TEACHERS AS TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERS: DO STUDENT EVALUATIONS HELP?

Venkat R. Krishnan

Transformational leadership involves addressing the real needs and not just the stated wants of followers. Student evaluations focus on the process and not the outcome of teaching; they help fulfill stated wants but not the real needs. This paper reports a study that used a pre-test post-test design to measure teaching effectiveness.

When we wish to evaluate the effectiveness of the course of treatment given by a physician (medical practitioner), we seek to know whether the intended goal of treatment has been achieved. We do not rest satisfied with asking the patient about the process of treatment. However, when it comes to teaching a course, we seem to be satisfied with asking the students about the process of teaching. Student assessment of teaching may be useful input for teachers to modify their teaching style, but it cannot be taken as a measure of teaching effectiveness. Effectiveness is a question of whether intended objectives are achieved or not, just as a physician is considered effective if the disease is cured.

Transactional leadership seeks to fulfill the stated wants of followers, while transformational leadership helps achieve the real needs of followers. Student evaluations of teaching may encourage transactional leadership, which is a prescription for mediocrity. Addressing the real needs of followers, irrespective of whether it fully pleases them or not, is transformational leadership, which results in performance beyond expectations. This paper reports a study that used a pre-test post-test design to measure teaching effectiveness. It operationally defined the dependent variable, collected baseline measurements of this variable, imposed the intervention, and then measured any change in the dependent variable.

Theory and Hypotheses

Leadership could be broadly classified into two categories based on the nature of leader-follower interactions. The first one is transactional leadership and the second is transforming or transformational leadership (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership involves an exchange of valued things, and it is based on current values and motivations of both leaders and followers. It addresses the stated wants of followers. Transformational leadership on the other hand, does not take the current values and motivations to be fixed, but rather seeks to change them. It addresses the real needs of followers.

Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) identified two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. The more traditional transactional leadership involves an exchange relationship between leaders and followers,

but transformational leadership is based on leaders' shifting the values, beliefs, and needs of their followers. It is known to result in superior performance in organizations facing renewal and change. According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership "occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (page 20), and results in a transforming effect on both leaders and followers. Transformational leaders thus serve as an independent force in changing the makeup of followers' motive base through gratifying their motives.

Bass (1985) built on Burns' (1978) work and described transformational leadership in terms of the impact that it has on followers; followers feel trust, admiration, and loyalty towards the leader. Transformational leaders motivate followers to do more than the latter originally expected to do. Transformational leadership consists of four factors—charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Charisma could be further divided into two factors—idealized influence attributed and idealized influence behavior (Bass, 1998). Behling and McFillen (1996) identified six attributes of transformational leadership: Displaying empathy, dramatizing the mission, projecting self-assurance, enhancing the leader's image, assuring followers of their competency, providing followers with opportunities to experience success.

According to Burns (1978), "the result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (page 4). Transformational leaders throw themselves into a dynamic relationship with followers who will feel elevated by it and become more active themselves, thereby creating new cadres of leaders. Transformational leadership alters and elevates the motives, values, and goals of followers through the vital teaching role of leadership, enabling leaders and followers to be united in the pursuit of higher goals. Transformational leaders raise their followers up through levels of morality. The issue of moral leadership concerned Burns the most. He considered moral leadership as emerging from, and always returning to, the fundamental wants, needs, aspirations, and values of the followers. Satisfaction of followers' authentic needs is the primary objective of moral leadership. Burns held that transformational leadership "ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both" (page 20).

Studies have found significant and positive relationships between transformational leadership and the amount of effort followers are willing to exert, satisfaction with the leader, ratings of job performance, and perceived effectiveness (Bass, 1998). A study by Howell and Frost (1989) concluded that individuals working under a charismatic leader had higher task performance (in terms of the number of courses of action suggested and quality of performance), higher task satisfaction and lower role conflict and ambiguity in comparison to individuals working under considerate leaders or under structuring leaders. Leader's vision and vision implementation through task cues affects performance and many attitudes of subordinates (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Baum, Locke, and Kirkpatrick (1998) found additional support for this in their study. They concluded that vision and vision communication have positive effects upon organizational level performances. Strength of delivery of vision by the leader is an especially important determinant of perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). Stewart (2006) did a meta-analysis of 93 studies and found that transformational leadership exhibited a consistently positive relationship with collective performance. Zhu, Chew, and Spangler (2005) found that human-capital-enhancing human resource management fully mediated the relationship between CEO transformational leadership and subjective assessment of organizational outcomes. Although transformational leadership is applicable to most organizational situations, the emergence and effectiveness of such leadership may be facilitated by some contexts and inhibited by others (Garg & Krishnan, 2003; Shamir & Howell, 1999).

Several studies have obtained support for a positive relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment (Ozaralli, 2003). Jung and Sosik (2002) conducted a study to examine whether transformational leadership increases group effectiveness by empowering

followers to perform their job independently from the leader, highlights the importance of cooperation in performing collective tasks, and realigns followers' values to create a more cohesive group. Results indicated that transformational leadership was positively related to empowerment, group cohesiveness, and group effectiveness. Empowerment was positively related to collective-efficacy, which in turn was positively related to group members' perceived group effectiveness. Jung, Chow, and Wu (2003) showed that there exists a positive link between transformational leadership and organizational innovation. In addition, transformational leadership has significant and positive relationships with both empowerment and an innovation-supporting organizational climate.

Rafferty and Griffin (2006) drew a theoretical and empirical distinction between developmental leadership and supportive leadership, which are currently encompassed in a single sub-dimension of transformational leadership, namely individualized consideration. They found that developmental leadership displayed significantly stronger relationships with job satisfaction, career certainty, affective commitment to the organization, and role breadth self-efficacy than did supportive leadership. Mccann, Langford, and Rawlings (2006) tested the mediating role of follower beliefs (awe, inspiration, and empowerment) in the relationship between charismatic/transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment as hypothesized by Behling and McFillen (1996). They found that the follower beliefs of awe and inspiration, but not empowerment, mediated the effect of leader behaviors on affective commitment. Pillai and Williams (2004) found that transformational leaders built committed and high performing work groups by enhancing employee self-efficacy and cohesiveness.

Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) found that transformational leadership was significantly positively related to perceived levels of the five core job characteristics (variety, identity, significance, autonomy, and feedback), which were related to intrinsic motivation and goal commitment. Intrinsic motivation was related to both task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Keller (2006) studied transformational leadership, initiating structure, and selected substitutes for leadership as longitudinal predictors of performance. As hypothesized, transformational leadership predicted 1-year-later technical quality, schedule performance, and cost performance and 5-year-later profitability and speed to market. The substitutes of subordinate ability and an intrinsically satisfying task each predicted technical quality and profitability, and ability predicted speed to market.

Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000) found that followers' sense of collective identity and perceived group task performance mediated the relationship between charismatic leadership and followers' feelings of empowerment. Nandal and Krishnan (2000) found that three of the five factors of charismatic leadership were positively related to lack of role ambiguity, which in turn was positively related to self-efficacy. Hepworth and Towler (2004) found that psychological empowerment partially mediated the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression. Avolio, Zhu, Koh, and Bhatia (2004) showed that psychological empowerment mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' organizational commitment.

Pounder (2008) examined the applicability of the full-range leadership model—that included transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and non-leadership—to an unusual organizational setting, namely a university classroom. As the study took place in Hong Kong, it also considered the relevance of full-range leadership to an Asian rather than a western context. A classroom leadership instrument was developed and tested in the business school of one of the Hong Kong universities. The Hong Kong findings lent support to the argument that the full-range leadership paradigm is applicable across organizations and cultures. He found that scores on each of the transformational classroom leadership dimensions were significantly and positively correlated with students' willingness to put in extra effort, perceived effectiveness of the teacher, and satisfaction with the teacher.

Student Evaluations of Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching are routinely taken in many educational institutions across the world. There is an impressive body of knowledge regarding those evaluations. Marques, Lane, and Dorfman (1979) found that the dimensions of teaching, in order of importance, were (a) amount of information imparted in the course, (b) arousal of student interest, (c) lecture and/or presentation style, (d) instructor's general knowledge of the field, (e) intellectual demand of the course, (f) general rapport with students, and (g) clarity of course requirements and grading procedures. Marsh and Overall (1980) attempted to validate teaching evaluations against both cognitive and affective criteria of effective instruction. They found that both cognitive and affective criteria of effective teaching were correlated with different components of students' ratings; however, the cognitive and affective criteria were not correlated with each other. Marsh (1984) reviewed findings and research designs used to study students' evaluations of teaching and concluded that class-average student ratings are (a) multidimensional; (b) reliable and stable; (c) primarily a function of the instructor who teaches a course rather than the course that is taught; (d) relatively valid against a variety of indicators of effective teaching; (e) relatively unaffected by a variety of variables hypothesized as potential biases; and (f) seen to be useful by faculty as feedback about their teaching, by students for use in course selection, and by administrators for use in personnel decisions.

Howard, Conway, and Maxwell (1985) showed that student and former student ratings displayed substantially greater validity coefficients of teaching effectiveness than self-report, colleague, and trained observer ratings. However, the validity of student ratings has been questioned by several authors. It is well established that students' evaluative ratings of instruction correlate positively with expected course grades. Greenwald and Gillmore (1997) presented data that were most consistent with the theory that the grades-ratings correlation is due to an unwanted influence of instructors' grading leniency on ratings. Babad, Avni-Babad, and Rosenthal (2003) showed that a few seconds of high school teachers' nonverbal behavior predicted students' ratings of these teachers and that the relationship varied among various instructional situations. The most negative nonverbal behavior-ratings relations were found for teachers' differential nonverbal behavior toward high- versus low-achieving students. However, Marsh and Roche (2000) refuted the claim that student evaluations of teaching are substantially biased by low workload and grading leniency.

For years researchers have shown a positive relationship between grades and the evaluations students give to instructors. Numerous reasons for this effect have been suggested and vigorously debated. Clayson, Frost, and Sheffet (2006) proposed and studied a new hypothesis for the relationship, called reciprocity, which states that students reward instructors who give them good grades and punish instructors who give them poor grades, irrespective of any instructor or preexisting student characteristic. Using within-class data they found that changes in grades in the last half of a term were met with systematic and corresponding changes in the evaluations students gave to their instructors. Further, they found a relationship between change in grades and change in evaluations when controlling for both student and instructor characteristics. Only a reciprocity effect fully explained the results.

Several authors have also questioned the usefulness of student ratings. Marsh (2007) presented a serious challenge for existing programs that assume that students' evaluations of teaching alone are sufficient to improve teaching effectiveness. Redding (1998) noted that though student evaluations of teaching are widely used as an easy and objective means to evaluate teachers, their use has produced an unintended consequence—grade inflation, a primary contributor to declining academic standards and the "dumbing-down" of the curriculum. He also contended that the practice of inflating grades to increase student ratings suggests a lack of integrity. Friedrich (1998) commented that there is still much to learn about how student ratings might best be used to improve teaching and personnel decision making. He also claimed that there may be unique issues facing teachers in psychology that call for the exploration of teaching evaluations in a different light.

According to Armstrong (1998), there is no evidence that the use of student ratings improves learning in the long run. Student ratings do not improve the allocation of faculty effort between teaching and research, or the quality of the educational experience. Furthermore, the existing evidence on ratings-learning relationship seems to be based heavily on studies involving rote learning. The studies provide no breakdown of evidence for studies where skill development is the goal. Students' ratings of teachers are intended to change the behavior of teachers. We do not have evidence that these changes are likely to contribute to learning. In fact, faculty members might tailor the class to try to appeal to the least common denominator to avoid having dissatisfied students. Teachers may make their classes less challenging and decide that it is risky to work on skill development. They may give higher grades in the belief that this will improve ratings. They might reduce the workload in the belief that this improves ratings. Some of these beliefs, such as the latter, seem to be correct. Student evaluations are detrimental to students because they are a signal that responsibility for learning lies not with them, but with teachers and administrators. When people do not accept responsibility for their learning, they are not very successful. The loss of responsibility is expected to be most serious when the goal is skill development, especially when these skills are important to the learner.

The most serious problem with the entire student evaluation process is that it focuses on assessing teaching instead of assessing learning directly. Students could be asked to answer questions about their own performance because it is the students, not teachers, who are the producers of learning. Students could be asked "Were you clear about your objectives? Were you well prepared? Were you organized? Did you spend much time on learning tasks? Did you do the assigned work to the best of your ability? What new concepts and techniques did you master?" Their responses are likely to be related to learning. For an even more direct approach, departments (not teachers) could give common examinations, preferably at the end of a program of study. For example, it should be a relatively straightforward process to design exercises to determine whether students have mastered various techniques, such as how to listen to a client, set objectives, design an experiment, conduct a survey, assess the reliability and validity of information, or use statistical evidence. The effectiveness of a teacher could then be directly assessed by how well her or his students did in these evaluations (Armstrong, 1998).

Buck (1998) raised a fundamental question regarding the basic philosophy behind student evaluations of teaching. As scientists, if we want to determine whether an intervention had an effect, we would operationally define the dependent variable, possibly collect baseline measurements of this variable, impose the intervention, and then measure any change in the dependent variable. Why is it that researchers and instructors who study teaching effectiveness seem content to indirectly measure characteristics of their intervention (i.e., teaching) to determine whether the intervention was effective? The continued focus on students' evaluations being synonymous with teaching effectiveness has diverted academia from its overall academic goal. Equating teaching behaviors or styles with effectiveness or learning has resulted in the dangerous entrenched doctrine that student ratings or measurements of teaching behaviors are considered to be the best way to measure or define teaching effectiveness.

In much of the literature on student evaluations of teaching, the phrase "teaching effectiveness" almost always could have been replaced more accurately with the phrases "teaching behaviors" or "teaching styles." The definition of teaching effectiveness depends on one's definition of the goals of teaching. The goal of teaching could be defined as changing the behavior of students (termed as training) or developing the capacity of students to learn (called education). On the basis of a set of objectives relative to the course material, we are supposed to provide instructions and an environment that helps achieve the goal of teaching by the end of the course. Instead of relying on students' evaluations, instructors could first create well-defined behavioral objectives and methods for determining whether the students master them. Instructors could then collect from students at the beginning of each course data on baseline skill levels relative to course objectives. At the end of the course, data should be collected on final performance on course objectives, and instructors should then report the products of their teaching effectiveness (Buck, 1998).

Transformational Leadership and Student Ratings

According to Burns (1978: 61), the original sources of leadership and followership lie in vast pools of human wants and in the transformation of wants into needs, social aspirations, collective expectations, and political demands. Human wants are biological imperatives; they are the most widely distributed, intensely felt, and "absolutely dependable" motives. By wants are meant the palpable tissue demands in their simplest and most powerful state, expressed in the phenomena of persons directly and consciously feeling the lack of air or warmth or food or drink. The feeling of want is highly subjective, internal, and autonomous, as with a day-old infant wanting nourishment; the want stems from a drive, a tissue necessity, born into the child. Wants are biological requirements of the human system. They apply, in varying mixtures and degrees of intensity, to all human beings (page 63).

Burns (1978: 64) insisted that we must make a vital distinction between *wants* and *needs*. *Need* in longtime English usage implies a more socialized, collective, objective phenomenon, in the sense of persons requiring something needful in *the view of others* as well as of themselves. *Wants* are subjective, genetic, biological, organic, self-activating, inescapable. I *want* sweets but I *need* vitamins, so I am told. The distinction is worth pondering. The want is direct, conscious, internal, physiological, and to a degree undiscriminating; thus the tissue requirements of liquid are satisfied by potable liquid in almost any form. Wants, the great energizers, serve more as sources of action than guides to action. Another distinction between wants and needs has profound implications for our conception of political leadership. As subjectively felt *wants*, with their impetus toward direct and conscious action to satisfy those wants, give way more and more to socially influenced *needs* defined increasingly by others than the self, a vital element of personal volition and purpose is eroded. The wanting person will be subjected more and more intensively to leaders in various guises—parents and siblings and teachers and peers—who will seek, consciously or not, to substitute their conceptions of need.

It is in the transformation of human wants into needs that leadership first occurs. The wanting child is responding to a generalized drive shaped in the mother's womb. The child will want drink but will consume nutritionless liquid as well as milk, will want food but will eat poisoned candy as well as rice, will want to explore but will touch a scorching andiron as readily as a rubber ball. Parents who insist on milk and rice and rubber balls are substituting their own conceptions of the infant's needs for those of the child, and they do so in the pursuit of aims and values that the parents, rather than the child, establish. This is the initial act of leadership (Burns, 1978: 68).

The leader—parent, teacher, doctor, priest, schoolmate—chooses to encourage certain wants and discourage others. Drives and wants remain the basic energizers, the main "pushers," but the targets toward which the wants are directed become more focused as wants give way to needs. The child's want for food becomes, under the parents' guidance, a need for nutrition; the child's want for freedom from pain becomes, under the doctor's examination, a need for medicine (which the child would not take voluntarily). The leaders are those who closely influence stimulation and transformation of wants. There is a feedback effect in the push-pull of wants and needs: wants energize and broadly direct needs, but needs focus and channel wants. As needs "educate" wants, persons may come to want what they need. Leaders are distinguished by their quality of *not* necessarily responding to the wants of "followers," but to wants transformed into needs. Leaders respond to subjective wants and later to more objective needs as the leaders define those wants and needs. Followers' definitions of wants and needs will also change in the continuing interplay with leadership (Burns, 1978: 69).

O'Toole (1999: 192-193) quoted Woodrow Wilson as having once said, "The ear of the leader must ring with the voices of the people." O'Toole further claimed that when people are asked what they *need*, they almost always reply with what they *want*. And because everybody wants something different—and wants are limitless—would-be leaders get into trouble when they try to respond to the literal wish list of followers. Simply put, no leader can provide followers with everything they say they want. That's why John Adams counseled that Congress should not be palsied

by the will of our constituents. James Madison recognized that the expressed desires of the masses are mutually incompatible, self-serving, and seldom in the overall interest of the commonwealth. He concluded that although leaders must listen to the stated aspirations of followers, they should not become prisoners to public opinion. Instead, leaders must discern the true interests of the public and ascertain the underlying needs they have in common but are unable to articulate on their own. Then, the leaders must refine and enlarge the public views and restate them in a way that transcends the surface noise of contradiction and self-interest. In this way, it may well happen that the public voice as restated by their leaders will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves. Once having discovered the common underlying needs of followers, leaders then create a new, transcendent vision that not only is large enough to encompass the variety of needs, but, more important, elevates petty personal desires to the nobler level of a common good. In so doing, leaders hold out the promise to all of a better end than the ones they had dreamed of individually.

Friedrich (1998) commented that the pressures of teaching evaluations on faculty are very real, and their potential for manipulation goes well beyond mere concerns for leniency in grading. The politician's temptation to offer people whatever they want runs deep, and even if one could claim that these more highly satisfied students will learn more, there is little comfort to be had if what our students learn is not what we, as educators, really believe they most need to know. It is the task of the leader to ascertain the real needs of followers and articulate them in a way that is clearer than it is when followers attempt to do so (O'Toole, 1999: 193). Brewer (2005) argued that a key task for college professors is to help students develop their abilities and match them with the needs of the market place.

According to Armstrong (1998), there is little evidence that the ratings-learning relationship involves aspects of learning that are important to the student. Learning implies change, and this can be a trying experience, especially if it involves important attitudes and behavior. It is more comfortable to have one's existing beliefs and skills reinforced. For example, students give high ratings to outside speakers who tell them to rely on their gut instincts because techniques taught in school are of no value in the real world. Students are likely to rate courses more highly when their existing beliefs are confirmed. Student ratings may reduce experimentation by teachers. Ratings might also lead teachers to abandon approaches that they believe to be most effective for learning. If a course includes exercises that provide evidence that students are deficient in important skills, students are likely to give low ratings for that course, eventually resulting in instructors abandoning those exercises even if they are effective in enhancing learning.

The teacher leadership notion has developed over time and this development comprises three stages or waves. The first wave confined teacher leadership within the formal organizational hierarchy, and the department head was the archetypal teacher leader. The second wave placed more emphasis on the instructional dimension of the teaching function, but still vested teacher leadership in formally created organizational positions such as team leader and curriculum developer. The third wave integrates the notions of teaching and leadership. It emphasizes that teacher leadership is a process rather than a positional concept and notes that teacher leaders tend to possess many of the characteristics of transformational leaders. The third wave teacher leaders are excellent classroom performers. Pounder (2006) argued that a fourth wave of teacher leadership could include transformational classroom leadership as one of the defining qualities of a teacher leader and could embrace both school and university contexts. A classroom is a small social organization with teacher as leader and students as followers. Research evidence shows that there is an association between transformational leadership displayed in the classroom and exemplary classroom performance (Pounder, 2006).

O'Toole (1999: 276-277) drew a fundamental distinction between education and training. Training, according to Webster, means "forming habits of thought and behavior by discipline and instruction." Training has to do with right and wrong—right and wrong answers, right and wrong behavior. It has to do with facts, with a set body of information, with how-tos and how-to-dos. It is appropriate for routine and repetitive tasks. Education, again according to Webster, means "to develop

the faculties and powers of a person." The word comes from the Latin root of the word educe, to draw out. It is therefore, a maieutic, or Socratic, process. Education is not immediately practical. It is designed to develop the capacity to learn. We learn to ask fundamental questions and to challenge assumptions. The process, when done right, equips us to explore issues and ideas from multiple perspectives. Thus, it broadens us. It is not about learning right answers; it is about learning how to ask the right questions in order that one can become innovative, creative, and responsive to change. It is developmental.

Transformational leadership involves addressing the real needs of students, irrespective of whether it fully pleases the students or not. It requires setting clear course objectives and achieving those objectives. Student evaluations of teaching could be a hindrance in this regard, since they encourage satisfying the stated wants of students instead of giving them what they really need. A physician who is encouraged to give only pleasant treatments may end up not giving the best treatment. Addressing the real needs of students requires an objective measure of teaching effectiveness. Leadership effectiveness can only be measured by the extent to which intended goals of leadership are achieved.

Method

A measure of teaching effectiveness was introduced to test if a MBA course on power achieved its objective. The course was an elective course in a one-year fulltime MBA program in India. The class size was 30 and the course was completed over a term of six weeks. Most of the students in the course had a prior work experience of at least three years and their median age was 25 years. Of the 30 students, 11 were female and 19 were male.

The objectives of the course include enhancing political skills and increasing the awareness of the political nature of organizations. Pfeffer's (1992) book "*Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*" was used as the text book for the course. All students answered three questionnaires before the start of the course and they all answered the same three questionnaires just before the last day of the course. The questionnaires captured their political skills, attitude towards workplace politics, and acceptance of political perspective. All responses were recorded on a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = slightly disagree; 3 = neither disagree nor agree; 4 = slightly agree; 5 = strongly agree). The first questionnaire was the 18-item political skill inventory of Ferris et al. (2005). The questionnaire measured four dimensions of political skill—networking ability, interpersonal influence, social astuteness, and apparent sincerity. The mean of the 18 items was taken as the score for political skills.

The second questionnaire was on workplace politics, with the items drawn from Gandz and Murray (1980). Acceptance of the existence of workplace politics was measured using the items "The existence of workplace politics is common to most organizations" and "The higher you go in organizations, the more political the climate becomes." Success potential of workplace politics was measured using the items "Successful executives must be good politicians" and "You have to be political to get ahead in organizations." Tolerance of workplace politics was measured using the items "Top management should try to get rid of politics within the organization" and "Organizations free of politics are happier than those where there is a lot of politics" (both reverse-scored). The mean of the six items was taken as the score for attitude towards workplace politics.

The third questionnaire was the perceptions of politics scale of Kacmar and Carlson (1997). It has 15 items to capture three dimensions—general political behavior; going along to get ahead; and pay and promotion policies. The questionnaire items were presented as statements about what prevails in most business organizations, and some items were accordingly modified to remove reference to the respondent's organization. The mean of the 15 items was taken as the score for acceptance of political perspective.

Results

I did matched sample t-tests to see if the differences between the pre-course and post-course scores on the three variables—political skills, attitude towards workplace politics, and acceptance of political perspective—were significantly different from zero. The results are presented in Table 1. The post-course scores were significantly higher than pre-course scores for all the three variables.

Table 1. Matched Sample t-test

Variable	alpha	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean increase	Std Error	t Value
Political skill	0.91	3.69	3.88	0.19	0.07	**2.84
Attitude towards workplace politics	0.83	1.40	2.39	0.99	0.16	***6.19
Acceptance of political perspective	0.81	2.86	3.35	0.49	0.07	***6.74

N = 30. alpha = Standardized Cronbach coefficient alpha.
** = $p < .01$. *** = $p < .001$.

As expected, of the three variables, the increase was the least for political skills and was the highest for attitude towards workplace politics. The attitude towards workplace politics was negative at the start of the course (mean was 1.40 where 2 = 'slightly disagree' on the five-point scale) but ceased to be so at the end of the course (mean became 2.39).

Discussion

Measuring teaching effectiveness in a scientific manner like this has many positive implications. Students might base their registration decisions on which instructors are more successful at getting students to reach desired goals rather than which instructors give "easy As." This measurement would be valuable to personnel committees and administrators for making decisions on tenure and merit pay increases. Instructors could examine the effects of different teaching techniques and instructional designs by using this unit of measurement of teaching effectiveness. Instructors would likely continue collecting student surveys on their teaching styles and behaviors and use this information to find teaching characteristics they can systematically modify and to examine respective outcomes. Instructors would eventually create personalized student surveys that produce information about their teaching styles and behaviors that are related to effectiveness for their particular course. In fact, this type of educational research (i.e., examining factors of teaching effectiveness) would be encouraged at the individual instructor level because an instructor's career would depend on higher effectiveness (Buck, 1998).

More efficient instructional designs would be produced (flexible designs that can be adapted for a wide range of student needs would most likely evolve) as a result of implementing this method of validly assessing and reporting teaching effectiveness (Buck, 1998).

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The actual measure of teaching effectiveness would vary depending on whether the objectives of a course comprise cognitive outcomes or certain skills. The measure used in this study was for certain skills. In addition, even if the course seeks to enhance certain skills, the measure need not necessarily be self-reported. If the enhancing of a skill can be objectively measured by asking observers, it might make the measure more valid.

Future researchers should examine the validity of methods for evaluating students' performance as to whether they produce variables that truly measure educational gains. Once these valid measures are discerned, the value of students' evaluations of teaching can be accurately assessed

Conclusion

Teachers should be more interested in giving students what they would really need to succeed in their careers, rather than focus on giving them what is pleasant to them. A good physician is one who gives an effective treatment and not one who gives a pleasant treatment. Finding out what students want and giving them that is transactional leadership. Student evaluations of teaching encourage transactional leadership. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, gives student what they really need, which may not be fully pleasant always. An actual measure of teaching effectiveness that uses the pre-test post-test design reported in this paper would facilitate teachers becoming transformational leaders.

References

Armstrong, J. S. (1998). Are student ratings of instruction useful? *American Psychologist, 53* (11), 1223-1224.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25* (8), 951-968.

Awamleh, R. and Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 345-373.

Babad, E., Avni-Babad, D., & Rosenthal, R. (2003). Teachers' brief nonverbal behaviors in defined instructional situations can predict students' evaluations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95* (3), 553-562.

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

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1998). A longitudinal study of the relation of vision and vision communication to venture growth in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83* (1), 43-54.

Behling, O., & McFillen, J. M. (1996). A syncretic model of charismatic/transformational leadership. *Group and Organization Management, 21* (2), 163-191.

Brewer, E. W. (2005). Professor's role in motivating students to attend class. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 42* (3), http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JITE/v42n3/brewer.html.

Buck, D. (1998). Student evaluations of teaching measure the intervention, not the effect. *American Psychologist, 53* (11), 1224-1226.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Clayson, D. E., Frost, T. F., & Sheffet, M. J. (2006). Grades and the student evaluation of instruction: A test of the reciprocity effect. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5* (1), 52-65.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21* (7), 747-767.

Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. *Journal of Management, 31* (1), 126-152.

Friedrich, J. (1998). Teaching evaluations: Concerns for psychologists? *American Psychologist, 53* (11), 1226-1227.

Gandz, J., & Murray, V. V. (1980). The experience of workplace politics. *Academy of Management Journal, 23* (2), 237-251.

Garg G., & Krishnan V. R. (2003). Transformational leadership and organizational structure: The role of value-based leadership. In S. Bhargava (Ed.), *Transformational leadership: Value-based management for Indian organization (*pp. 82-100). New Delhi: Response Books (Sage Publications)

Greenwald, A. G., & Gillmore, G. M. (1997). Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. *American Psychologist, 52* (11), 1209-1217.

Hepworth, W., & Towler, A. (2004). The effects of individual differences and charismatic leadership on workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9* (2), 176-185.

Howard, G. S., Conway, C. G., & Maxwell, S. E. (1985). Construct validity of measures of college teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77* (2), 187-196.

Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43* (2), 243-269.

Jung, D. I., & Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research, 33* (3), 313-336.

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* (4/5), 525-544.

Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the perceptions of politics scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of Management, 23* (5), 627-658.

Keller, R. T. (2006). Transformational leadership, initiating structure, and substitutes for leadership: A longitudinal study of research and development project team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91* (1), 202-210.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 36-51.

Marques, T. E., Lane, D. M., & Dorfman, P. W. (1979). Toward the development of a system for instructional evaluation: Is there consensus regarding what constitutes effective teaching? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71* (6), 840-849.

Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential baises, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76* (5), 707-754.

Marsh, H. W. (2007). Do university teachers become more effective with experience? A multilevel growth model of students' evaluations of teaching over 13 years. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99* (4), 775-790.

Marsh, H. W., & Overall, J. U. (1980). Validity of students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness: Cognitive and affective criteria. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72* (4), 468-475.

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (2000). Effects of grading leniency and low workload on students' evaluations of teaching: Popular myth, bias, validity, or innocent bystanders? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92* (1), 202-228.

Mccann, J. A. J., Langford, P. H., & Rawlings, R. M. (2006). Testing Behling and McFillen's syncretical model of charismatic/transformational leadership. *Group and Organization Management, 31* (2), 237-263.

Nandal V., & Krishnan V. R. (2000). Charismatic leadership and self-efficacy: Importance of role clarity. *Management and Labour Studies. 25* (4), 231-243.

O'Toole, J. (1999). *Leadership A to Z: A guide for the appropriately ambitious*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal, 49* (2), 327-340.

Pillai, R., & Williams, E. A. (2004). Transformational leadership, self-efficacy, group cohesiveness, commitment, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17* (2), 144-159.

Pounder, J. S. (2006). Transformational classroom leadership: The fourth wave of teacher leadership? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 34* (4), 533-545.

Pounder, J. S. (2008). Full-range classroom leadership: Implications for the cross-organizational and cross-cultural applicability of the transformational-transactional paradigm. *Leadership, 4* (2), 115-135.

Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). Refining individualized consideration: Distinguishing developmental leadership and supportive leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79* (1), 37-61.

Redding, R. E. (1998). Students' evaluations of teaching fuel grade inflation. *American Psychologist, 53* (11), 1227-1228.

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 10* (2), 257-283.

Stewart, G. L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance. *Journal of Management, 32* (1), 29-55.

Zhu, W., Chew, I. K. H., & Spangler, W. D. (2005). CEO transformational leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of human-capital-enhancing human resource management. *Leadership Quarterly, 16* (1), 39-52.