomplished in a variety of ways both inside and outside of the classroom. Some options are meeting with students after both poor and good results on an assignment to let them know that the teacher is aware of how they are doing, another opportunity is to take time both before and after class to interact with the students. The importance of individualized attention in the study highlights the centrality of professors in helping their students to be motivated to excel and participate in the course. This presents an opportunity to focus more specifically in future research on how to create the feeling of individualized attention among the students.

Hypothesis two predicted a positive relationship between transformational teaching and student learning. Affective learning and teacher transformational leadership are positively correlated. Affective learning is focused on how a student "feels" about the material and instructor in their course (Sorensen, 1989). Transformational teachers focus, not only on outcomes, but on how to achieve them. This process creates a meaningful and positive environment in the classroom (Pounder, 2003). Transformational teachers are concerned with the affective dimensions as well as performance. Research has explored the role that affect plays in foregrounding other forms of learning (Frymier, 1993). In fact, student attitudes toward the course, instructor and content are mediating variables for student cognitive learning and performance (Rodriguez et al., 1996). Inspirational moti-

vation and idealized influence are the two I's of transformational teaching most concerned with affective dimensions of leadership and accounted for the most variance, in the study, in affective learning (Avolio et al., 1991; Dionne et al., 2004).

When students are engaged, teachers are immediate, and learners are empowered the likelihood of students to engage in learning indicators is increased (Frymier, Shulman & Houser, 1996). As a result, transformational teachers are well positioned to positively influence learning indicator behavior. Intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration positively impact student learning indicators (Noland, 2005). This result was confirmed in the current study. Transformational teachers that focus on student needs and promote novel approaches to coursework see an increase in student learning indicators, which predict student retention (Avolio et al., 1991; Frymier et al., 1996).

Limitations

This study has a few limitations. A central limitation in the study is the use of the transformational leadership construct. There is the potential that it is measuring how much the students like the course or the instructor rather than if the teacher is using transformational leadership principles. This is especially true given the high correlations between affect and transformational teaching. Another potential issue is the clarity of the measures and this potential lack of clarity could alter how participants respond to the questions. Though the reliabilities are all acceptable, further scale development should be done to improve the clarity and validity of these scales. The sample was not racially diverse which inhibits the generalizability of the results to a larger population and it contained a high percentage of females (67%). The sample consisted of mostly first year students who have not had a variety of professors or classes. This lack of collegiate coursework could inhibit their ability to judge their instructors.

Another limitation is the variety of coursework tested in the sample. Though disciplinary and class diversity was secured in the method, the fact that students were freshmen meant their classes were mostly lower level courses. Pedagogy, and thus transformational teaching, in upper division courses should be further analyzed. Another issue was the low reliability in the transformational subscales. The inspirational motivation and individualized consideration scales had the lowest reliability. These scales need to be investigated further to better understand why they are not achieving the desired results. The discourse of "my teacher" throughout creates a power distance that seems counter to the very tenets of transformational leadership. Future research and scale development should avoid this binary and masculine form of measurement. Another limitation is that the relationship between student and teacher was still in an early stage and having spent only one semester with the professor may not be enough time to create a transformational learning environment.

Future Research

One of the most pressing issues regarding this research is working to create a transformational leadership scale that works well with undergraduate students and their professors.

To get a better understanding of the transformational leadership scale it needs to be tested with another college population and these results should be compared with the results of the current study. This will provide more information about which questions are working and which need to be altered for this population. The reliability issues of the subscale may require additional scale creation and validation (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010).

Building on the research examining how teachers manage the classroom this study, and others, focused on how teacher leadership impacts the classroom, particularly student outcomes. Of particular importance here are the significant correlations evident between transformational leadership and student outcomes; however, an underlying trend may emerge. This underlying trend would involve the relationship between transformational leadership and the traditional instructional predictor variables such as teacher clarity and immediacy. Future studies should examine the relationships between teacher transformational leadership, immediacy, and clarity. Additionally, future studies should attempt to analyze to what extent transformational leadership accounts for variance in student outcomes in comparison to other instructional predictors. For example, does transformational leadership account for a relatively small amount of variance in comparison to clarity, immediacy, and other predictors?

Can we study leadership communication theory in the context of instructional communication? It is clear given the correlations between transformational teaching and the outcome variables that transformational teachers are well positioned to influence student outcomes. Similar to Bolkan and Goodboy (2010, 2011), Harvey et al. (2003), and Pounder (2003) this study implemented the transformational leadership model to make that leap. We must be careful when transitioning from one field to another. However, we have evidence that transformational leadership practices in the classroom positively impact student attitudes, motivation and therefore learning and student indicators of learning. As the literature on transformational teaching practices pervades, new measurement and instructional practices will emerge founded on strong evidence to positive student outcomes.

References

Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook,* (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990's: The four i's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 15*, 9-16.

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

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. In R.W. Woodman & W. A. Pasmore (Eds), *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4*, 231-272. Greenwich, CT.

Beauchamp, M. R., Barling, J., & Morton, K. L. (2011). Transformational teaching and

adolescent self-determined motivation, self-efficacy, and intentions to engage in leisure time physical activity: A randomised controlled pilot trial. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being, 3*(2), 127-150. doi. 10.1111/j.1758-0854.2011.01048.x

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objective, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain.* New York: David McKay.

Bogler, R., Caspi, A., & Roccas, S. (2013). Transformational and passive leadership: An initial investigation of university instructors as leaders in a virtual learning environment. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 41*(3), 372-392. doi. 10.1177/1741143212474805

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. (2009). Transformational leadership in the classroom: Fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 36, 296–306.

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A.K. (2010). Transformational leadership in the classroom: The development and validation of the student intellectual stimulation scale. *Communication Reports*, 23, 91-105. doi:10.1080/08934215.2010.511399

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. (2011). Behavioral Indicators of Transformational Leadership in the College Classroom. *Qualitative Research Reports In Communication*, 12(1), 10-18. doi:10.1080/17459435.2011.601520

Bolkan, S., Goodboy, A. K., & Griffin, D. J. (2011). Teacher leadership and intellectual stimulation: Improving students' approaches to studying through intrinsic motivation. *Communication Research Reports, 28*(4), 337-346. doi. 10.1080/08824096.2011.615958

Castro, C. B., Perinan, M., M., V., & Bueno, J. C. C. (2008). Transformational leadership and followers' attitudes: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 1842–1863. doi:10.1080=09585190802324601

Chory, R. M., & McCroskey, J. C. (1999). The relationship between teacher management communication style and affective learning. *Communication Quarterly, 47*,1-11.

Coppola, B. P. (2013). The distinctiveness of higher education. *Journal of Chemical Education, 90*(8), 955-956. doi. 10.1021/ed400452u

Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17,* 177-193.

Eden, T. D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: Field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 735-744.

Forward, G. L., Czech, K., & Allen, P. (2007). Leadership, Communication and Religiosity in Higher Education Administration: Distinctions That Make a Difference. *Journal Of Communication & Religion*, 30(1), 153-185.

Frymier, A. B. (1993). The impact of teacher immediacy on students' motivation: Is it the same for all students? *Communication Quarterly, 41*, 454-464.

Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (1999). The revised learning indicators scale. *Communication Studies, 50*, 1 – 12.

Frymer, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education, 49*, 207 – 219.

Frymier, A. B. & Shulman, G. M. (1995). "What's in it for me? *Communication Educa-*

tion, 44, 40-50.
Frymier, A. B., Shulman, G. M., & Houser, M. L. (1996). The development of a learner empowerment measure. *Communication Education, 45*, 181-199.
Gorham, J. (1988). The Relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education, 37*, 40-53.
Harvey, S., Royal, M., & Stout, D. (2003). Instructor's transformational leadership: University student attitudes and ratings. *Psychological Reports, 92*, 395-402.
Jaasma, M. A. & Koper, R. J. (1999). The relationship of student-faculty out-of-class communication to instructor immediacy and trust and to student motivation. *Communication Education, 48*, 41-47.
Jung, D. I., Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 1-17. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00050-X
Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 246-255. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246
Kearney, P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1980). Relationships among teacher communication style, trait and state communication apprehension and teacher effectiveness. *Communication Yearbook, 4*, 533-551.
Kelley, D. H., & Gorham, J. **(**1988**)**. Effects of immediacy on recall of information. *Communication Education, 37*, 198 – 208.
Luechauer, D. L., & Shulman, G. M. (1996). Training transformational leaders: A call for practicing empowerment in the classroom. *International Journal of Public Administration, 19*, 827-848.
Messman, S.J. and Jones-Corley, J. (2001). Effects of communication environment, immediacy, communication apprehension on cognitive and affective learning. *Communication Monographs*, 68, 184-200.
Mitra, R. (2013). From Transformational Leadership to Leadership Trans-Formations: A Critical Dialogic Perspective. *Communication Theory* (10503293), 23(4), 395-416. doi:10.1111/comt.12022
Morton, K. L., Keith, S. E., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2010). Transformational teaching and physical activity: A new paradigm for adolescent health promotion? *Journal of Health Psychology*, 15, 248–257.
Mottet, T. P., & Richmond, V. P., (1998). Newer is not necessarily better: A reexamination of the affective learning measurement. *Communication Research Reports, 15*, 370-378.
Noland, A. K. (2005). The relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student outcomes. Miami University. Retrieved from http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=miami1123168677
Pillai, R., & Williams, E. A. (2004). Transformational leadership, self-efficacy, group cohesiveness, commitment, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17*, 144-159. doi: 10.1108/09534810410530584
Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy, and affective learning. *Communication Education, 35,* 43-55.
Pounder, J. S. (2003). Employing transformational leadership to enhance the quality of

management development instruction. *Journal of Management Development, 22*, 1-13.

Pounder, J. S. (2006). Transformational classroom leadership: The fourth wave of teacher leadership? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34, 533–545.

Pounder, J. S. (2008a). Transformational Leadership: Practicing What We Teach in the Management Classroom. *Journal Of Education For Business*, 84(1), 2-6.

Pounder, J. S. (2008b). Transformational classroom leadership: A novel approach to evaluating classroom performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33, 233-243. doi: 10.1080/02602930701292621

Pounder, J. S. (2009). Transformational classroom leadership: A basis for academic staff development. *Journal of Management Development, 28*(4), 317-325. doi: 10.1108/02621710910947353

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. *Communication Education, 39,* 181-195.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1992). *Organizational communication for survival.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Robinson, V. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.

Rodriguez, J., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1996). Clarifying the relationship between teacher nonverbal immediacy and student cognitive learning: Affective learning as the central causal mediator. *Communication Education, 45,* 293-305.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A. (1992). Teacher communicator style. *Communication Education, 41,* 153-166.

Sidelinger, R. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Communication correlates of teacher clarity in the college classroom. *Communication Research Reports, 14,* 1-10.

Slavich, G. M., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2012). Transformational teaching: Theoretical underpinnings, basic principles, and core methods. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*(4), 569-608. doi.10.1007/s10648-012-9199-6

Sorensen, G. (1989). The relationships among teachers' self-disclosive statements, students' perceptions, and affective learning. *Communication Education, 38,* 259-276.

Walumbwa, F. O., Peng, W., Lawler, J. J., & Kan, S. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal Of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 77(4), 515-530.

Weber, K., Martin, M. M., & Patterson, B. R. (2001). Teacher behavior, student interest and affective learning: Putting theory to practice. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 29,* 71-90.