POLISH JOURNAL *of* EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

ISSN 2657-3528

2021, Vol. III (LXXIII)

DOI: 10.2478/poljes-2021-0003

An Assessment of Transformational Leadership Theory against a University EAP Pre-session Course

Sarah Blythe¹

ABSTRACT

The evolution of leadership theory since the Industrial Revolution has been characterised by a shifting of focus from leaders' qualities to the construction of effective leadership systems and methods. Transformational leadership, as one such theory, has gained traction in educational settings thanks both to its democratic principles and the applicability offered by its value profile modelling. A set of capacities are provided by the theory, with the intention of providing a toolkit for effective leadership which can be adopted by a range of leaders, thus avoiding the need for inherent leadership qualities. The theory continues to face charges of promoting despotism, however, and most importantly of lacking relevance to real-world settings. Through the reflective analysis of a university-based English for Academic Purposes pre-session course – a fixed-term, high-stress setting – a grounded assessment of the real-world applicability of transformational leadership theory can be conducted. It is proposed that such courses within the higher education sector pose specific challenges to leadership, due to time constraints, staff retention and pressures on student achievement. The scope for meaningfully engaging staff in structural processes is thus restricted and there is a clear need for an accessible theory which supports a democratic, pluralistic approach to leadership, such as transformational leadership. However, reflective analysis of the leadership methods employed on the course, and an assessment of their correlation to the principles of transformational leadership, reveals a deficit in real-world applicability of the theory and a failure to convincingly avoid the pitfalls of the cult of the leader.

KEYWORDS

Transformational, leadership, English for Academic Purposes, higher education, university.

1 University of Northampton, United Kingdom
e-mail: s.c.blythe@googlemail.com ORCID: 0000-0002-9562-7580

Introduction

Since the middle of the last century, as society has move gradually further from the legacy of the Industrial Revolution, leadership theory has undergone a large-scale shift in focus. Ideas around what should be most valued in leadership have evolved from the pursuit of the identification of key traits or behaviours a leader ought to have (Great Man or Trait theory) towards discussions centred around the methods leaders should employ in order to maximise the success of their organisation (Hunt & Fedynich, 2019). In practice, this has amounted to a steady shift from the analysis of inherent character traits leaders hold, towards the formulation of leadership methodologies which can be adopted by a wide range of actors.

One still popular leadership theory to emerge in modern times has been transformational leadership, which aims for employee satisfaction, exceptional outcomes and the achievement of organisational, rather than leader, gains; employees' voices are heard but agents need to be motivated by the leader, who relies in part upon charisma to develop a following (Bush, 2008; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Lea, 2019; Investors in People, n.d.). Within the educational sector, teachers and leaders are afforded with, and need to exercise, a particularly high level of autonomy in their professional lives as they are responsible for making wide-ranging professional decisions and for the safety and welfare – educationally, socially and otherwise – of their students (Iszatt-White, 2009).

Therefore, transformational leadership frequently features in educational leadership theory, thanks in large part to its apparent objective of empowering followers and thus protecting autonomy. But its promise may be overstated; the efficacy of transformational leadership's methodology, and thus its practicable distance from outmoded trait theories, is disputed (Allix, 2000); there is a lack of evidential writing to support its success (Currie & Lockett, 2007 p. 7) and key concepts of the theory are rarely articulated plainly when referenced by other writers (Reid & Dold, 2018), implying theoretical ambiguity or opacity when put into practice.

This essay seeks to contribute to this academic field by assessing and evaluating transformational theory in reference to the leadership on an EAP (English for Academic Purposes) pre-session course, held at a UK university in 2019. This context has been chosen as it is somewhat unusual within educational settings, and therefore has the potential to provide an interesting analysis of the applicability of transformational leadership values within an atypical situation. The theory in turn can illuminate where room for growth within the leadership of this type of program may lie, a field of enquiry which remains underrepresented in literature. A brief discussion of how key features of leadership theory have developed in the West will lead to an explanation of transformational leadership in more detail. The nature of the EAP program will then be introduced, before carrying out an analysis and evaluation of transformational

leadership in relation to the program. Themes and ideas will be linked to literature and theory throughout. A summary of the findings and recommendations is provided in conclusion.

Leadership theory in the West: Postmodernism and the move from transactional to transformational leadership

Leadership theory has a relatively short but progressive history in the West, reaching from Industrial Revolution-era conceptions that a leader, always male, is born to lead in the Great Man theory; to contemporary theories, where leadership is fluid and task-orientated and not assigned to a single entity (Hunt & Fedynich, 2019). Developments in society are catalysts to such progression, bringing changes in thinking, behaviour and theory which are subtle, complex and nuanced. Of interest to this study is post-modernist theory, which stretches across disciplines, from philosophy to educational theory.

Although post-modernist thought is wide-ranging and complex, of specific relevance to leadership theory are discussions around the abolition of metanarratives, as it is herein that the shift from traits-based leadership theories centred around one individual, to a broader, more inclusive era may be traced. Metanarratives are broad, all-encompassing stories, whose primary purpose is to explain history but which also have the capacity to influence future outcomes (Tabrizi & Rideout, 2016; Irving & Klenke, 2004). They frequently feature within institutions and firms as they can provide continuity within an establishment, ensuring that core values are retained and passed onto new stakeholders; however, they also have the potential to destabilise democratic processes as they fail to acknowledge each constituent story (Tabrizi & Rideout, 2016; Irving & Klenke, 2004). In leadership theory, replacing the metanarrative with a plurality of narratives is a form of democratisation, empowering all agents within the organisation with a voice (Keough & Tobin, 2001 p.4).

It is from this foundation of plurality and representative growth that leadership theory could begin to shake off the shackles of the 'born leader' ideology inherent in trait theories, and more methods based systematic theories could be developed. These theories, of which transformational leadership is an example, can synthesise the collective narratives of stakeholders to create a new metanarrative for the organisation and develop a new culture (Tabrizi & Rideout, 2016; Investors in People, n.d.). These ideas were concretised when James McGregor Burns lifted leadership from trait- and behaviour-based theory to develop transformational leadership (Burns, 1978), a method of leading charismatically through group engagement (Jyoti & Bhau, 2015).

This was furthered by Bernard Bass in 1985 when he outlined four key components of transformational leadership known as the 'Four Is' – Idealized influence; Inspirational motivation; Intellectual stimulation; and Individualized consideration (Bass and Riggio, 2006 p.6).

The Four Is aim to provide a clear guide, a kind of handbook for agents, to the qualities which are necessary for a more inclusive and universally attainable form of leadership. Yet they suffer from a lack of applicability in this study and highlight the wider, irreconcilable conflicts which exist between key elements of the transformational model – the starkest of which pertains to the very need for a leader. Despite moves towards greater democratisation, transformational leadership is far from free of the shackles of the cult of the leader apparent in other leadership styles. Indeed, its demand for a charismatic leader to oversee the democratised followers has exposed the theory to criticism pertaining to the very character of such transformational leaders (Allix, 2000). Moreover, the theory is susceptible to criticism that it creates the strain of emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983) on both leaders and the led, which can be brought about by transformational practices such as valuing practices (Iszatt-White, 2009). These will be discussed in greater length following a deeper exposition of transformational theory.

Transformational leadership theory: The vision and the reality

Transformational leadership is best understood in contrast to transactional leadership. Transactional leadership depends upon the attainment of a valued resource – a salary, for example – as the motivation for followers to subscribe to leaders' wishes (Hartog et al., 1997). The relationship between the leader and the follower depends upon rules, rewards and 'punishments' in order to control the behaviour of the led and thus also entails the application of methods for monitoring behaviours (Hartog et al., 1997; Tabrizi & Rideout, 2016); leaders are viewed as *the* authority and have an innate power which is non-distributed. On the other hand, transformational leaders stimulate work engagement through a merging of the motives of leaders and followers, so that all members experience a convergence of morals and values from which proactivity and growth of both the individual and the collective are achieved (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Iszatt-White, 2009; Bush, 2008; Lea, 2019).

This 'convergence' is brought about by the influence the leader has upon the led – a clear and charismatic leader (Lea, 2019) who is able, as a minimum, to encapsulate the 'Four I's' (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The role is somewhat complex, requiring the leader to be both undisputed and appealing, and yet to be able to hear and consider the

needs of each follower. Therefore, limitations to the theory when put into practice can result in stakeholders not being heard; being coerced or manipulated by charismatic leaders, intentionally or unintentionally (Allix, 2000; Chirichello, 1999); or, frequently, a demand for excessive emotional labour from both leaders and the led (Currie & Lockett, 2007; Iszatt-White, 2009). Via analysis and evaluation, this essay will now argue that whilst transformational leadership provides educational settings with an ostensibly easy-to-apply framework, the outline is overly simplistic to represent the complexity of its components; it is impracticably ideological and, ultimately, fails in the face of high-stress settings.

Breakdown of the pre-sessional program

The English language EAP pre-sessional program of a UK based Russell Group University, at which the author has taught, is used here as a basis for evaluating and assessing the efficacy of transformational leadership. The courses are run every summer as a means of preparing overseas students, the vast majority of whom are Chinese (95–99%), followed by a smaller cohort of Arabic and, very occasionally, one or two Thai students, for postgraduate study at the University the following autumn. The students have all received conditional offers for Master's or PhD programmes of study, contingent upon their passing the pre-sessional course. Failing the course means that they will not only be unable to take their chosen course but, in most cases, will also have their UK study visa revoked with immediate effect.

The university employs around 80 extra teachers every year to deliver the courses, which is mirrored across EAP – a recent survey amongst leaders in EAP (English for Academic Purposes) showed that over 50% of respondents were responsible for managing up to 120 employees at a time, with significant fluctuations throughout the year (Brewer & Wilding, 2017). The courses are between 8 and 20 weeks in length and, as the position is very well paid, there is rarely an issue with finding teachers. Despite this, a number of teachers will only work one course and not return in subsequent years. Below-optimal staff retention may in part be due to the pressures on teachers and leadership, which are considerable; with 5 hours of teaching a day, weekly workshops and meetings and substantial marking duties, it is not unusual for teachers to work 50-hour weeks. On top of that, staff carry the burden that a failing student will encounter serious, sometimes life changing, consequences. The pressures on the teachers and the leaders are significant but leadership of the program is nevertheless conscientious and fairly progressive and, of those teachers who return, there is a sense (anecdotally) of feeling valued.

Evidence of transformational leadership elements on the program

Provision of a moral framework as shared values

Values need to be clear and coherent in order to form the basis of a transformational leadership, dependent as it is upon a merging of leaders' and teachers' values for its success (Allix, 2000). Coleman and Glover posit that stronger foundations for leadership are laid when values are articulated clearly (Coleman & Glover, 2010) and Leithwood outlines the importance of modelling best practices and central organisational values to transformational leadership (Leithwood, 1994, cited in Bush, 2008, p. 12). However, Hodgkinson takes this further by stating that, where values are the result of beliefs and not facts, they can differ and cause conflict to arise (Hodgkinson, 1991). Thus, an epistemological problem arises as to *how* one is to decide whether a value is a fact or a belief; and then extends to the yet more problematic *who* decides. Although transformational leadership speaks of engaging and empowering the plurality of voices within the organisation (Jyoti & Bhau, 2015), there is little evidence that this is expected at the developmental stages which underpin subsequent interaction.

A similar process occurred on the pre-sessional program, which has developed its own set of values and behaviours, based upon broader institution-wide values which strive towards collegiality and inclusivity. The values and behaviours, outlined below, demonstrate a strong desire for a cohesive moral system within the team, with a focus on collaboration, supportiveness and adaptability; all principles of transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Lea, 2019).

Values and behaviours

The values and behaviours, delivered to staff via an infographic, are broken into three sub-sections entitled 'Why we're here', 'How we get the job done' and 'How we treat others'. The first section, 'Why we're here', is centred around the level of the quality of the service which will be provided to students, stakeholders and the colleagues. Secondly, 'How we get the job done' sets out a list of professional and personal qualities and attributes which teachers have in order to complete the job to the aforementioned high standard. Attributes range from being enthusiastic and responsive to feedback, to working efficiently and aiming to resolve issues in a timely manner. Finally, 'How we treat others' incorporates terms such as trust, support, collaborate and inclusive.

By providing a set of values and behaviours, which staff are expected to subscribe to, the leadership has attempted to create a levelling framework with the objective of increasing conformity to, however moral in tone, a set metanarrative.

Marked cynicism towards its implementation was expressed by a number of teachers. Rather than engage with the content and sentiment of the framework, it

was considered abstract, idealistic and of little practical help. The lack of investment from teachers into the 'Values and Behaviours' may lie in the fact that it was drawn up *without* input from the staff – teachers instinctively felt that their voices were not taken to be part of this new metanarrative. The 'unilateral' drawing up of such a set of morals does not conflict with transformational principles – whilst leaders and staff having a shared interest in a set of values is a prerequisite of transformational leadership (Bush, 2008), it is the charismatic leader who is ascribed with developing the collective interest (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 50). However, as values themselves are weak motivators, which depend upon environmental conditions to manifest as action (Lazarus, 1991), empowerment of teachers (Tabrizi & Rideout, 2016) and individual investment in shared values without the motivator of a charismatic leader they may not be sufficient to support a successful transformational leadership. Furthermore, this lack of plurality of input erodes the democratic narrative upon which transformational leadership depends and the Values and Behaviours thus present rather as a metanarrative.

In this way, values may at best remain as the 'foundation' discussed by Coleman and Glover (Coleman & Glover, 2010). This is especially the case in short-term, highly stressful environments such as the pre-sessional, where the positive impact of a charismatic leader may not have the space or time to develop; and where proactivity is hindered because the work-engagement produced by transformational leaders is subject to depletion where high levels of strain exist (Schmitt et al., 2016). It therefore seems apparent that the values principle of transformational leadership would struggle to thrive in a setting such as the EAP program leadership unless a different approach were taken at the foundational stage of creating the moral framework, in order to engage teachers more securely.

Assessing the 'Four I's' of transformational leadership

The 'Four I's', developed by Bass in 1985 (Bass & Riggio, 2006), delineate the main ideological components of transformational leadership:

- 1) Charismatic leadership or idealized influence (II).
- 2) Inspirational leadership or motivation (IM).
- 3) Intellectual stimulation (IS).
- 4) Individualized consideration (IC). (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Krishnan, 2001; Lea, 2019)

Here, they will provide a framework against which to continue evaluating the EAP program leadership.

Idealized Influence (II) and Inspirational Motivation (IM)

Idealized Influence (II) refers to the need for transformational leaders to be respected and admired role models, able to influence engagement and motivation as followers wish to emulate them; consequently, transformational leaders have been likened to coaches, who motivate others through both their behaviour and the qualities which the followers perceive them to have (Bass & Riggio, 2006 p. 6; Lea, 2019) but also to despots (Allix, 2000), populist leaders who are capable of controlling the led (Chirichello, 1999). These components signify a departure from the reward-punishment structure of transactional leadership, and link back to Bush's intention that transformational leaders' morals merge with those of the followers, and thus all stakeholders find themselves in a state of mutual 'elevation' (Allix, 2000 p. 4). Inspirational Motivation (IM) is regularly combined with Idealised Influence, as both pertain to a dependency upon a charismatic leader and their influence. Beyond the role model aspect of Idealised Influence, followers are further motivated by the recognition given to their work by the leaders; teamwork and spirit are nurtured and emphasis is placed on the shared vision of all of the stakeholders (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Krishnan, 2001; Lea, 2019).

Nevertheless, the idea of motivating followers via a type of populism is potentially problematic for two main reasons; firstly, it may demand considerable emotional labour of followers and leaders. Emotional labour is a concept first coined by Hochschild, who posited that certain service-industries demanded taxing emotional 'acting' of its staff which had the potential to detach the actor from their true selves (Hochschild, 1983). Although educational settings are not the same as service industries as they are more complex, diverse and ongoing (Maxwell & Riley, 2017) the presence and cost of emotional labour is no less real. Iszatt-White gives an interesting example of a headteacher who is so heavily invested in the well-being of her teachers that she feels she must 'act' in order to portray the desired enthusiasm, only releasing the pressure of this emotional labour by venting when she is safely behind the closed doors of her office (Iszatt-White, 2009 p. 14).

In part, a similar phenomenon was observed on the EAP program, where leaders consistently presented as calm, in control and positive, despite the stresses they must have been under. Whilst this presentation of a highly competent front may increase teachers' faith in the leadership, and provides a useful role model to follow, it also potentially results in teachers feeling they cannot express themselves honestly or that being, or even just feeling, overwhelmed is a kind of weakness to be frowned upon. The surface acting (Hochschild, 1983) of the leaders is therefore either emulated by the teachers, potentially hindering meaningful growth, or teachers are left feeling inferior and overlooked. As consideration may be tied to those behaviours which nurture trust, mutual respect and warmth between leaders and the led (Bryman, 2007) it becomes apparent that a failure of consideration is equivalent to the breaking of trust.

Miller and Gkonou find that, amongst teachers of tertiary-level English language programs, agency and emotion are essential components of teacher identity and practice and, importantly, that they exist in a co-constitutive state (Miller & Gkonou, 2017). Where a teacher's agency is removed, there will be an emotional deficit; and where emotions are not recognised there will be a loss of agency. That individuals be considered is not only impactful upon the strength of professional relationships and well-being of agents, but it also comprises an important facet of transformational leadership 'Individualised Consideration' (Bass & Riggio, 2006), which will be discussed in more detail subsequently.

Whilst emotional labour may in some industries be seen as an imposition, which agents are required to adopt (Hochschild, 1983), *teachers* who exhibit effective practice are often naturally inclined to do so as part of a process of ethical self-formation (Miller & Gkonou, 2017). Emotional labour within an educational setting may be considered an intrinsic part of day-to-day teaching practice, 'a natural part of teaching' (Zembylas, 2005). For serious practitioners it is therefore not a phenomenon consigned solely to the sort of highly pressurised, emotionally charged situations which may arise in meetings and other extra-classroom settings where leaders and teachers convene. Instead, emotional labour becomes something of an omnipresence and teachers are faced with an absolute deficit of space where they may unwind, reconnect to their true self and reset, emotionally.

Furthermore, whilst the emotional retention of the leaders may be well-intended, it is widely accepted that emotional intelligence is a vital component of modern leadership (Goleman, 1998). Michie and Gooty present a defence of the morality of affective responses in leadership, arguing that it is therein that authenticity can be displayed (Michie & Gooty, 2005). Valuing practices, a lower leader to follower ratio or even a system of coaching or mentoring could help to alleviate emotional labour (Iszatt-White, 2009; Barrow & O'Shea, 2019) by reducing the pressure on leaders to present a unified and unemotional front and also by allowing teachers an informal and, thus, more personal space in which to express themselves more authentically.

The second point of criticism against the populist leader model is the threat that the charisma of the leaders swells to become a type of 'despotism' (Allix, 2000). In his original theory of transformational leadership, Burns states that the subjectively based, individualistic wants of the led can become 'educated' by the outside influence of leaders, so that they become objective needs, shaped socially and thus situated in the collective (Allix, 2000). In order to carry out this manipulation of perceptions, the leader needs to hold 'epistemically privileged judgement' (Allix, 2000, p. 12); which affords them disproportionate power. In the case of the EAP program, this could be observed in the 'aloofness' of the leadership, a lack of responsiveness to the sentiments of the teachers which, in practice, amounted to a degree of unaccountability.

This may at least in part have been driven by the high workloads leaders bore; nonetheless there was the sense that the leadership were often unapproachable and unreachable and there was a deficit of meaningful two-way input between teachers and leaders, further exacerbating the divide of perceived emotional labour. Transformational leadership could be seen to lay the foundations for this aloofness, in its need for charismatic, inspiring leadership which seeks power (Krishnan, 2001, p. 3) and in the laying-down of the moral framework which stakeholders are required to consign to, wholeheartedly (Bass & Riggio, 2008, p. 4).

It may be that a more non-positional, or more distributed, form of leadership could mitigate this by relieving the pressure on the higher leadership and allowing for more diverse input from stakeholders, even within the high stress environment of a program such as the EAP pre-sessional (Frost, 2014, p. 2). Frost uses the word 'vision' instead of theory in his paper on non-positional leadership in education (Frost, 2014), a semantic choice which alludes to less rigidity, more creativity and greater flexibility of application. Thus, although the implementation of truly non-positional or distributed leadership could be beyond the scope of an EAP pre-sessional program, objective elements could be introduced in order to strengthen democratisation and diminish despotism.

Further to this finding, recognising and encouraging input from staff is in itself a means of distributing power, through which the group can reach a point of equity, democracy, empowerment and inclusion (Coleman & Glover, 2010, p. 24), increasing engagement, energy and commitment to the cause (Schmitt et al., 2016). Additionally, the pitfalls of the first two components may be naturally mitigated by the implementation of the following components, although their applicability to high-stress, fixed-term settings may be limited.

Intellectual Stimulation (IS)

The development of a stimulating environment so that problems may be dealt with creatively (Carmeli et al., 2014) is a process dependent upon reviewing and updating practices and facilitating input from all stakeholders, who are then able to air ideas in a non-judgemental environment (Bass & Riggio, 2008; Currie & Lockett, 2007; Krishnan, 2001). In a practical sense, this may take the form of group discussions within team meetings and briefings, as in the case of the pre-sessional program, where teachers were encouraged to collaborate on problem-solving tasks, centred around a pedagogical issue or to interpersonal and social issues. This was undoubtedly a highly valuable practice.

Teachers worked in small groups, allowing each teacher the space to be heard, with ideas collated in poster form, before being presented to the other teachers by displaying them on the wall. Ideas remained anonymous and pluralistic, created with-

out the explicit guidance of leadership thus removing the disempowering nature of shame and *empowering* teachers (Tabrizi & Rideout, 2016, p. 4). It is worth noting that the success of this type of intellectual stimulation rested upon the absence of leadership interference – teachers needed a ‘safe space’ in which to experiment and voice their opinions and share their ideas. Therefore, in short-term, high-stress settings such as the pre-sessional, where there are a large number of unacquainted teachers, smaller, more intimate groupings could yield greater intellectual stimulation than larger, leader-led groupings.

Individualised Consideration (IC)

In order to maximise the growth of the individual and the group, transformational leaders learn about and respond to employees on a one-to-one basis, acquainting themselves well with each member of the team and thus being able to tailor support and praise accordingly (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Jyoti & Bhau, 2015; Lea, 2019). This component links leadership to coaching and mentoring, possibly even requiring leaders to become coaches or mentors to staff (Lea, 2019) and also to ‘valuing practices’, the aforementioned process of noticing individual stakeholders’ strengths and weaknesses and supporting them accordingly (Barrow & O’Shea, 2019). Individualised Consideration, if it were able to manifest as valuing-practices, would have the capacity to limit the risk of ‘despotism’ discussed by Allix, as it recognises the individual needs of the group and allows for their input (Jyoti and Bhau, 2015). However, the foundational belief of transformational leadership, the idea of a collective ‘raising up’, hinges upon the leader providing the moral metanarrative and subsequently seeking out the convergent beliefs in the led in order to bolster the moral framework – it is emotional and affective (Allix, 2000, p. 12).

This is at odds with the objectivity of valuing practices, whose inherent aim is to notice the individuality of stakeholders and acknowledge both the positive and negative aspects of that person (Barrow & O’Shea, 2019; Iszatt-White, 2009). Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the scope for such practices on a program such as the pre-sessional is severely limited by the pressures which time and workload pose for the leadership and is further exacerbated by the short-term duration of the courses; it would seem implausible that a leader, in a short space of time, could become acquainted with upwards of 80 teachers adequately enough to apply meaningful valuing-practices.

Despite this, one valuing practice is carried out as individual teacher feedback is sought at the end of each program. Teachers are strongly encouraged to complete the feedback by the leadership and the findings are generally implemented the following year. Although Barrow and O’Shea state that the distance between follower and leader and the confidence followers feel in said leadership are inversely proportional (Barrow and O’Shea, 2019 p.2), and thus the remoteness of teacher feedback may not encourage

confidence in the way coaching or mentoring sessions could, acting upon the results of the teacher feedback does make returning teachers feel heard and respected, even when they did not feel sufficiently acknowledged during the program.

Conclusion

The development of transformational leadership in the 1970s and 80s signalled an important progression from the accepted notion of leadership as a birth right or privilege earned through personality. Leadership could, ostensibly, move from authoritarian elitism towards a more democratic, universally inclusive methodology of practice. Assessing leadership such as on the EAP pre-sessional, however, has helped to amplify the inherent faults within the theory of transformational leadership – although the Four I's model may provide an accessible and catchy framework, it would seem, in practice, too simplistic and ideological to instruct leadership effectively. Furthermore, it fails to free itself from trait-based theories. The qualities outlined in the Four Is are presented as those which can be learned or developed but, in truth, they naturally exclude those who do not hold them as the burden of emotional labour renders those who do not hold the qualities prone to failure. The impact of emotional labour can further be felt in the expectation that teachers or followers ought to subscribe, authentically, to a set of moral beliefs, the creation of which they have not been involved in. This was apparent both in transformational theory and in practice on the EAP course, where teachers evidently felt disempowered by the imposition of a set of prescribed values and behaviours.

Specific to the EAP program, where the focus on the leader needed to be tempered or valuing practices instigated in order to prevent the type of despotism posited by Allix (2000), the stresses of the course obscured the path forward. The real-world results of this disjunct are that staff retention remains lower than should be for such a highly paid job and (anecdotally) work satisfaction varied substantially across the teachership. Bass himself defines transformational leadership as an extension of transactional leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 4) and the evaluation and assessment which this essay has carried out against the EAP program shows that perhaps the progressiveness which transformational leadership promised last century is not adequate for today's educational leaders, especially as the sector becomes more pressurised and nuanced due to changing desires, political environments and social structures.

References

- Allix, N.M. (2000) Transformational leadership: Democratic or despotic? *Educational Management & Administration*, 28(1), 7–20. DOI: 10.1177/0263211X000281002. [Accessed: January 3, 2021].
- Barrow, J., & O'Shea, A. (2019) A case study exploring the impact of valuing practices and emotional labour on the well-being of one senior leader. *Polish Journal of Educational Studies*, 72(1), 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.2478/poljes-2019-0008> [Accessed: January 6, 2021].
- Bass, B.M., & Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.northampton.ac.uk/10.4324/9781410617095> [Accessed: December 23, 2020].
- Brewer, S., & Wilding, L. (2017). *Creating an EAP management network together. BALEAP leadership and management SIG: 2017* [online]. <https://www.baleap.org/projects/leadership-and-management> [Accessed: December 18, 2020].
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114> [Accessed: August 12, 2021].
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership* (6th ed). Harper and Row.
- Bush, T. (2008) *Leadership and management development in education*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Carmeli, A., Sheaffer, Z., Binyamin, G., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Shimoni, T. (2014). Transformational Leadership and Creative Problem-Solving: The Mediating Role of Psychological Safety and Reflexivity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 48(2). DOI: 10.1002/jocb.43 [Accessed: January 5, 2021].
- Chirichello, M. (1999) Building Capacity for Change: Transformational Leadership for School Principals. Presented at: 12th International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, San Antonio, Texas. ERIC.
- Coleman, M., & Glover, D. (2010). *Educational leadership and management: Developing insights and skills*. Open University Press.
- Currie, G., & Lockett, A. (2007) A critique of transformational leadership: Moral, professional and contingent dimensions of leadership within public services organizations. *Human Relations*, 60(2), 341–370. DOI: 10.1177/0018726707075884 [Accessed: January 2, 2021].
- Frost, D. (2014). Non-positional teacher leadership: a perpetual motion miracle. A paper presented within the symposium: *Changing teacher professionalism through support for teacher leadership in Europe and beyond at ECER 2014 Porto, 2nd-5th September 2014*. [s.n.].
- Goleman, D. (1998) What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*. <https://thisisthrive.com/sites/default/files/What-Makes-a-Leader-Daniel-Goleman.pdf>.
- Hartog, N. den, Muijen, J.J. van, & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: an analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational*

- Psychology, 70(1), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00628.x> [Accessed: January 4, 2021].
- Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling* (3rd ed). London: University of California Press.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. State University of New York Press.
- Hunt, T. & Fedynich, L. (2019). Leadership: Past, present, and future: An evolution of an idea. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 8(2), 22–26. DOI: 10.18533/journal.v8i2.1582 [Accessed: January 6, 2021].
- Investors in People (n.d.). *Transformational leadership: What is it?*. <https://www.investorsinpeople.com/knowledge/transformational-leadership/> [Accessed: January 7, 2021].
- Irving, J.A., & Klenke, K. (2004). Telos, Chronos, and Hermēneia: The role of metanarrative in leadership effectiveness through the production of meaning. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, [n.k.], 28–48. DOI: 10.1177/160940690400300303 [Accessed: December 30, 2020].
- Iszatt-White, M. (2009). Leadership as emotional labour: The effortful accomplishment of valuing practices. *Leadership*, 5(4), 447–467. DOI: 10.1177/1742715009343032 [Accessed: December 18, 2020].
- Jyoti, J., & Bhau, S. (2015). Transformational leadership and job performance: A study of higher education. *Journal of Services Research*, 15(2), 77–110. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281230084_Transformational_Leadership_and_Job_Performance_A_study_of_Higher_Education [Accessed: January 4, 2021].
- Keough, T., & Tobin, B. (2001). Postmodern leadership and the policy lexicon: From theory, proxy to practice. Presentation for: *The Pan-Canadian Research Agenda (PCERA) 2001*. Laval University.
- Krishnan, V. (2001). Value systems of transformational leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(3), 126–132. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235301372_Value_systems_of_transformational_leaders [Accessed: December 28, 2020].
- Lazarus, R.S. (1991). *Emotion and Adaptation*. Oxford University Press.
- Lea, S. (2019). *The Four I's of Transformational Leadership*. <https://www.businessballs.com/leadership-styles/four-is-of-transformational-leadership/#:~:text=The%20Four%20Elements%20of%20Transformational%20Leadership,-The%20modern%20idea&text=Bass%20in%201985%3A%20Idealised%20Influence,Individualised%20Consideration%20and%20Inspirational%20Motivation> [Accessed: January 5, 2021].
- Maxwell, A., & Riley, P. (2017). Emotional demands, emotional labour and occupational outcomes in school principals: Modelling the relationships. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(3), 484–502. DOI: 10.1177/1741143215607878 [Accessed: December 28, 2020].
- Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, emotions, and authenticity: Will the real leader please stand up? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 441–457. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984305000317> [Accessed: August 15, 2021].

- Miller, E., & Gkonou, C. (2017). Language teacher agency, emotion labor and emotional rewards in tertiary-level English language programs. *System*, 79, 48–59. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0346251X17305596> [Accessed: August 12, 2021].
- Reid, W., & Dold, C. (2018). Burns, Senge, and the study of leadership. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 7(1), 89–116. DOI: 10.4236/ojl.2018.71006 [Accessed: January 7, 2021].
- Schmitt, A., Hartog, N. den, & Belschak, F.D. (2016). Transformational leadership and proactive work behaviour: A moderated mediation model including work engagement and job strain. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89(3), 588–610. <https://bpspsychub-onlinelibrary-wiley-com.ezproxy.northampton.ac.uk/doi/epdf/10.1111/joop.12143> [Accessed: January 3, 2021].
- Tabrizi, S., & Rideout, G. (2016). Styles of educational leadership for modernist and post-modernist approaches. *International Journal for Infonomics (IJl)*, 9(4), 1239–1246. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326339115_Styles_of_Educational_Leadership_for_Modernist_and_Postmodernist_Approaches [Accessed: December 28, 2020].
- Zembylas, M. (2005). *Teaching with emotion: A postmodern enactment*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.