



## Research Article

# TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL: A CASE REPORT FROM KIEN GIANG, VIETNAM

*Du Thong Nhat*

*Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Vietnam*

*Corresponding author: Du Thong Nhat – Email: [nhatdt@hcmue.edu.vn](mailto:nhatdt@hcmue.edu.vn)*

*Received: May 10, 2020; Revised: May 20, 2020; Accepted: May 28, 2020*

## ABSTRACT

*Transformational leadership has been seen as an important issue in Human Resources management and empirical educational research. This article presented the findings of a study in which the transformational leadership scale (TLS) was adapted to Vietnamese educational context in order to describe the principals' transformational leadership as perceived by 655 Vietnamese elementary school teachers in Kien Giang province for the school year 2014-2015. The purpose of this study was to determine the transformational leadership level of elementary school principals. The study used a quantitative research method and employed a descriptive research design. The reliability scores for five dimensions of TLS ranging from .80 to .94 were satisfactory. The findings indicated that the elementary school teachers perceived their principals fairly often present transformational leadership. Besides, there were significant differences in the perceptions of elementary school teachers about the dimensions of transformational leadership, according to their gender, degree, school size, and school location.*

**Keywords:** transformational leadership; principal; elementary school; teacher; Kien Giang province

## 1. Introduction

from the 1800s through the early 20th century, the concept of leadership was investigated in terms of characteristics or traits theory (Creighton, 2005). This concept was based on the assumption that people were born with congenital characteristics or traits for successful leaders, such as high intelligence, a good memory, persuasiveness, and unlimited amounts of energy (Amoroso, 2002). However, at the mid - 20<sup>th</sup> century, the trait theory was debated by scholars and researchers because of its lack of predictability (Amoroso, 2002). Due to the unreliability of the trait theory, scholars and researchers

---

**Cite this article as:** Du Thong Nhat (2020). Transformational leadership of elementary school principal: a case report from Kien Giang, Vietnam. *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science*, 17(5), 887-899.

began to concentrate on the observable leadership behaviors, known as behavioral leadership theory (Horn-Turpin, 2009).

In mid 1900s, behavioral leadership was the dominant theory. In this era of observable leadership behaviors, two key research studies were carried out by researchers from the University of Michigan and Ohio State. Both studies obtained similar results. The study of Ohio State identified two central leadership behaviors: (a) behavior centered on structure and (b) behavior based on consideration. Since these leadership behaviors were exhibited, it was premised the leader provides structure for his or her followers, and the leader considers or cares about their employees (Horn-Turpin, 2009).

The study of Vieluf, Kunter, and van de Vijver (2013) revealed the similar results that corresponded to the two behaviors identified in the Ohio State study: (a) production-oriented and (b) employee-oriented. The production-oriented behavior was homologous to the structure behavior in the Ohio State study, which involved completion of tasks. The employee-oriented behavior was homologous to the consideration-based behavior in the Ohio State study. Leaders who displayed the employee-oriented behavior also showed human relationship-oriented skills and relationships with her or his followers. These above studies provided evidences supporting the notion that effective leaders must be cognizant of both task and relationship orientation. Moreover, these studies also suggested that task orientation behavior may need for some organizations while relationship-oriented behavior may require for others (Creighton, 2005).

Since the late 1970s, a new leadership paradigm which has strongly attracted attention has been known as transformational leadership theory. It was first introduced by Burns (1978) in his seminal work *Leadership as* contrasting the characteristics of transformational with transactional leadership (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). According to Burns (1978), leaders approach their followers with the intent of “exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions”. In transformational leadership, the leader strives for understanding employees’ needs and motives. The main point is to shift the need from the leader to the followers. Through gaining an understanding of the followers’ needs, “the transformational leader can potentially convert followers into leaders” (Horn-Turpin, 2009).

Numerous studies which have been conducted in countries where schools are high decentralization confirm that school leadership is the key to the effectiveness of school organizations (Gkolia, Belias, & Koustelios, 2014). Leaders who can develop a positive school culture they can improve the quality of their schools (Gkolia et al., 2014). In the setting of Vietnamese elementary school, the principal’s transformational leadership has not been explored. Thus, the present paper was designed to examine the current situation on transformational leadership of elementary school principals.

## 2. Content

### 2.1. Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is defined as “a process of influencing in which leaders change their associate awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way” (Bass, & Avolio, 2004). Transformational leadership theory, originally, introduced by Burns (1978) and later expanded by Bass (1985), and by Bass and Avolio (1994), which has become the most widely regarded leadership concept in current education research (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leadership includes four components: (1) idealized influence (including two subdimensions, idealized attribution and idealized behavior), (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) individual consideration.

*Idealized Influence:* Transformational leaders display behaviors of honesty, integrity, power, confidence, having a collective responsibility and genuine care for others is admired by his or her employees. Idealized Influence (Attributed) refers to leaders who have ability to build trust in their followers, and Idealized Influence (Behavior) refers to leaders who act with integrity (Bass, & Avolio, 2004).

*Inspirational Motivation:* Transformational leaders inspire followers by providing meaning and challenge to the work, communicating high expectations for the group, sharing vision, and arousing enthusiasm and optimism about the future of the organization (Bass, & Avolio, 2004).

*Intellectual Stimulation:* Transformational leaders stimulate their followers' innovation and creativity by promoting critical thinking to solve problems, questioning assumptions, approaching old situations in new ways, and soliciting creative ideas to problems (Bass, & Avolio, 2004).

*Individual Consideration:* Transformational leaders pay close attention to the individual needs of followers for achievement and growth. Leaders act as a mentor and coach with recognizing individual abilities, aspirations, and strengths (Bass, & Avolio, 2004).

### 2.2. Methodology

#### 2.2.1. Sample

The participants were part of a convenience sample of 665 elementary teachers (60.3%, n=395 men; 39.7%, n=260 women) from 28 schools in six school districts in Kien Giang, the Southern part of Vietnam. There were 655 valid responses from 1000 copies of questionnaires that were delivered. Participants were working in large schools (49.5%, n=324), medium-sized schools (42.4%, n=278), and small schools (8.1%, n=53) and held a university degree (76.3%, n=500), an associate degree (17.7%, n=116), and diplomas (6.0%,

n=39). About two thirds of the participants in the sample (69.6%, n=456) taught in rural areas, whereas 30.4% (n=199) taught in urban areas.

### 2.2.2. Instrument

a questionnaire with 20 items on transformational leadership was designed to investigate the principals' transformational leadership as perceived by 655 Vietnamese elementary school teachers. it was adapted from the 45-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ - Rater Form 5X) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004). MLQ is categorized into nine leadership dimensions (i.e., idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behaviors), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent rewards, active management-by-exception, passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire) and three outcome effects (i.e., extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction). The original dimensions of Transformational Leadership Scale as identified by Bass and Avolio (2004) included idealized influence (attributed) (items 10, 18, 21, 25), idealized influence (behaviors) (items 6, 14, 23, 34), inspirational motivation (items 9, 13, 26, 36), intellectual stimulation (items 2, 8, 30, 32), and individual consideration (items 15, 19, 29, 31). In this study, the dimension item numbers on the TLS were rearranged as follows: (a) idealized influence (attributed) (items 5, 9, 11, 13), (b) idealized influence (behaviors) (items 2, 7, 12, 19), (c) inspirational motivation (items 4, 6, 14, 20), (d) intellectual stimulation (items 1, 3, 16, 18), and (e) individual consideration (items 8, 10, 15, 17). The instrument was purchased under invoice # 28561.

For this study, the response format employed a 5-point Likert scale with the following categories: with 1 denoting "not at all", 2 as "once in a while", 3 as "sometimes", 4 as "fairly often", 5 = "frequently", if not always instead of the original response anchors were: 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, 4 = frequently, if not always. The average means scores that range from 1 to 1.80 are rated as 'not at all'. It means that the principal is perceived as not transformational in his/her leadership. The mean scores ranging from 1.81 to 2.60 are rated as 'once in a while', which means that the principal is perceived as less transformational in his/her leadership. the means scores from 2.61 to 3.4 are rated as 'sometimes' represented a perception that the principal is moderate transformational in his/her leadership. the mean scores ranging from 3.41 to 4.20 are rated as 'fairly often' represented a perception that the principal is more transformational in his/her leadership. the mean scores ranging from 4.21 to 5.0 are rated as 'frequently, if not always' represented a perception that the principal is most transformational in his/her leadership. The averages for each dimension are calculated to identify whether a principal's leadership behavior is perceived as "more or less transformational than the norm" (Bass, & Avolio, 2004) by their teachers.

### 2.2.3. Data Analysis

SPSS software, version 20, were used for analyzing the collected data from the survey and testing the reliability of the scales. Descriptive statistics was employed for measuring mean scores (Mean), frequency distributions (n), standard deviations (SD), and the percentage of responses (%). The independent t-test was conducted for testing two group comparisons (gender, school location). Then, multiple ANOVA tests followed by Scheffé post-hoc test were used for testing three or more group comparisons (degree and school size) to find differences in the perceived principal's transformational leadership.

### 2.2.4. Reliabilities and intercorrelations of the TLS dimensions

Table 2.1 shows that there was a high level reliability of five dimensions of TLS. The reliability scores for these dimensions ranged from .80 to .94 (for idealized influence attribution,  $\alpha=.888$ ; for idealized influence behaviors,  $\alpha=.887$ , for inspirational motivation  $\alpha=.937$ , for intellectual stimulation  $\alpha=.943$ , for individual consideration  $\alpha=.800$ ). A coefficient alpha for internal consistency of the scale greater than .70 indicates satisfactory reliability (Field, 2013). These reliabilities were similar to the previous research alphas of Avolio and Bass (2004), which ranged from .86 to .91 (namely  $\alpha=.86$ ,  $\alpha=.86$ ,  $\alpha=.91$ ,  $\alpha=.90$ ,  $\alpha=.90$  for these dimensions respectively) (Bass, & Avolio, 2004). Table 2.1 also indicates that there was strong convergence between each TLS dimension. These correlations averaged .767 (range = .718–.812). The findings suggested that the internal consistency reliability of five dimensions of TLS is satisfactory and stable. The instrument is consistent reliability.

**Table 2.1.** Alpha Reliabilities and Intercorrelations  
of the Transformational Leadership Scale Dimensions

Dimension	Coefficient Alpha		Intercorrelations			
	This study	By A&B	1	2	3	4
1 Idealized Influence (Attributed)	.888	.86	-			
2 Idealized Influence (Behavior)	.887	.86	.774**	-		
3 Inspirational Motivation	.937	.91	.789**	.812**	-	
4 Intellectual Stimulation	.943	.90	.750**	.807**	.780**	-
5 Individual Consideration	.800	.90	.744**	.723**	.718**	.770**

Note. \*\*  $p < 0.01$  (2-tailed). A&B = Avolio & Bass.

## 3. Finding and Discussion

### 3.1. Vietnamese Elementary School Teachers' perception of Principal's Transformational Leadership

Table 3.1 shows Descriptive statistics for each of the individual items of the TLS grouped by dimensions.

The average item mean scores of the 20-item TLS dimensions were ranked from high to low as follows: 3.91 (SD=.78) for idealized influence (behavior), 3.85 (SD=.81) for

intellectual stimulation, 3.82 (SD=.86) for inspirational motivation, 3.73 (SD=.90) for idealized influence (attributed), and 3.48 (SD=.90) for individual consideration. Overall transformational leadership mean of 3.76 indicated that the study participants had a perception that their principal was more transformational in his/her leaderships.

The highest average idealized influence (attributed) score was 3.87 for “Displays a sense of power and confidence”. The lowest average idealized influence (attributed) score was 3.61 for item “Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.” The highest average idealized influence (behavior) score was 4.05 for item “Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.” The lowest average idealized influence (behavior) score was 3.80 for the item “Talks about their most important values and beliefs”. The highest average inspirational motivation score was 3.80 for the item “Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved”. The lowest average inspirational motivation score was 3.79 for the item “Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.” The highest average intellectual stimulation score was 3.91 for the item “Re-examines critical assumption to question whether they are appropriate.” The lowest average intellectual stimulation score was 3.80 for the item “Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments”. The highest average individual consideration score was item “Spends time teaching and coaching”. The lowest average individual consideration score was 3.25 for the item “Considers me as having different need, abilities, and aspirations from others.”

**Table 3.1.** Average Item Mean and Standard Deviation (SD)  
for Transformational Leadership Scale Grouped by Dimensions

Dimensions and Items Content	Average Item Mean	SD
<i>Idealized Influence (Attributed) (IA)</i>	3.73	.90
5. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her	3.61	1.06
9. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group	3.67	1.08
11. Acts in a way that builds my respect	3.79	1.03
13. Displays a sense of power and confidence	3.87	1.00
<i>Idealized Influence (Behaviors) (IB)</i>	3.91	.78
2. Talks about their most important values and beliefs	3.80	.90
7. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	3.87	.91
12. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	3.94	.90
19. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission	4.05	.89
<i>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</i>	3.82	.86
4. Talks optimistically about the future	3.81	.94
6. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	3.79	.97

14. Articulates a compelling vision of the future	3.83	.92
20. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved	3.85	.91
<i>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</i>	3.85	.81
1. Re-examines critical assumption to question whether they are appropriate	3.91	.85
3. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems	3.88	.85
16. Get me to look at problems from many different angles	3.80	.89
18. Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	3.80	.91
<i>Individual Consideration (IC)</i>	3.48	.90
8. Spends time teaching and coaching	3.64	1.12
10. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of the group	3.41	1.05
15. Considers me as having different need, abilities, and aspirations from others	3.25	1.25
17. Helps me develop my strengths	3.62	1.15
<b>Overall Scale</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>.77</b>

### 3.2. Differences in Elementary School Principal's Transformational Leadership according to Demographic Characteristics

#### (i) By Gender

Table 3.2 shows that male teachers ( $M=3.60$ ,  $SD=.84$ ) had significantly higher level of perception with individual consideration than female teachers ( $M=3.41$ ,  $SD=.94$ ). A possible explanation for this might be that the majority of female teachers do less administrative work at school. After teaching, they come back home to complete household tasks such as taking care children, cooking, washing, etc., so they have little time and opportunity to share their feelings with colleagues and especially with the principal. meanWhile. male teachers were provided with a chance to collaborate with each other and work with their principal in common school mission. Hence, male teachers were perceived to have received the individual consideration of the elementary school principals whom the majority are men. This finding is similar to previous research outcomes of Wu (2010) in that male teachers had significantly higher average score with individual consideration than that of female teachers. There were no significant differences between male and female ragarding Four other dimensions of the transformational leadership and overall transformational leadership. This implies that male and female teachers would be similar in their perception with idealized influence attributed, idealized influence behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and overall transformational leadership.

**Table 3.2.** Independent *t*-Test of Differences in the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Gender

Dimension	Male(n=260)		Female(n=395)		<i>t</i> (563)	<i>p</i>	95%CI	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			LL	UL
IA	3.74	0.86	3.73	0.93	0.20	.841	-0.13	0.16
IB	3.95	0.75	3.89	0.80	1.00	.319	-0.06	0.18
IM	3.86	0.83	3.79	0.87	1.09	.276	-0.06	0.21
IS	3.92	0.79	3.80	0.82	1.76	.079	-0.01	0.24
IC	3.60	0.84	3.41	0.94	2.68*	.008	0.05	0.33
Overall TLS	3.81	0.73	3.72	0.79	1.494	.136	-0.03	0.21

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

(ii) By Degree

Table 3.3 reveals that teachers who earned an associate degree ( $M=3.94$ ,  $SD=.76$ ) were greater in attributed idealized influence than those teachers who held a university degree ( $M=3.69$ ,  $SD=.93$ ), ( $F=3.74$ ,  $p < .05$ ). A possible explanation for this might be due to the fact that the principals, in the process of leadership, pay much attention to teachers with lower degree in order to encourage and motivate them to enhance teaching. It could also be that the principals are more active in a way that make them feel a sense of respect, pride, power, and confidence. There were no significant differences between teachers who earned different degrees regarding Four other dimensions of transformational leadership and also for overall transformational leadership. This shows that teachers who had different degrees would be similar in their perception, especially with idealized influence behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and overall transformational leadership. There were no empirical studies regarding differences in teachers' degree and dimensions of transformational leadership in Vietnam.

**Table 3.3.** Descriptive Statistics and One-way ANOVA of Differences in the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Degree

Dimension	Degree	n	Mean	SD	<i>F</i> ( <i>df</i> =2)	<i>p</i>	Scheffé Test
IA	1. Diploma	39	3.65	0.96	3.74*	.024	2>3
	2. College	116	3.94	0.76			
	3. University	500	3.69	0.93			
IB	1. Diploma	39	3.88	0.90	0.86	.423	--
	2. College	116	4.00	0.65			
	3. University	500	3.90	0.80			
IM	1. Diploma	39	3.78	1.06	1.88	.153	--
	2. College	116	3.96	0.72			
	3. University	500	3.79	0.87			



IS	1. Diploma	39	3.85	0.96	1.31	.272	--
	2. College	116	3.96	0.69			
	3. University	500	3.82	0.82			
IC	1. Diploma	39	3.53	1.08	1.17	.311	--
	2. College	116	3.59	0.76			
	3. University	500	3.45	0.92			
Overall TLS	1. Diploma	39	3.74	0.92	2.04	.131	--
	2. College	116	3.89	0.63			
	3. University	500	3.73	0.78			

Note. \*  $p < .05$ .

(iii) *By School Size*

Table 3.4 indicates that teachers who taught at large schools and medium-sized schools ( $M=3.81$ ,  $SD=.90$ ;  $M=3.72$ ,  $SD=.90$ , respectively) had idealized influence (attributed) than those at small schools ( $M=3.36$ ,  $SD=.85$ ), ( $F=5.72$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Also for idealized influence behavior, teachers who taught at large schools ( $M=3.94$ ,  $SD=.77$ ) had higher level of perception than those at small schools ( $M=3.65$ ,  $SD=.73$ ), ( $F=3.47$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Besides, teachers who taught at large schools ( $M=3.89$ ,  $SD=.82$ ) had greater inspirational motivation than those at small schools ( $M=3.52$ ,  $SD=.74$ ), ( $F=4.26$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Furthermore, teachers who taught at large schools and medium-sized schools ( $M=3.88$ ,  $SD=.79$ ;  $M=3.88$ ,  $SD=.81$ , respectively) were greater in intellectual stimulation than those at small schools ( $M=.51$ ,  $SD=.81$ ), ( $F=4.99$ ,  $p<.05$ ). In addition, teachers who taught at large schools ( $M=3.54$ ,  $SD=.91$ ) were greater in individual consideration than those at small schools ( $M=3.16$ ,  $SD=.85$ ), ( $F=3.95$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Also for the overall transformational leadership, teachers who taught at large schools and medium-sized schools ( $M=3.81$ ,  $SD=.76$ ;  $M=3.76$ ,  $SD=.78$ , respectively) had higher level of perception than those at small schools ( $M=3.44$ ,  $SD=.70$ ), ( $F=5.35$ ,  $p<.05$ ). A possible reason for this might be due to the fact that teachers who teach at large schools and medium-sized schools were provided with greater opportunity to participate in community activities, cooperate with each other and work together with the principal in common school mission. thus, they were more experienced in the transformational leadership than those at small schools.

**Table 3.4.** *Descriptive Statistics and One-way ANOVA of Differences in the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to School Size*

Dimension	School Size	n	Mean	SD	$F$ ( $df=2$ )	$p$	Scheffé Test
IA	1. Small school	53	3.36	0.85	5.72*	.003	2>1 3>1
	2. Medium-Sized s.	278	3.72	0.90			
	3. Large schools	324	3.81	0.90			

IB	1. Small school	53	3.65	0.73	3.47*	.032	3>1
	2. Medium-Sized s.	278	3.93	0.79			
	3. Large schools	324	3.94	0.77			
IM	1. Small school	53	3.52	0.74	4.26*	.015	3>1
	2. Medium-Sized s.	278	3.80	0.90			
	3. Large schools	324	3.89	0.82			
IS	1. Small school	53	3.51	0.81	4.99*	.007	2>1 3>1
	2. Medium-Sized s.	278	3.88	0.81			
	3. Large schools	324	3.88	0.79			
IC	1. Small school	53	3.16	0.85	3.95*	.020	3>1
	2. Medium-Sized s.	278	3.48	0.90			
	3. Large schools	324	3.54	0.91			
Overall TLS	1. Small school	53	3.44	0.70	5.35*	.005	2>1 3>1
	2. Medium-Sized s.	278	3.76	0.78			
	3. Large schools	324	3.81	0.76			

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . Small school =  $\leq 12$  classes; Medium-Sized school = 13-24 classes; Large schools =  $\geq 25$  classes.

(iv) *By School Location*

Table 3.5 shows that teachers who taught in rural areas perceived higher idealized influence (behavior) ( $M=3.96$ ,  $SD=.71$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $M=3.90$ ,  $SD=.77$ ), and individual consideration ( $M=3.53$ ,  $SD=.86$ ) than those in urban areas ( $M=3.80$ ,  $SD=.90$ ;  $M=3.72$ ,  $SD=.87$ ;  $M=3.37$ ,  $SD=.99$ , respectively), ( $t=-2.49$ ,  $p<0.5$ ;  $t=-2.62$ ,  $p<0.5$ ;  $t=-2.11$ ,  $p<0.5$ , respectively). this might be due to the fact that people in rural areas had stronger interpersonal relationship than those in urban areas. The relationship between teachers and principals is not only the relationship of superior to subordinate in terms of expertise but also is an intimate villagers' relationship. Perhaps, thanks to higher level of intimacy, teachers who taught in rural areas perceived greater idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, and individual consideration. There were no significant differences in transformational leadership with inspirational motivation, idealized influence attribution, and overall scale between teachers who taught in different school location. This shows that teachers who taught in different school locations would be similar in their perception of the level of inspirational motivation, idealized influence attributed, and overall scale.

*Table 3.5. Independent t-test of Differences in the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to School Location*

Dimension	Urban area (n=199)		Rural area (n=456)		<i>t</i> (653)	<i>p</i>	95%CI	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			LL	UL
IA	3.68	1.03	3.76	0.85	-0.96	.336	-0.22	0.08
IB	3.80	0.90	3.96	0.71	-2.49*	.013	-0.29	-0.03
IM	3.79	0.93	3.83	0.82	-0.53	.598	-0.18	0.10
IS	3.72	0.87	3.90	0.77	-2.62*	.009	-0.31	-0.04
IC	3.37	0.99	3.53	0.86	-2.11*	.035	-0.31	-0.01
Overall TLS	3.67	0.87	3.80	0.71	-1.90	.058	-0.25	0.00

*Note.* \*  $p < .05$ . CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

#### 4. Conclusion

these findings indicated that elementary school teachers perceived that their principal often used transformational leadership behaviors in schools. In other words, elementary school principals relatively showed idealized attributed influence, idealized influence behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration to direct teachers to achieve schools' goals. There were significant differences in the elementary school teachers' perceptions of the dimensions of transformational leadership, retarding their gender, degree, school size, and school location. Male teachers had higher level of perception with individual consideration than female teachers. Teachers who earned an associate degree were greater in idealized influence (attributed) than those teachers who held a university degree. Teachers who taught at large schools and medium-sized schools were greater in idealized influence (attributed) than those at small schools. Also for idealized influence (behavior), teachers who taught at large schools reported more perception that the principals were transformational in his/her leadership than those teachers who taught at small schools. Besides, teachers who taught at large schools were greater in inspirational motivation than those at small schools. Furthermore, teachers who taught at large schools and medium-sized schools had higher level of perception with intellectual stimulation than those at small schools. In addition, teachers who taught at large schools were greater in individual consideration attributes than those at small schools. Also for the overall transformational leadership, teachers who taught at large schools and medium-sized schools had higher level of perception than those at small schools. Teachers who taught in rural areas perceived that they had higher level of idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, and individual consideration than those teachers who taught at urban area.

❖ **Conflict of Interest:** Author have no conflict of interest to declare.

## REFERENCES

- Amoroso, P. F. (2002). *The impact of principals' transformational leadership behaviors on teacher commitment and teacher job satisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Creighton, T. (2005). *Leading from below the surface. A non-traditional approach to school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from [https://books.google.com.vn/books?hl=vi&lr=&id=c0Wk9IuBmAoC&oi=fnd&pg=PP2&dq=Discovering+statistics+using+IBM+SPSS+statistics&ots=LbHqLGYB4C&sig=5-\\_zsvKzO\\_2hs5miWefDjhOvZi4&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Discovering%20statistics%20using%20IBM%20SPSS%20statistics&f=false](https://books.google.com.vn/books?hl=vi&lr=&id=c0Wk9IuBmAoC&oi=fnd&pg=PP2&dq=Discovering+statistics+using+IBM+SPSS+statistics&ots=LbHqLGYB4C&sig=5-_zsvKzO_2hs5miWefDjhOvZi4&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Discovering%20statistics%20using%20IBM%20SPSS%20statistics&f=false)
- Gkolia, A., Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). The impact of principals' transformational leadership on teachers' satisfaction: evidence from Greece. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 69-80.
- Horn-Turpin, F. D. (2009). *A study examining the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on the factors of teaching efficacy, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as perceived by special education teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ERIC.
- Robinson, V. M., 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.
- Vieluf, S., Kunter, M., & van de Vijver, F. J. (2013). Teacher self-efficacy in cross-national perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 35, 92-103
- Wu, M. H. (2010). *A study of the relationship among principals' transformational leadership, teachers' knowledge management and school effectiveness in elementary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, National Taichung University of Education, Taiwan, (written in Chinese).

**LÃNH ĐẠO CHUYỂN ĐỔI CỦA HIỆU TRƯỞNG TRƯỜNG TIỂU HỌC:  
BÁO CÁO TRƯỜNG HỢP TẠI KIÊN GIANG, VIỆT NAM**

***Dư Thống Nhất***

*Trường Đại học Sư phạm Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh, Việt Nam*

*Tác giả liên hệ: Dư Thống Nhất – Email: nhatdt@hcmue.edu.vn*

*Ngày nhận bài: 10-5-2020; ngày nhận bài sửa: 20-5-2020, ngày chấp nhận đăng: 28-5-2020*

**TÓM TẮT**

*Lãnh đạo chuyển đổi được xem là một vấn đề quan trọng trong quản lý nguồn nhân lực và nghiên cứu giáo dục theo kinh nghiệm. Bài viết trình bày kết quả nghiên cứu về sự lãnh đạo chuyển đổi của hiệu trưởng được nhận thức bởi 655 giáo viên ở các trường tiểu học tại Kiên Giang, năm học 2014-2015. Công cụ nghiên cứu là thang đo TLS được hiệu chỉnh cho phù hợp với bối cảnh giáo dục Việt Nam. Mục đích của nghiên cứu này là xác định mức độ lãnh đạo chuyển đổi của hiệu trưởng trường tiểu học. Nghiên cứu sử dụng phương pháp định lượng và áp dụng thiết kế nghiên cứu mô tả. Điểm số độ tin cậy cho năm khía cạnh của TLS từ 0,80 đến 0,94 là thỏa đáng. Kết quả nghiên cứu chỉ ra rằng giáo viên ở các trường tiểu học nhận thấy hiệu trưởng của họ khá thường xuyên thể hiện sự lãnh đạo chuyển đổi. Ngoài ra các yếu tố giới tính, bằng cấp, quy mô trường học và vị trí nhà trường có ảnh hưởng đến nhận thức của giáo viên tiểu học về một số khía cạnh lãnh đạo chuyển đổi của hiệu trưởng.*

***Từ khóa:*** sự lãnh đạo chuyển đổi; hiệu trưởng; trường tiểu học; giáo viên; tỉnh Kiên Giang