



The Impacts of School Leadership Dynamics on School Effectiveness in Elementary Schools

Ming-Dih LIN & Chun-Chih LIAN

The idea and practice of principal leadership had been focused mainly on the individual person, i.e., the principal. Recently, the ideas of teacher leadership, distributed leadership and a community of leaders have gotten an increased attention. To broaden the practice of school leadership, the purposes of this study were to analyze the school leadership dynamics (a variable consisted of the scores of principal transformational leadership, teacher self-management, and leadership community of school) and its influence on school effectiveness.

In this study, principal transformational leadership consists of three elements, i.e., setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization. The variable of teacher self-management includes self-rehearsal, self-goal setting, self-criticism, self-reinforcement, self-expectation, and self-observation. The variable of leadership community of school is measured by community builder, community leadership, community with leadership capacity, and community of leaders. In addition, school effectiveness is described by a single integrative variable that includes the ideas of school productivity, service quality, adaptability, and flexibility.

Utilizing the method of the random stratified sampling, this study chose 45 sample elementary schools in Taiwan. Each school was selected a representative sample including teachers and administrators to answer a questionnaire consisted of the above 4 variables, 14 dimensions.

The method of Cluster Analysis was used to classify the 45 schools (636 valid questionnaires) based on their combined scores of characteristic of school leadership dynamics. It was found that there were four types of elementary schools in terms of leadership dynamics, including the Dynamic Integrated School, the Administrative Vertical School, the Teacher Horizontal School, and the Static Inertia School. Each type of school reveals different characteristics in terms of their degrees of principal's transformational leadership, teacher's self-management, and leadership community of schools. The four types of leadership dynamics in schools are described in details in this paper.



Furthermore, the findings of this study indicated that significant differences were found among the four types of schools in terms of school effectiveness. The school effectiveness in those Dynamic Integrated Schools and the Teacher Horizontal Schools were higher than the Administrative Vertical Schools and the Static Inertia Schools.

The ANOVA analysis of school effectiveness in different leadership dynamics schools was tested and analyzed in this paper. School effectiveness of type 1 (Dynamic Integrated Schools) is 3.23. School effectiveness of type 2 (Administrative Vertical Schools) is 2.94. School effectiveness of type 3 (Teacher Horizontal Schools) is 3.2. School effectiveness of type 4 (Static Inertia Schools) is 2.94. The F test was 14.422 ($p < .001$) with .001 level of significance. The method of scheffe' post-hoc comparison was applied to test the differences between any two types of schools. Significance differences were found between type 1 and type 2, type 3 and type 2, type 1 and type 4, and type 3 and type 4. School effectivenesses of type 1 and type 3 were higher than type 2 and type 4. The η^2 is 51.3% with a high effect size, and the statistical power ($1-\beta$) is 1.

Discussions and related suggestions were provided based on the findings of this study by the researchers

Keywords: leadership dynamics; leadership community of school; principals' transformational leadership; teachers' self-management; school effectiveness

