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Abstract

This study examines the leadership style of Head Start and Early Head Start leaders in the context of program quality. The study was designed to answer the question: Does transformational leadership contribute to quality in Head Start/Early Head Start programs?

The study used a quantitative design within a transformational leadership theory framework. Head Start/Early Head Start directors, education coordinators, site/center directors and chief executive officers received an email request to answer a brief (10- to 15-minute) survey. Questions included the education level of the leader, leader’s years of experience, program site accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children, grantee monitoring status, and designation renewal status for all programs. In addition, the survey requested information from the most recent Program Information Report (PIR). Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Instructional Learning Format Scores for Head Start programs were also examined. The Global Transformational Leadership Scale (GTL), a valid and reliable seven-question scale of transformational leadership, served as a useful tool to measure leadership style.

Data were gathered using a link embedded in an email leading to the survey, which was hosted on Survey Monkey. The sender asked recipients to forward the survey to other leaders within their program. Data were analyzed using bivariate correlation analysis and yielded moderate correlations to several of the quality indicators. This research contributed to the field and found that leadership is important in Head Start programs and has a moderate but significant effect on program quality.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Over 11 million children in the United States are enrolled in early childhood education (ECE) programs. In 2009, the Obama administration expanded access to high-quality ECE programs for very young children, ages birth to three, through an unprecedented expansion of the Early Head Start program. Another expansion in 2014 occurred through the Early Head Start–Child Care Partnerships grant program. In 2015, the administration proposed yet another increase in the funding of high-quality preschool for all four-year-olds in the United States. The stated purpose of these expansions was to increase the number of very young children in high-quality early childhood education programs. However, quality as a construct is difficult to define. In this most recent expansion to four-year-old children, the administration chose to define quality as the Head Start model.

Head Start was designed to eliminate poverty in 1965, a time in America’s history when government was perceived as the solution to big problems. Head Start serves preschool-age children from age three and four until kindergarten. Designed and funded in the 1990’s, Early Head Start serves the youngest, most vulnerable members of the population: pregnant women and children from birth through age two. The Head Start model includes providing small class sizes with a limited ratio of teachers to children and a requirement that at least 50% of all teachers have a Bachelor’s in Early Childhood Education. In addition to a set of research-based classroom and curricular standards, programs must provide comprehensive medical, dental, and mental health services to children and families. Parents of enrolled children are elected to serve on a policy council.
that is legally designated and defined, having required tasks similar to those of a school board. Head Start serves primarily low-income families, and at least 10% of children must be children with disabilities. Additionally, at minimum, each program site must meet state child care licensing requirements, which vary widely. A higher level of child care quality is widely accepted as accreditation. Just as in school districts, colleges, and universities, where accreditation is necessary to assure a high-quality education, child care has several voluntary accrediting bodies. One that is commonly accepted nationwide is the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), which accredits teacher preparation programs for early childhood education at the college and university level as well as child care centers at the local level.

In its 2009 increase in Early Head Start grants, the Obama administration placed an increased importance on early childhood education. This recognition of the Head Start model as a level of quality brought increased funding and intensified scrutiny, as well as requiring the ability of program directors to transform their agencies. Program leaders need to be responsive to new regulations while continuing to inspire staff and empower families.

Leadership will be the key to these new challenges. Recently, leadership development programs for leaders of early childhood education programs have multiplied regionally and nationally. The National Head Start Association has two Leadership Institutes each year, Erickson Institute in Illinois has recently started an Early Childhood Leadership Academy, and the Illinois Head Start Association has begun a Leadership Training Institute. In addition, the McCormick Center at National Louis University offers
a week-long leadership training each year to a select group of child care directors, as well as an annual leadership conference.

The leaders of these government entities, educational institutions, and professional associations have recognized a connection between leadership and high-quality early childhood programs. There is an assumption that high-quality leadership leads to high-quality programs, resulting in better student achievement over the life of a child.

**Statement of the Problem**

Almost one million children are in Head Start or Early Head Start programs across the country, and yet only some of the programs are identified as the highest-quality accredited programs.

According to the federal Office of Head Start (OHS) locator database, Illinois contains 910 Head Start and Early Head Start sites (https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/center-locator). Assuming each program has an administrative office, Illinois has 863 Head Start or Early Head Start sites. A search of the locator database for the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accredited early childhood sites reveals 437 accredited child care sites in Illinois (https://families.naeyc.org/find-quality-child-care). If all the sites on the NAEYC locator database were Head Start or Early Head Start programs, 50.6% would be accredited. The OHS does not list programs having accreditation, and NAEYC does not always indicate if a site is an Early Head Start or Head Start program, making the exact percentage difficult and tedious to determine.

What might compel a director to want her or his center to be of the highest quality and complete the accreditation process in addition to Head Start regulations? Why do a
small percentage of Head Start leaders pursue higher quality through accreditation, while others are content to meet the minimum standards? These questions have yet to be answered by the field. Educational institutions and national associations providing leadership training have recognized that leadership is important and have thus offered solutions such as training programs. Bloom (1991) and Bloom and Able (2015) have identified child care center directors as a key to high-quality instructional leadership, yet their research does not identify the factors making a center director an effective leader in an ECE program.

Researchers have explored leadership in K–12 schools, however, for over 25 years. Hallinger (2003) stated that the field has changed, conceptualizing leadership as instructional in the 1980s and most recently as transformational. That said, it is not known what leadership styles, practices, or characteristics are important in high-quality Head Start or Early Head Start programs. Empirical studies relating to this subject may not yet be published or available to the public.

In 2016, the Obama administration continued its focus on quality with the first major revision of Head Start regulations since 1998. The new Head Start Program Performance Standards completely revised and enhanced the requirements of Head Start programs, including a new qualification requirement for Head Start directors. Prior to this revision, Head Start directors were required to have expertise and experience in the administration of programs serving children and families. Some Head Start directors only had a high school diploma. The new requirements compel a Head Start director to hold at least a baccalaureate degree and have experience in supervision of staff, fiscal management, and administration, thus reflecting the importance of leadership to the
overall quality of a program. Head Start is a comprehensive program serving low-income children, with a requirement to prioritize the lowest-income, highest-risk families. In the past, the expertise required to hire and train staff, coordinate the requirements of regulations, and manage multimillion-dollar budgets was often left to directors who had a high school diploma. The new emphasis on higher education signals a shift to a focus on leadership.

This topic is important to the field as well as this author, currently the director of a small Early Head Start program in northeast Illinois. Upon assuming the position several years ago, the author discovered that the previous center director had applied for accreditation with NAEYC but had never followed through in the process as evidenced by paperwork left in the desk. Under the time limit for the process, the paperwork had expired.

Several years later, the author’s program was recognized as an effective program for Black children. The nominating professor stated the reason for effectiveness as the leadership of the center. This statement prompted a burning question for the author: Why would some leaders follow through and provide a high-quality program for all children, while other leaders failed to create an optimum environment? This question became the topic for this study.

This study is important because it examines leadership in Early Head Start and Head Start programs, an area where little empirical research has been published. It explores the concept of leadership style and how it contributes to the success of Head Start programs.

The research question asks:
Does transformational leadership contribute to quality in Head Start/Early Head Start programs?

The independent variable in this study is transformational leadership. The dependent variables include experience of the leader, leader’s education level, quality of the program as defined by accreditation, quality of the program as defined by Head Start CLASS Instructional Learning Format scores, quality of Early Head Start as defined by health indicators of children, and quality of Head Start and Early Head Start as defined by monitoring results.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was transformational leadership. Bass (1985, 2010) defined transformational leaders as having charisma, inspiring followers, using intellectual stimulation, and considering each employee as an individual, giving personal attention in coaching and advising. According to Bass, transformational leadership is considered as the highest aspect of a continuum that begins on the low end with a very transactional leader. This kind of leader is one who may play favorites, operates on a contingent reward system, and punishes problems instead of inspiring solutions.

Transformational leaders are likely to be seen as satisfying; they inspire effort from those below them, and their followers will make extra effort for them. Such leaders set high goals and expect to achieve them, and their followers strive to reach these goals because of the extra individual consideration that the leader inspires. Transformational leaders can do more with less and can make a large difference in the outcomes of an organization.
In 1990, Yammarino and Bass conducted one of the first major studies on transformational leadership on naval officers representing all sizes and types of ships in every type of duty station in the surface warfare fleet at the time. This study used the transformational concept developed by Bass in 1985 to compare transformational leadership to transactional leadership along with the outcomes of satisfaction, extra effort, and effectiveness. The researchers issued a modified form of the Multi Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to 186 officers. Senior officers among the volunteers were then selected, resulting in a total of 793 participants overall.

Yammarino and Bass (1990) analyzed the results within and between groups at all levels on all nine constructs measured. The authors concluded that transformational leadership and its outcomes were positively highly related. They also noted that transactional leadership was less related, and laissez faire leadership was negatively related.

Additional leadership theories such as Greenleaf’s servant leadership model were explored. Greenleaf described servant leaders as those who put other people’s needs and interests before their own. The motive of a servant leader is to serve first, not lead first. It is somewhat similar to transformational leadership in that both types of leaders will lead others to perform better because of inspiration from the leader, but the greatest difference is that transformational leaders are leaders first and servants second. Servant leaders are servants first. Gandhi and Jesus Christ are considered models of servant leadership. Both demonstrated the concepts of servant and steward as opposed to leader or owner (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2010).
Servant leaders have been identified in organizations such as Southwest Airlines and TD Industries. Both corporations have been listed among the top 100 best companies to work for in the United States. These companies embed servant leadership in their companies and believe that doing so embodies trust, which provides the foundation for organizational excellence (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2010).

Bill George (2010) described authentic leadership not as a style but as a way of being, considering an authentic leader as one who is his or her own person, not swayed by the whims of others. For those who have strict and unwavering core values and are aware of their weaknesses, core values are important and needed because leaders are tempted by the power and prestige of leadership and must steer back to and depend upon their values. Authentic leaders understand the purpose and direction for their leadership, practicing and following their unwavering values. George (2010) described “leading with heart” (p. 58) as engaging the hearts and minds of employees, caring about employees, and understanding the role the leader has in employees’ lives. Authentic leaders establish relationships to know and connect with employees, so they can inspire and care for employees simultaneously. In addition, authentic leaders practice self-discipline.

Other authors have described the components of authentic leadership differently. Peus, Wesche, Striecher, and Frey (2012) portrayed a balanced decision-making process in which an authentic leader performs an analysis of data before making any decision. Balance includes considering information that contradicts the initial viewpoint of the leader, forcing that individual to take all views into consideration prior to making a decision. The authentic leader relies on an internal moral compass and strong values to take a stand, even if it goes against the views of the group. Peus et al. (2012) described
authenticity as being transparent in relationship, always presenting one’s true self. The authentic leader shares information, thoughts and true feelings, openly keeping in consideration the opposing views of others. An authentic leader is considerate and compassionate, understanding his or her own weaknesses and strengths and how they impact others.

Onorato and Zhu (2014) contended that authentic leadership is successful when it brings leaders and followers together to define goals and determine how to meet them. Such leadership attempts to determine what is best for the organization but understands that what is best for the organization is also best for the employees. The authors also described four aspects of authentic leadership in their study of trust. Onorato and Zhu’s quantitative study determined that the authentic behavior of leadership predicted trust as an outcome. In this study, leaders that had higher authentic leadership ranked higher on trust from followers in their organization. Regression analysis determined that authentic leadership predicted the development of trust with the organization.

Another study by Cianci, Hannah, Roberts, and Tsakumis (2014) examined an aspect of ethics in authentic leadership using the construct of moral courage. The researchers found that authentic leadership had a positive effect on ethical behavior by increasing followers’ moral courage or their ability to do what they considered right and not just follow the group. The presence of an authentic leader reduced the possibility of a person completing an unethical action, by moderating temptation. Authentic leadership, however, did not make a difference if temptation was not present suggesting it is only a factor in making ethical decisions.
Copeland (2016) proposed to extend the research on leadership that outlines the relationships between authentic, ethical, and transformational leadership behavior and improved levels of effectiveness in leaders. This study tried to determine if the attributes of all three improve leader behavior in any way and attempted to identify whether transformational leadership moderates authentic and ethical leadership and leader behaviors. The model in the study used seven leadership characteristics, and the author proposed that these seven characteristics combine to create a new model of leadership, that of ethical, authentic transformational leadership. Copeland questioned if the presence of all seven characteristics predict higher levels of leader effectiveness and whether the presence of transformational leadership increases the effectiveness of ethical and authentic leadership.

Copeland’s (2016) quantitative design surveyed 175 people who had contact with the leaders of their organizations in the northeast United States. Respondents represented for-profit organizations, nonprofits, government agencies, colleges, universities, and churches. Copeland’s survey instruments included several designed to measure authentic leadership, ethical leadership, and transformational leadership through the eyes of the follower. The author measured leader effectiveness by a subordinate’s willingness to work at a high level for his or her leader, as well as the degree to which the individual enjoyed working for, got along with, admired, was compatible with, and had the same ideals as the leader. Copeland distributed these surveys to the participants by email and manually.

Results partially supported the hypotheses in Copeland’s (2016) study. The researcher’s initial hypothesis was supported by the results, which showed that leadership
effectiveness increased as each of type of leadership behavior was added. The results also demonstrated that as each leader behavior type was added to the model, an incremental increase was measured in effectiveness, supporting a second hypothesis. Copeland performed a regression analysis that showed that as leaders had traits of transformational, authentic, and ethical leadership, then effectiveness increased incrementally. However, the author’s hypothesis that transformational leadership was a moderator of authentic and ethical leadership did not occur.

Copeland (2016) concluded that though there were limitations in the study, it demonstrated that leaders exhibiting authentic, ethical, transformational behaviors are more effective as defined by their followers. The study results demonstrated that ethical leadership is the most predictive of effectiveness and authentic the least predictive. Copeland concluded with the observation that more research is still needed on this subject.

Rationale for theory. Shared leadership, authentic leadership, servant leadership and ethical leadership were each considered and abandoned in favor of transformational leadership theory. Business and leadership literature reveal intense study of transformational leadership since 1985. A preponderance of evidence leads to the conclusion that a leader’s use of transformational leadership style directly leads to higher quality and more effective organizations. The demands of leading a Head Start or Early Head Start program are most effectively performed by a transformational leader. The requirements of Head Start and characteristics of a transformational leader are compared in Table 1 as described by Bass (2010) and the Office of Head Start (2016d).
### Table 1

*Characteristics of Transformational Leadership and Responsibilities of Head Start Leader Compared*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of a Transformational Leader</th>
<th>Responsibilities of a Head Start Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspires vision and mission</td>
<td>Strategic planning, continuous quality improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes learning</td>
<td>Creates a coordinated approach to professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats employees as individuals</td>
<td>Creates individual professional development plans, plans a coordinated approach to professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving—asks questions in new ways</td>
<td>Conducts program self-assessment, creates program goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets high expectations</td>
<td>Increasing CLASS scores and program information report data, meets and exceeds scores year over year using a coordinated approach to continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, several reliable and valid scales are available that can measure the effects of transformational leaders on a large or small scale. Examining the quality of Head Start and Early Head Start programs through the lens of transformational leadership adds to the available empirical evidence on leadership in early childhood education programs and may answer the author’s burning question of why ECE leaders do not always pursue industry recognition of a higher-quality program or center.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This study was designed to answer the question: Does transformational leadership contribute to quality in Head Start/Early Head Start programs? This chapter begins with a brief history of early childhood education, laying the foundation for an understanding of Head Start and Early Head Start. It goes on to explore the scant evidence regarding leadership in early childhood education, including any evidence available on Head Start leadership. The review then turns to the most closely related field, that of K–12 leadership, most notably the role of the school principal in improving the academic outcomes of children. Many early childhood programs, including Head Start and Early Head Start, are located within nonprofit organizations; therefore, the chapter also examines leadership in nonprofits as well as leadership in the corporate world.

The review concludes by discussing empirical research on quality indicators of early childhood education and Head Start. Head Start and Early Head Start programs providing services to differing age groups, with differing quality indicators, are explored. The quality of Head Start, as defined by the OHS, are also examined. The resulting connection between leadership style and quality of programs provides the basis for this study.

A Brief History of Early Childhood Education

The field of early childhood education in the United States is relatively young. Developed by Friedrich Froebel, it began in 1855 with the kindergarten movement, which originated in Germany. By the mid-1900s, Maria Montessori had become an outspoken
proponent of focusing on the needs of the child and had created a curriculum centered on the child, designing a child-sized environment that fostered independence. Schools based on her philosophy are still popular in the United States today. The mid-1900s were an important time for early childhood education; in the United States, John Dewey was also a pioneer for ECE programs. Dewey was a proponent of the progressive educational movement, which believed in individuality, respect, child choice, learning through experience, and reflecting on that experience. Most modern ECE programs in the United States are based on Dewey’s philosophy of learning (Brewer, 1995).

In 1941, when most young men in the United States went off to fight in World War II, women were hired to build ships and planes in the factories. A need for child care arose, and the Lanham Act established 24-hour, seven-day-a-week child care for women working in war factories, ending when WWII ended.

Head Start was created in 1965 as part of President Johnson’s War on Poverty. It began as an eight-week summer program to give children a summer of preschool before kindergarten. Now a multi-million-dollar program operating year-round in most communities, Head Start serves hundreds of thousands of children each year from birth to kindergarten age.

In 1985, the field began a journey of professionalization when the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the professional association for early childhood educators, developed a set of national accrediting standards. Since that time, NAEYC accreditation has become the standard of high quality in the early childhood education profession.
Congress created a landmark piece of legislation in 1990 that drove changes to child care in the United States. The Child Care Development Block Grant (1990) expanded child care assistance to all low-income families. This legislation required each state to create a voucher system and assure that any program or center receiving these federal funds met a minimum level of regulations.

These regulations included minimum health and safety standards for family child care homes and centers, minimum training standards for caregivers, and background checks for all caregivers.

**Early Childhood Education Leadership**

The literature on leadership in early childhood education is limited. Few empirical studies exist, and much of the literature consists of editorials and research reviews. Several authors have reviewed leadership styles, discussing how they are important to the field of early childhood education. According to these authors, no single definition of leadership exists in early childhood education. Authors have all agreed that leadership in early childhood education is an under-researched area (Brownlee, Nailon, & Tickle, 2010; Nupponen, 2006; Wise & Wright, 2012).

Empirical studies from the United States seem to be lacking in the literature. Several cross-cultural studies are available; however, it is wise to be cautious in comparing these to the United States because of differences in culture.

Stamopoulos (2012) described two studies conducted over a ten-year period in Australia. The country had implemented a dramatic series of changes in the early childhood field, and the studies documented the changes and needs of early childhood directors and staff. The author concluded that the government provided inadequate
leadership, noted inadequate knowledge of the field from government officials driving the change, and described a situation where few support structures were in place, along with a lack of consultative processes (Stamopoulos, 2012). A description of four aspects of leadership was derived from the data: (a) attention to professional knowledge; (b) professional identity of the field; (c) application of an infrastructure connecting children, families, and their needs to the needs of professionals; and (d) trust between parties.

Hard and Jónsdóttir, in their 2013 cross-cultural article comparing programs in Iceland and Australia, found several resonating themes in their qualitative examination. According to the authors, a theme emerged of horizontal violence in which people in the programs participated in staff conflict and activities that diminished and marginalized co-workers. Hard and Jónsdóttir also discovered a similar theme of the use of power and how people use power against each other. A culture of niceness emerged, including avoidance of debate and conflict, and other themes involved a sense of equality and ethic of care in a field that is largely, almost exclusively, female (Hard & Jónsdóttir, 2013).

However, in both of those studies, by Stampoulos (2012) and by Hard & Jónsdóttir (2013), people evidenced strong teamwork and wanted to work together. An interesting point in the study was that teams may work against leadership because people want to stay part of the team and not be the leader with the power. There seems to be a need to not be different from one’s peers and thus not take on a position of leadership. The authors end with a call for more leadership development in early childhood programs. Leaders are needed and will make the profession stronger by making leadership their focus and building capacity for excellence in leadership.
A study from Finland (Hujala, 2004) gave a systems theory perspective of leadership, viewing leadership through the lens of the leader. The author conducted a qualitative study, using focus groups that included directors, higher administrators, teachers, parents, and outside stakeholders, that revealed that leadership is described differently depending on the level of the system from which the person operates. The stakeholders on the macro level, or outside influences such as regulators, saw leadership differently than those internally at the micro level, such as teachers. Parents saw leadership at the meso or middle level. All focus groups saw the director at the meso level as the person that must integrate the macro and micro levels. Power and responsibility were most connected with leadership. Leadership in Hujala’s study was demonstrated to be defined by the self-interest of the group being questioned. Parents saw the children as the most important issue, teachers saw the leader as the person that cares for them the most, and the directors saw it as vision-building and serving the mission of the center (Hujala, 2004).

In 1991, Bloom identified child care directors as key to the quality of a child care center, citing research that demonstrated that the higher level of education a child care director attained was directly indicative of the level of quality of the director’s center. As a field, child care director qualifications are driven by state regulations that vary across the country. Most states take the perspective that the purpose of child care regulations is to prevent harm to children. Bloom asked states to take quality to the next level by requiring child care regulations to enhance learning: Only then will quality increase across the country.
Bloom and Able (2015) defined the child care center director as an instructional leader responsible for the quality of the center. The authors proposed that those directors that see leadership as an organizational asset should view their program as a place that leadership can be practiced at all levels of the center. Bloom and Able (2015) propose that doing so will sustain the program and contribute to ongoing leadership of the program.

Several authors have agreed that this is a critical time for leadership in early childhood education, which is becoming publically visible and is subject to accompanying public scrutiny. Leadership is needed to transform the field (Bloom & Able, 2015; Wise & Wright, 2012). Child care directors are seen in all the domestic articles as the key to quality in early childhood education, and cross-cultural studies identify directors as key in most instances. Clearly, child care center directors are the driving force of leadership in a child care center.

**Head Start Leadership**

In 2014, the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation within the Administration for Children commissioned a report as part of its Head Start Leadership, Excellence and Data Systems Project. The resulting report, a literature review and conceptual framework, was written by researchers at the Urban Institute to assist Head Start in understanding data use for continuous improvement in Head Start programs (Derrick-Mills, Sandstrom, Pettijohn, Fyffe, & Koulish, 2014). The researchers relied on a panel of experts to validate and guide their research. The resulting report identified six elements that either support or impede data use in Head Start programs. The first identified element was that of leadership, specifically transformational leadership, as key
to continuous quality improvement. According to the report, effective leaders are transformational, and once transformational leadership is in place, distributed leadership motivates staff to use data. In addition, effective leaders clearly communicate high expectations concerning the use of data for continuous improvement. The other key items identified included “the analytical capacity of the program staff, the commitment of resources, professional development, a culture of collaborative inquiry, a continuous cycle and environmental and organizational considerations” (Derrick-Mills et al., 2014, p. iv). As the most commonly cited theme in the report, leadership was considered the most fundamental in that all other identified key themes that emerged depended on the decisions of the program leadership (Derrick-Mills et al., 2014).

The federal Office of Head Start has recently begun to emphasize the importance of Head Start directors in the newly revised Head Start Performance Standards, issued in September 2016 (OHS, 2016b). For the first time since Head Start was funded in 1965, Head Start directors are now required to possess at least a bachelor’s degree and have experience in management and administration of programs. In the preamble to the standards, in which OHS responded to comments from the comment period prior to adoption, OHS indicated that some commenters were concerned that requiring a Head Start director to have any more education than a high school diploma would make it difficult for programs to recruit directors. OHS responded by retaining the requirement and offering flexibility for programs to define any other needed requirements for the position (OHS, 2016b).

In 2016, prior to the release of the new Head Start Performance Standards, McCormick Center for Leadership at National Louis University released a report on
qualifications of Head Start leaders. McCormick Center examined data from the Illinois Gateways to Opportunity, a credentialing system in Illinois that captures data on administrators. All data are verified by documentation and transcripts. Credentials are given for differing levels of education and other criteria to meet three to five levels of credential. This report reviewed data on Head Start and Early Head Start administrators that has never been reviewed to this point.

The report examined education coordinators, site-level directors, and program directors (McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership, 2016). According to the report, there are 137 Early Head Start and Head Start programs in Illinois and 258 education coordinators. In the Gateways registry, 593 people self-identified as Early Head Start or Head Start administrators, and 130 of those had earned an Illinois Director credential.

The report indicated that 90% of education coordinators have a Bachelor’s in Early Childhood Education, and 7% do not meet the minimum requirements for their position (McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership, 2016). Five percent (5%) have an associate degree, 52% have a BA, and 40% have a graduate degree. For those persons listing themselves as site manager, 74% have a bachelor’s degree or higher, 31% have a graduate degree, and 10% have an associate degree. Among Early Head Start managers, 15% have a graduate degree. Thus, the study found that most people in Head Start and Early Head Start have the education to qualify them for the position, but one quarter fail to meet the qualifications.

According to the report, a key role of Head Start and Early Head Start leaders is to provide effective educational leadership, and if 25% do not have the qualification for
their job, they will not be effective educational leaders (McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership, 2016). The report concluded that efforts should be made to support Head Start and Early Head Start directors to attain directors’ credentials.

The McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership (2016) report contained two major flaws. First, an assumption is made that every Head Start Director is required to have an Illinois Directors credential; the Directors credential is designed for site-level child care directors and is only recently required for those directors whose centers are funded by a State of Illinois Preschool For All program. These directors must have a bachelor’s degree and a level two or three Illinois Gateways Director credential (Illinois State Board of Education, 2017). Most Head Start and Early Head Start program directors or Early Head Start managers are not directors of their own child care centers; those positions are located with the center itself, meaning the administrators that the report proposes to critique are not included in Gateways because they are not required to do so. They would only be included if they voluntarily decided to apply for a Directors credential.

The second flaw is the definition of education coordinator (McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership, 2016). This definition may be different at the site level and the program level. Head Start/Early Head Start grantees are required to have one education coordinator for each grantee, and each grantee may have from one to hundreds of sites. The McCormick Center’s report seems to assume that the education coordinators listed in Gateways are the content area expert for the grantee, when in fact they may be the site-level expert, which may or may not meet the requirement and is not required, by Head Start or any other law, to do so (Office of Head Start, 2016d).
The few other studies found for this chapter include dissertations. One, a qualitative study by Gonzalez (2015), explored three questions:

- What are the Head Start Directors’ ideas of ideal leadership?
- How do teachers perceive ideal leadership?
- How do these two perceptions compare?

Gonzalez’s study used a transformational leadership theoretical framework, integrating Kouzes and Posner’s model. Their survey of leadership practices, the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI), was used as a basis for the interviews in this study, which surveyed a purposeful sample of 6 directors and 9 teachers.

Gonzalez (2015) reported that results from the director interviews indicated three themes: director as motivator/cheerleader, director as visionary, and collaboration. All directors saw their role as motivating teachers to do their jobs well and to improve over time. They saw themselves as setting the vision for the program and teachers as collaborators and all had a strong team approach.

According to Gonzalez (2015), teachers agreed that motivation by directors was important. The teachers wanted personal verbal and written encouragement from the directors. They valued visibility and indicated the need for directors to be in classrooms and at parent meetings so that the directors could see the day-to-day operation of the program as well as encourage the staff. Teachers also wanted the director to go into the room and observe and encouraged the directors to “stay connected” (Gonzalez, 2015, p. 11).

According to Gonzalez (2015), teachers wanted directors to lead by example. Directors should be hard working and knowledgeable about child development and need
to follow through on concerns and issues. There should be two-way communication. They need to “walk the talk” (Gonzalez, 2015, p. 11). Leading by example and following through was how directors gained respect from teachers.

Lastly, Gonzalez (2015) noted that the teachers valued professional development. Specifically, they wanted professional development opportunities so they could improve their skills. They wanted to enhance their skills in the classroom.

Gonzalez’s (2015) comparison of the results from the two groups revealed similarities and differences. The similarities included the need for motivation and vision-making, and both groups discussed the changes in Head Start toward school readiness. Teachers and directors both agreed a vision was very important and that the director should set the vision.

Differences were also evident in the two groups in Gonzalez’s (2015) study. Teachers talked more about the children and families, and directors discussed more of the program and its abstract operations, including compliance and budget. Teachers also talked about leadership as a big picture and the leader as the computer, while directors talked about how a lack of leadership would impact operations.

The results of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) that Gonzalez (2015) conducted indicated that teachers valued *Modeling the Way* the most, while directors valued *Enable Others to Act. Inspire a Shared Vision* was rated the least important. As a general tendency, directors scored the LPI higher overall than teachers.

Gonzalez’s (2015) study concluded that transformational leadership practices are important in ECE programs. Directors and teachers both defined aspects of transformational leadership (TL) in the interviews and identified the most important
practices in the LPI. Directors should be aware that TL is important, and the should collaborate with and be more visible to teachers as well as acknowledge and praise them.

Gray-Pierre explored Head Start leadership and its relationship to early learning in her 2014 dissertation, using a qualitative case study of 14 participants from four programs and a collaborative leadership framework. The work resulted in four major findings:

• Effective leadership is considered a critical aspect of early learning.
• Head Start’s structure offers a unique ability to collaborate within the program that then serves as a component of early learning.
• Early childhood programs can be significantly enhanced by collaborative relationships.
• Ongoing learning can be sustained “through motivation and accountability” of collaboration. (Gray-Pierre, 2014, p. 60)

Gray-Pierre (2014) discussed various strategies for collaboration, including parents being involved, leadership team meetings, and collaborative meetings for teachers. The author called for increased collaboration between Head Start, PreK programs, and school districts to increase early learning. The study also indicated the need for more collaboration between these entities so that as children transition from Head Start to the schools, the process becomes easier for the family. The author ended with a call for more research on the subject, including larger studies and cross-sector studies that examine public school teacher’s viewpoints (Gray-Pierre, 2014).

The purpose of a dissertation by Valencia in 2013 was to assess the leadership skills of Head Start leaders in California and identify future behavior and skills that these
leaders might report as needed. This was a mixed methods study covering three regions in the state.

Head Start programs are undergoing rapid, transformational change. In 2007, with the passage of the new Head Start Act, new emphasis was placed on accountability. Several years later, the Designation Renewal System (DRS) was put into place. The DRS automatically requires that the programs scoring in the bottom 20% in the nation be placed on renewal status and re-compete for their grant. In addition, although grants were formerly ongoing and continuously funded across the board, they are now time-limited for five years, at which time programs may re-compete (Head Start Act, 2007)

Leadership has become increasingly important in responding to the new regulations in Head Start. Valencia’s (2013) study examined leadership skills and behaviors. The author asked the following research questions:

- How do leadership skills and behaviors differ by region in California?
- What skills and behaviors are used by Head Start leaders?
- What are the three priority leadership skills that these leaders think they will need in the future?

Valencia (2013) used three key leadership arenas from the book, *Leadership Agility* by Joiner and Josephs (2007) for this study. These are: leading organizational change, improving team performance, and engaging in pivotal conversations. The methodology was a purposeful sampling of Head Start leaders across the state of California, using a survey sent to all 160 Head Start program directors. This was a quantitative descriptive study using a survey with a seven-point Likert scale. The survey received an 85% response rate.
Valencia (2013) discovered no differences between the three regions of California in the answers given. The Head Start leaders reported that they need to be visionary, (15%), creative, innovative, and use strategic planning (8% each). Of the total number of leaders, 13% valued communication, while 11% saw flexibility as being key. Using data as well as adapting to and managing change were also considered important.

The data in Valencia (2013) suggested that the participating Head Start leaders were not agile in terms of leading organizational change. Only 20% used strategies to increase buy-in from stakeholders, and 18% did not “transform conflicts into opportunities” (Valencia, 2013, p. 176). Of the respondents, 66% said they would rather focus on issues within their unit. Although the respondents stated they valued collaboration, the same respondents work only one-on-one with their direct reports and concentrate on their own work, not that of the group.

Valencia (2013) concluded with the statement that more work could be done to make Head Start leaders more agile. Leaders can share the organization by empowering others, and it did not appear the majority of Head Start leaders surveyed valued this strategy. Leaders need to use self-reflection. “Leading from their chair” (Valencia, 2013, p. 178) is no longer a valid leadership style.

The literature on leadership in early childhood education is still emerging. Though the field of early childhood is beginning to recognize the importance of leadership, empirical studies are just starting to emerge.

**Principal Leadership in K–12 Schools**

The role of public school principals as leaders in school improvement has been studied in depth over the past years and can serve as a road map for the early childhood
field. In their 1996 study, Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis explored the importance of the school principal in student learning. The researchers used a conceptual framework and model that incorporated contextual and personal antecedents of principal leadership, a principal leadership construct, and factors leading to teaching and learning and student achievement (Hallinger et al., 1996).

Hallinger et al. (1996) analyzed data from 87 schools in Tennessee that participated in the state’s school improvement program. Included were the principal’s gender, parent involvement, organizational variables, faculty attitudes, faculty effectiveness, and incentives to school personnel, which was gathered through several surveys to different school populations. According to the authors, student learning was assessed by a criterion-referenced reading test administered by the schools during 1984–85 as a pretest and a post-test. Thus, Hallinger et al.’s (1996) study was a secondary analysis of participants in the 1983–86 School Incentives Improvement Program.

Hallinger et al.’s (1996) analysis of the data revealed that parent involvement in the school had a positive effect on principals, in that principals perceived as instructional leaders worked in schools with parents who were more involved in the education of their children. Principals in higher socio-economic status areas were more active leaders in the school. The results of the analysis revealed that principals had no direct effect on students’ reading achievement; however, principals influenced teachers indirectly through instructional leadership. The researchers found a correlation between having a clear school mission and its effect on student achievement. A clear mission influenced opportunity for students to learn and raised teachers’ expectations of learning, which then had a positive effect on reading achievement.
A qualitative study of instructional leadership in elementary schools in South Africa was published in 2013 by Mestry, Moonsamy-Koopasammy, and Schmidt. The researchers interviewed principals of six schools: three schools that needed to improve their math scores and three that were doing well. Although it is important to realize that research on cultures other than that of the United States should be examined for cultural differences and may not be applicable, the results seemed to be relevant for this study. Three themes came out of the data analysis:

- the principals’ need to balance their administrative and instructional roles,
- the principal’s role in managing the instructional process, and
- the principal’s role in promoting a positive school environment. (Mestry et al., 2013)

Mestry et al. (2013) found that all the principals considered promoting teaching and learning in the schools as their core responsibility. However, they were usually swamped with administrative duties that made it difficult. In this study, instructional leadership meant setting clear goals, managing the curriculum, and monitoring and evaluating teaching and learning.

In a report for the Wallace Foundation, Murphy, Elliott, Goldring, and Porter (2006) found that leadership matters and is an important ingredient in school success. In difficult times, leadership matters even more to prevent decline and destruction, and leadership can save or turn around a school. In times when there is significant transition, leadership can be the major factor in explaining organizational performance. Murphy et al.’s report concluded that the field of education should focus on instruction and leadership that are adept at managing change.
The link between leadership and improved student learning was explored by Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson in 2010. This was the largest research study of its kind at the time, including nine states, 43 school districts, and 180 K–12 schools. It reviewed student achievement test results for math and literacy using a mixed methods explanatory approach (Louis et al., 2010).

According to Louis et al. (2010), the results demonstrated that collective leadership has a stronger influence than individual leadership, and higher-performing schools awarded greater influence to teacher teams, parents, and students. Principals and district leaders had the most influence on decisions in all schools, and they did not lose influence as others gain it. School leaders impacted student achievement mostly through their influence on teachers’ motivation and working conditions and less on teachers’ knowledge and skills. Leadership affected achievement because it strengthens community wherein teachers work together to improve their practice. The study concluded that professional community is a strong predictor of student achievement.

A 2013 Wallace Foundation report on the School Principal as Leader found that an effective principal makes sure that a notion of academic success gets spread to all the faculty to create a “school wide learning improvement agenda” (p. 7). The report noted that the most effective school principals are those who build a sense of community. These include respect for every member of the school community; “an upbeat, welcoming, solution-oriented, no-blame, professional environment” (Wallace Foundation, 2013, p. 9).
Nonprofit Organization Leadership

Many early childhood education programs, including Head Start and Early Head Start, are located within nonprofit organizations. Thus, evidence regarding leadership in nonprofit organizations is relevant to the global exploration of leadership for this study.

Leadership in a nonprofit organization has been proven important to the health and longevity of the organization. Leadership is the ability to get participants to focus their attention on the issues that the leader considers important. Hoefer and Sliva (2014) have identified that experienced leaders are leaving the nonprofit field. Their study revealed that leaders are retiring, and fewer lower level managers wish to take the top spot in organizations. Nonprofit managers are often promoted without knowing why they were promoted and do not receive any managerial training, leading to burnout and frustration. Nonprofits invest less time and money in recruiting from within than their business counterparts, decreasing motivation from employees. The number of nonprofit organizations has increased while the capacity of the organizations is decreasing, leading to a leadership gap (Hoefer & Sliva, 2014).

Phipps and Burbach, in their 2010 article on strategic leadership theory, addressed the role of the leader and how this individual contributes to overall organizational performance. To be effective, the capacity of the leader must be matched to the complexity of the work. This paper was based on a framework of three elements: the capacity to learn, to change, and for wisdom.

According to Phipps and Burbach (2010), strategic leaders play a crucial role in the learning capacity of their organizations by encouraging learning about the knowable and unknown futures of the organization. The best top managers influence the rate at
which their organizations learn by increasing the level of readiness for the followers. At a network level, they increase knowledge between and across the social networks of the organization, and they engage in transformational behaviors to challenge the organization. They use transactional behaviors to improve learning. Leaders influence the organization’s capacity to change. Nonprofits value clarification and a compelling direction both during crisis and during stability.

Phipps and Burbach (2010) described managerial wisdom as the ability to make the right decisions at the right moment based on the environment and people acting within it. Strategic leaders with more experience can more easily and quickly identify problems and their solutions than those without experience. Informal experience is more valuable than formal education or training programs.

Phipps and Burbach (2010) also suggested that context matters, in that organizational culture plays a role in a relationship between leadership and innovation. Organizational innovation and mission trajectory also matter. These are areas that should be researched more and are needed additions to the literature on nonprofit leadership.

A 2014 article by Hopkins, Meyer, Shera, and Peters is an editorial describing the leadership challenge in nonprofits now and in the future. The authors suggested that by 2016, a need for 80,000 new nonprofit leaders will arise. New models of leadership will be in force as described by the Leadership Learning Community, comprised of funders from across the country. According to Hopkins et al., this group has called for a transformation in how leadership is conceived in nonprofit organizations. The group also suggested that collective leadership be developed, in which leaders collaborate with stakeholders and the community to develop innovative solutions to problems. The authors
stress the idea that leadership for today will not be the leadership for tomorrow (Hopkins et al., 2014).

Nonprofit leaders must be good at connecting agencies and fostering a new organizational climate. This type of leadership fosters collaboration and calls for organizations to work together in collaborative, collective ways to advocate for innovative approaches for clients.

Leadership has been defined as a way that managers and leaders effectively manage change, and as the ability to present a vision so that others want to follow it. It includes building relationships as well as organizing resources effectively.

Uzonwanne’s study from 2015 examined the choice of a situational leadership model, which has been used as a training device at Fortune 500 businesses and a widely accepted philosophy, assuming that “behaviors affect outcome” (p. 288). Nonprofit organizations are finding it necessary to change and adapt to a rapidly changing environment in which collaboration and innovation are becoming the new normal. Little research has examined leadership styles of nonprofit leaders and their preferred decision-making models. Uzonwanne’s study is an in-depth look at leadership styles of selling, telling, delegating, and participating as well as the decision-making models leaders use, whether rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, or spontaneous. The study was a quantitative design using correlation and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The target group for the study was 500 executives from the state of Texas, resulting in a sample of 109 completed surveys. The results of the study indicated a strong relationship between leadership style and decision-making.
Uzonwanne (2015) concluded that rational decision-making is used by more experienced executives, no matter their age or gender, suggesting that this style of decision-making leads to better decisions over the long term. This model is more favorable for decision-making in more complicated decisions. The author made a final case for teaching young executives management and leadership techniques by attending conferences and trainings. They should focus on using rational decision-making techniques to hone in on the best possible choices in challenging times. A criticism of this study is that it was focused only on nonprofits in the state of Texas, limiting its replicability across other states.

An article by Taylor, Cornelius, and Colvin (2014) explored visionary leadership and organizational effectiveness in nonprofit organizations. The authors explained that visionary leaders develop a personal vision and share it with their colleagues. Such leaders communicate their vision and inspire people to act on that shared vision. If people do not follow one of these leaders, it is because they are unsure of the vision and how to act. Taylor et al. maintained that visionary leaders are similar to transformational leaders in that the former use transformational behaviors, but they use other behaviors that are needed for the followers to have the knowledge and skills with which to act.

The purpose of Taylor et al.’s (2014) study was to expand the literature and determine which leadership behavior characteristics are most conducive to success. The results concluded that six of the eight scales of leadership behavior correlated with organizational effectiveness. The results of this study demonstrated leaders’ ability to advocate, innovate, change policy, and become politically savvy. The authors perceived
these leaders as effective leaders who employed transformational and transactional skills. The executive directors saw themselves as being innovative and adaptive.

A limitation of Taylor et al.’s (2014) study was the definition of effectiveness. In this study, effectiveness was determined by the follower and did not use any external measures of organizational effectiveness such as that found through finance or external accrediting bodies.

Phipps and Burbach published a 2010 review of the available literature on strategic leadership and the nonprofit organization (NPO). The idea of strategic leadership theory is that “a leader’s field of vision and interpretation of information is influenced by the leader’s values, cognition and personality” (Connella & Monroe, 1997 as cited in Phipps & Burbach, 2010, p. 137).

The authors proposed several ideas for further research, first that as effective leaders in NPOs increase the learning capacity of the organization, they increase the organization’s capacity for change, and they do this using “managerial wisdom” (p. 144). They also saw ethics as having a critical role.

The authors ended by calling for research on the effectiveness of NPOs using multilevel analyses of the individual and the organization simultaneously. The effect of the leader on the organization must be measured, and the effect of the organization on the leader should also be explained. In addition, the effect of the leader on individual needs to be explained.

Phipps and Burbach’s (2010) article focused on the need for research on strategic leadership but clearly described the problem in research on nonprofit organizations. The authors quoted Warren Buffet, explaining:
The nature of the problems that a foundation tackles is exactly the opposite of business. In business, you look for easy things, very good businesses that don’t have very many problems and that almost run themselves . . . . In the philanthropic world, you’re looking at the toughest problems that exist. The reason why they’re important problems is that they’ve resisted the intellect and money being thrown at them over the years and they haven’t been solved. You have to expect a lower batting average in tackling the problems of philanthropy than in tackling the problems of business. (Warren Buffett, 2003 as cited in Phipps & Burbach, 2010)

**Corporate Leadership**

Though the majority of Head Start programs are located within nonprofit organizations, transformational leadership has been researched in all sectors. Since it was first studied within the framework of influence on the corporate leader, it is important to examine the research on corporate transformational leadership in order to provide a balanced and complete review of all leadership literature.

According to Eisenbeiss, van Knippenberg, and Fahrbach (2015), leadership and performance at the top level of an organization depends on a strong ethics program for the corporation. Chief executive officers (CEOs) are the source of influence in an organization by transmitting cultural values. Therefore, CEOs with strong ethical leadership create a culture of ethics in the organization, which leads to better performance. “CEO leadership is much more complex than supervisory leadership” (Eisenbeiss et al., 2015, p. 635) and has many more layers and relationships, making the impact of leadership at the CEO level much more difficult to determine.
Eisenbeiss et al.’s (2015) study was based on upper echelons theory, which proposes that decision-making at the top is done in complex ways that consider the managers’ experiences and values. The performance of the organization is then seen as a reflection of the manager’s characteristics, especially the CEO.

Eisenbeiss et al. (2015) argued that when the leadership is ethical and does not tolerate unethical behavior such as cheating, lying, or arriving late to work, the performance of the organization improves because of the increased support for each other. This results in better business partnerships and teamwork. The culture of the organization changes to an ethical organization, and this explains how the CEO impacts and improves the organization’s effectiveness.

Eisenbeiss et al.’s (2015) research design was a quantitative study of organizational leadership using a web-based survey that included rating the CEO’s ethical behavior and the organization’s ethics program. The authors conducted a survey on ethical leadership and ethical organizational culture, determined the scope of the organization’s ethics program, and assessed performance of the firm using a scale designed for that purpose that assessed the perceived performance of the organization compared to its competitors.

Eisenbeiss et al.’s (2015) results indicated that a CEO’s ethical performance is positively correlated with ethical organizations and the strength of the ethics program within the organization. Indeed, the authors determined that ethical leadership at the CEO level and positive firm performance were contingent on “a strong corporate ethics program” (Eisenbeiss et al., 2015, p. 646).
Weaknesses in Eisenbeiss et al.’s (2015) study included a small sample size and the fact that the participants came only from Germany, limiting the generalizability to the United States. The study demonstrated that the CEO level does indeed impact the organization’s performance, but this study was limited only to ethical behavior. This raises the question: Are ethical leaders attracted to ethical organizations, or did the CEO create and or enforce the ethics program in place in the organization? The effectiveness of the firm was measured by the participants themselves, not by any external measures such as profit, or industry accolades. Although the authors did not consider any other method, the addition of external indicators would have added to the research (Eisenbeiss et al., 2015).

An article by Felfe and Schyns in 2004 discussed the similarities between transformational leadership and correlations of outcomes of the organization. Felfe and Schyns used the Multi-Factor Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) by Avolio and Bass (2004). The purpose of Felfe and Schyn’s (2004) research was to determine the similarity in leader and follower behavior and how it affects the organization. It is assumed that when leaders’ and followers’ behavior is congruent, the organization performs well, but the authors sought to determine if differences arise when the leader and follower have different levels of transformational behavior, specifically, when the leader is rated lower than the follower on leadership behaviors.

Felfe and Schyn’s (2004) quantitative study examined the behaviors of 213 people who were both supervisors and followers; that is, they were middle managers in administrative positions within a local governmental agency. Outcomes of the organization were measured using several different surveys such as an organizational
commitment scale, a satisfaction scale, a citizen behavior scale, and an achievement scale as well as a work experience scale that measured negative experience.

Felfe and Schyn’s (2004) results indicated a positive relationship between transformational leadership and outcomes such as efficiency, effort, and satisfaction. Findings also indicated that when supervisors consider themselves to be similar to their leaders, they perceive their leaders as successful.

However, the leaders could also be overestimating their performance (Felfe & Schyn, 2004). An unexpected pattern illustrated that dissimilarity stimulated people to work harder for the organization. Subordinates who saw themselves as dissimilar to their leaders tended to indicate they were more overachievers. Additionally, subordinates who felt dissimilar from their leader tended to feel more stress and irritability. Subordinates who rated themselves high in transformational leadership, and their leader was just as high or higher, showed the highest correlation between their own and their leaders’ success.

Again, the limitations for Felfe and Schyn’s (2004) study are evident in that the participants were all from one industry and one city. The use of the MLQ yielded good information for the study, but the outcomes were measured by the participants themselves and did not indicate any external benchmark, which is a limitation of the study.

In their 2013 study, Schuh, Zhang, and Tien proposed that transformational leaders are not really the best or most effective leaders. Their study examined a model that reviews the interactive relationship between transformational leadership and altruistic and self-focused leadership behaviors. Schuh et al. (2013) stated that transformational leadership does not always include ethical behavior, indeed, that
sometimes transformational leaders are pseudo-transformational in that they are using their standing and behavior for their own gain. This study tried to determine if followers look for signals from leaders to reveal the leaders’ intentions. The expectation is that moral and authoritarian behaviors will be pronounced for transformational leaders. The authors sought to better understand the entire leadership process, specifically looking for any link in bad leadership behaviors.

According to Schuh et al. (2013), having a compelling vision and charismatic role modeling are two of the hallmark behaviors of a transformational leader. These skills can lead to the collective good or to lead others in unethical behavior. Moral leadership behaviors on the part of the leader should influence followers and should be pronounced for transformational leaders, and conversely, followers’ responses to non-transformational leaders should be weaker. This formed a hypothesis of this study.

Schuh et al. (2013) noted that authoritarian leadership behaviors have been linked to leaders’ self-centered motives and need for personal power. They are negatively related to followers’ perception of selflessness. This is the basis of the researchers’ second hypothesis: The more transformational leadership behaviors, the stronger a negative association with authoritarian leadership.

There were 228 participants, including 114 supervisor–subordinate couples, all from China (Schuh et al., 2013). The study employed a transformational leadership scale, an authoritarian leadership scale, and a moral leadership scale.

Schuh et al.’s (2013) results indicated that moral leadership and transformational leadership predicted follower’s behavior. Leaders’ moral behavior and subordinates’ efforts were positive and significant for employees who “experienced their leaders as
highly transformational” (Schuh et al., 2013, p. 635). In addition, the researchers found that the relationship between leaders’ authoritarian behaviors and subordinates’ efforts was significant and negative for employees experiencing their leaders as highly transformational. This relationship did not affect followers’ reactions to leaders perceived as non-transformational.

Schuh et al.’s (2013) study reinforced the importance of transformational leadership but also the importance of moral leadership. When hiring or training new leaders, it is important to seek out the authentic transformational leader, to include the trait of moral leadership.

**Summary of Leadership Research**

Leadership is widely recognized as important to the corporate world, demonstrating that organizations with strong leadership are more effective and have better outcomes for the organization. Research on nonprofit leaders is lacking, and research on the effective principal is more widely available, proving that leadership is important in the achievement of K–12 students through the leadership of the principal.

The field of early childhood education recognizes the importance of leadership, but empirical evidence is not yet available for the field in general or Head Start/Early Head Start in particular. All researchers have agreed that leaders need to be visionary, setting clear goals and having a high level of expectation for success whether increasing academic achievement for students or leading a corporation. The leader sets the direction of the organization and is instrumental in leading the organization through change. Above all, a leader must be ethical, for an unethical leader may be charismatic and visionary, but
will eventually lead the organization to fail. Leadership is what makes the difference in an organization achieving its goals.

This chapter now turns to the subject of quality in early childhood education.

**Defining Early Childhood Education Program Quality**

The quality of care in early childhood education is important and was subjective until the early 1990s. In 1993, a major longitudinal study was launched to measure the correlation of the cost of child care, the quality of child care, and how those issues relate to the outcomes of children in child care (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2000). This large study, conducted at the University of North Carolina Frank Porter Graham Center, followed 826 preschool-age children enrolled in 183 preschool classrooms in four states over four years. Classrooms were observed, teachers were observed, children were tested with valid, reliable scales of language, literacy, and general cognitive development five times from age four to second grade.

Peisner-Feinberg et al. (2000) measured quality of care using four different observational instruments: the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, the Caregiver Interaction Scale, the UCLA Early Childhood Observation Form, and the Adult Involvement Scale. All scales measure process quality and are highly related. The researchers then computed a quality score using principal component analysis. Overall, the children were in child care programs that were of medium quality. Detailed analysis revealed that only 48% of children were in child care programs that had a high level of quality indicators.

A robust analysis of the results found that the quality of child care affected children’s development (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2000). Those who attended higher-
quality care performed better on measures of cognitive skills and social skills than those who attended poor-quality care.

High-quality care positively affected the children as they progressed through their school career, and the effects persisted over time until second grade (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2000). The authors also found that children who were at risk of not doing well were affected more by the level of quality of care than other children. Lastly, the quality of the classroom practices was directly related to each child’s cognitive development, and the quality of the teacher-child relationship affected the child’s social development through second grade.

The authors of this report ended with recommendations for policy makers (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2000). Child care quality is related to the achievement of children in elementary school, and it is most important for children at risk for academic problems. A greater investment in quality must be made in assuring all children have access to high-quality care. In Peisner-Feinberg et al.’s (2000) study, higher-quality child care programs had access to greater resources, which allowed them to put more resources into the classroom. The programs paid higher wages and had staff with higher levels of education. The authors recommended a series of policy improvements for the field and for policymakers, including specific recommendations for states on how to improve child care through an investment in more rigorous state licensing regulations and recommendations for how to improve the systems and infrastructure of child care for continuous improvement. One important recommendation was that of a rigorous national accreditation system. The programs in this study that were accredited also showed a higher level of quality than those that were not accredited (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2000).
In 1997, Whitebrook, Sakai, and Howes assessed National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation and its relationship to child care quality for the National Center on the Early Childhood Workforce. The quantitative study examined 92 centers in California as they received NAEYC accreditation and tracked them over 20 months. Centers that became NAEYC-accredited showed higher classroom quality in the beginning and greater improvement in overall quality than centers that attempted accreditation and did not receive it. The researchers concluded that NAEYC accreditation is not a guarantee of quality as nearly 40% of NAEYC-accredited centers were mediocre in quality even though they did make improvements (Whitebrook et al., 1997). Predictors of quality found from this study were nonprofit status, higher wages, and the retention of teachers.

Winterbottom and Piasta, in their 2015 article, looked at accreditation rates and kindergarten readiness of children across Florida in 2008, 2009, and 2010. Florida tests all children within the first 30 days of kindergarten to see their readiness level, and the test scores are then traced back to the child care centers the children attended. Readiness rates are used to compute a facility readiness rate for each child care facility. The rate also considers whether the center is accredited.

After data analysis was complete, Winterbottom and Piasta (2015) found that children in accredited centers showed no difference in readiness levels from children in non-accredited centers or homes. The researchers attributed this to the focus on structural quality and not process quality in accreditation standards. As defined in the study, structural quality includes such criteria as the number of children allowed within a classroom, called group size; number of minimum square feet for each classroom; and
number and credentials of teachers required to teach one group of children, called child-
teacher ratio. These criteria are defined minimally by each state in child care licensing
standards and further defined by accreditors within the accrediting standards.

According to Winterbottom and Piasta (2015), structural quality does not
necessarily improve children’s cognitive scores. The authors noted that process quality is
more important in improving children’s cognitive skills and is not addressed in any
accreditation program. The authors define process quality as the interaction between
teachers and children, specifically related to teaching. Using open-ended questions, a rich
vocabulary, and warmth in interactions as well as good classroom management skills are
examples of process quality. Winterbottom and Piasta recommended that programs
should still strive for accreditation but emphasized that more than just accreditation is
needed to improve outcomes.

In a similar study, Winterbottom and Jones (2014) analyzed accreditation
standards and licensing violations in accredited and non-accredited centers. According to
the authors, the state of Florida recently created a tiered system of licensing standards
that included accredited centers at the top, which were labeled Gold Seal programs. The
research was to determine if the attainment of the Gold Seal level of quality empirically
indicated that the program is higher quality and would have fewer licensing violations. A
stipulation by the state was that only programs that could demonstrate accreditation by
NAEYC or an equivalent accreditation to NAEYC could receive the Gold Seal.
Winterbottom and Jones looked at 4,323 centers, 23% of which were accredited, and
analyzed four years of data. The study concluded that accredited centers are safer and
provide better care than non-accredited centers. The researchers recommended that
parents should look for accredited centers because they will have fewer licensing violations.

Members of active duty military in the United States must be able to know that their children are safe while they are on duty. This has not always been the case. Until 1989, military child care was substandard; it did not always meet basic fire and safety codes and was carried out in a haphazard manner according to Floyd and Phillips (2013). In their article, the authors described the transformation of military child care through the Military Child Care Act of 1989, which transformed military child care from substandard, not meeting fire and safety codes, to a network of the highest quality child care in the United States. The military requires that all centers be accredited by a nationally recognized body. This sets a higher bar than the certification standards alone, ensuring that military children receive care that meets nationally recognized criteria for quality, including staff-child interactions, learning environments, and curriculum content. By 2002, “all child-care centers on military installations were either accredited by the NAEYC or in the process of obtaining or renewing their accreditation” (Floyd & Phillips, 2013, p. 8).

**Quality in Head Start.** When Head Start began in 1965, grants were awarded, and organizations could keep their grants indefinitely. The 2007 renewal of Head Start in Public Law 110-134, Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act, required grants to be awarded for five years, with a designation renewal system in which programs had to prove they were of high quality or they would be required to re-compete for the grant. The final rules were published in 2011, and five-year grant cycles began to be enforced. Programs were considered high quality if they met the following conditions:
• Annual budget and fiscal management data that followed the guidance of the program specialist and regulations related to allowable and allocable costs.

• Successful program reviews with few issues or concerns and no deficiencies.

• Annual audits with no or few findings that are corrected quickly.

• Classroom quality as measured by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System.

• Program information reports: submitting timely, accurate annual reports.

Grantees meeting these conditions are considered as providing a high-quality program and are able to continue to provide services for five years.

Seven conditions signify a program is not high in quality and triggers re-competition:

• A deficiency that is a systemic or substantial material failure in an area of performance

• Failure to establish and take steps to achieve school readiness goals

• Low Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) scores

• License revocation

• Suspension

• Debarment from any federally funded program

• Going Concern—an audit finding of being at risk of failure to continue functioning as a going concern.

The 2007 Head Start Act also required that the Office of Head Start use a valid and reliable research-based instrument to assess the classroom quality of teacher-child interactions. The Office of Head Start determined that the CLASS-PreK was the only
instrument that met that standard. No instrument meets the standard for children in Early Head Start (OHS, 2016a).

Assessing process quality in Head Start. The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) was developed by University of Virginia researchers to measure the quality of classrooms through observation of teacher–child interactions. Its descriptions of multiple dimensions of quality are linked to student achievement, and it has been validated in over 2,000 classrooms. This scoring system offers a tool to help teachers improve their teaching practice. CLASS is now commercially available, with access and training through Teachstone. Training is rigorous, with reliability testing required prior to and annually to maintain access to the tool.

Teachstone’s 2017 summary report on research related to CLASS revealed the significance and usefulness of the tool for teachers and Head Start. CLASS is composed of three scales, each containing three subscales. Emotional support has subscales on positive climate, negative climate, teacher sensitivity, and regard for student perspective. Classroom organization contains behavior management, productivity, and instructional learning formats. Instructional support contains concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling as its subscales. Each of these items is scored on a seven-point scale. Seven is the highest desired score except for the category negative climate, in which the high score would be a one, indicating an absence of negativity in the classroom. When scoring, subscales can be reported separately but are combined in an overall scale score. This report compares scale scores.

According to the report, studies that have measured thousands of classrooms comprising children from infancy through high school have supported CLASS efficiency.
The summary report described here provided information from 150 peer-reviewed studies on Pre-K through third grade in the United States. CLASS has become important in the United States because of its adoption by the Office of Head Start as the measure of quality in Head Start programs. CLASS scores are now used to partially determine whether a program can continue to operate because it is high quality, or it must re-compete, potentially losing the grant because of low quality. Its three scales correlate directly to classroom quality and the achievement of student outcomes.

The emotional support scale measures how teachers and children develop warm and caring relationships and, in turn, how children can develop relationships and become excited about learning. Classrooms with high emotional support scores have higher social–emotional outcomes than children in lower scoring rooms. Children have higher social competence and positive engagement with their teachers, fewer behavior problems, and fewer conflicts with their teachers. High emotional support scores also have shown to moderate executive functioning and larger working memory in children. Children in classrooms with higher emotional support also have higher mathematical thinking and can solve problems more easily. Children also had higher language and literacy gains in these classrooms. Moreover, early reading, vocabulary, print awareness, and expressive language are also higher.

The classroom organization scale refers to the way teachers help children to regulate behavior. The rules, routines, and clear expectations of a classroom serve to directly benefit children in their social–emotional and achievement outcomes. Children have higher social skills when their classrooms are organized and they have clear expectations from their teachers. Higher levels of classroom organization lead to higher
academic scores, better behavior, and higher language and literacy skills such as book knowledge, listening comprehension, and early writing skills. This measure has also been linked to early mathematics skills.

Teachers who effectively support children by supporting metacognition and language development have high Instruction Support domain scores. Children in these classrooms have high social–emotional functioning and academic achievement. Students also display increased behavior competence and high “teacher–child closeness” (Teachstone 2017, p. 10). Eight studies have found a relationship between high instructional support scores and language, literacy, and vocabulary. High scores in this area are also associated with high executive functioning skills in children. Higher order thinking skills supported by teachers allow children to control impulsive behavior and use more language and reasoning to solve problems of all kinds. Early mathematics is also associated with higher Instructional Support scores.

The report concludes that the CLASS measures the constructs that clearly lead to overall student growth. Significant evidence indicates that the CLASS is a valid reliable measure of those constructs and is a useful tool to enhance teacher interactions through coaching or feedback.

**Head Start studies of quality.** As a national federally funded program of early childhood education for low-income children, Head Start programs have been the subject of scrutiny since funding and accountability began to increase in the 2000s. The Family and Child Experiences study (FACES) was developed to measure the quality of programs, beginning in 2006. The study used samples of programs from across the
United States to assure a representative sample of the programs’ children and families that were enrolled in Head Start. FACES included children age three to five.

Aikens, Bush, Gleason, Malone, and Tarullo’s 2016 report to the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation of the Administration for Children at the Department of Health and Human Services examined FACES data from three cohorts to determine the level of quality over time. The studies occurred in 2006, 2009, and 2016 and included data on classroom characteristics as well as teacher characteristics. Additionally, the researchers interviewed center directors to determine teacher turnover rates. The authors also examined data from ECERS-R and CLASS instruments from all cohorts.

Examination of data from 60 programs included child level data in all three cohorts resulted in the inclusion of approximately 1,000 classrooms and data for 8,000 children in the analysis (Aikens et al., 2016). The researchers used linear regression analysis and simple logistics regression to analyze the data. The results indicated that teacher characteristics did not change much over time; thus, the authors excluded this category. Scores from the ECERS-R short-form Teaching and Interactions scale and Provisions for Learning scale were divided into inadequate, minimal, and good/excellent. Scores for CLASS were divided into low, mid and high. CLASS Instructional Support was the only scale used in FACES 2006, but all CLASS scales were used in 2009 and 2014.

Aikens et al.’s (2016) key findings on classroom quality and instruction indicated that over time, ECERS-R Teaching and Interactions scores moved from the minimal range to average. Scores for Provisions for Learning moved from inadequate to minimal in the 2009 cohort and more scored in the good/excellent range. The scores rose even
further by 2014 as the majority reflected a score of minimal and more moved to the good/excellent range.

According to Aikens et al. (2016), average scores for Instructional Support on CLASS improved between 2006 and 2014 from 1.9 to 2.4, although the scores are still in the low range. By 2014, only 1% of programs scored in the high range. However, scores in that time frame on Emotional Support scales or Classroom Organization scales of CLASS reflected no change. Most classrooms scored in the mid-range, and no significant change in data occurred over time. Some changes in teacher characteristics were evident as the number of teachers having a bachelor’s degree increased, as well as more children categorized as lower-income. The study authors concluded that the change in teacher characteristics explained the increase in CLASS Instructional Support scores, attributing it to 12% of the increase.

Aikens et al.’s (2016) report examined Head Start data from the three cohorts of FACES. In general, the researchers determined that the quality of classrooms improved over time as teacher characteristics increased, explaining some of the increase in quality. However, the authors did not examine the policies of the Office of Head Start or individual program policies that may have also contributed to the changes.

Quality in Early Head Start

The Early Head Start Family and Child Experiences Study (Baby FACES) conducted by Aikens, Xue, Bandel, Caronongan, Vogel, and Boller (2015) is a longitudinal study of 89 Early Head Start programs with two cohorts of children. A newborn cohort followed 192 pregnant women and their children, and the 1-year-old
cohort followed 782 children who were 12 to 16 months of age at the beginning of the study.

An important reason for Aikens et al.’s (2015) study was to identify any relationship between the provision of high-quality services and children’s growth and development. This report was commissioned to determine the quality of home visits and classrooms and how children and families experience differing levels of quality during their enrollment. The researchers also examined predictors of quality, including program, classroom, teacher, and home visitor characteristics. Baby FACES gathered child characteristics, family characteristics, and program characteristics as well as teacher and home visitor characteristics. The authors also gathered classroom and home visit characteristics and level of program implementation on a scale of 1 (low) to 4 (fully implemented). Aikens et al. (2015) evaluated classrooms using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) and CLASS-Toddler. The authors observed home visits using the Home Visitor Rating Scale-Adapted (HOVRS-A) and assessed children’s language and cognitive development using five different measures.

Aikens et al. (2015) analyzed the data using Hierarchical Linear Modeling and Generalized Additive Modeling (GAM). Their analyses revealed that only job satisfaction was related to home visit quality; child and parent characteristics were not. No program characteristics were found to be related to classroom quality, and teacher education level was associated with higher quality as were teacher depressive symptoms. Aikens et al. also noted that teachers with higher depressive symptoms had lower CLASS Emotional Support scores. Neither of those results predicted Engaged Support for learning. Additionally, children in classrooms with higher social–emotional scores displayed
higher language outcomes. Engaged Support for Learning scores between 3 and 4 were associated with higher child outcomes. The authors concluded that quality in Early Head Start is in the mid-range in general, and few elements predict quality. Program characteristics do not predict quality, nor do most teacher or home visitors’ characteristics. Teachers with higher education and less depression are related to higher quality and higher language scores in children. Home visitors are a predictor of quality only when they are more satisfied with their jobs (Aikens et al., 2015).

Overall, it is difficult to predict quality in Early Head Start programs, and the level of quality is even harder to measure. At this writing, the Office of Head Start uses neither the CLASS-T nor the HOVRS-A to measure quality in Early Head Start programs for the purpose of monitoring or review or as an indicator on the Program Information Report (PIR). Where Head Start quality is measured by CLASS scores, no comparable measurement exists in Early Head Start. A review of quality in Early Head Start reveals no public empirical evidence for quality in Early Head Start.

This author turned to a program officer with over 20 years’ experience in oversight and monitoring of Early Head Start programs for advice. According to this individual, “there is no one particular measure in Early Head Start” that indicates quality (Anonymous, personal communication, August 23, 2017). He further noted that the closest measures would relate to health, dental, and well-baby care.

As comprehensive programs, Head Start and Early Head Start require program staff to assist families in accessing and gaining health care, specifically, a medical home, where the child can see a primary care physician for ongoing health care that is not primarily urgent or emergency care. The program is also required to assist the family in
acquiring all immunizations for the child, as well as a dental home with a dental exam. Data on the completion and acquisition of these for each child are collected and reported annually to the Office of Head Start on the annual Program Information Report or PIR. This report is completed online and reviewed by program officers, monitoring review teams, the federal Office of Head Start, and Congress.

**Summary**

This literature review has demonstrated that school principals are the driving force for student achievement in schools, for students of all ages. The evidence is clear and exhaustive, including multiple reports from the Wallace Foundation and other sources of empirical research. The quality of early childhood education programs is demonstrated by accreditation, and accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) is most commonly researched. Winterbottom and Jones (2014) and Winterbottom and Piasta (2015) found in extensive studies of school children in Florida that accreditation by NAEYC indicated these programs were the safest for children; however, NAEYC accreditation did not always signify improved school outcomes for the children enrolled in child care.

Head Start and Early Head Start program quality is defined by the Office of Head Start and has been further studied in national, controlled, valid, and reliable studies that have identified quality through CLASS scores. CLASS is not currently used in Early Head Start programs, and currently, no publicly available measure of classroom quality exists for Early Head Start. However, rates of children’s medical or dental access have been suggested as a measure of quality in Early Head Start.
Empirical studies on nonprofit leadership style and its relationship to organizational quality have offered a variety of results. Hoefer and Sliva (2014) and Hopkins et al. (2014) identified a leadership gap in nonprofit organizations as many nonprofit leaders will be retiring in the next decade. Phipps and Burbach, in their 2010 article on Strategic Leadership Theory, addressed the role of the leader and how that individual contributes to overall organizational performance.

Uzonwanne’s (2015) study examined the choice of a situational leadership model. The results of the study indicated a strong relationship between leadership style and decision-making. Taylor et al. (2014) explored visionary leadership and organizational effectiveness in nonprofit organizations, identifying that not only do visionary leaders use transformational behaviors, but they also use other behaviors needed for the followers to have the knowledge and skills required to act.

Corporate leadership literature on the transformational leadership model has revealed that ethics is important for the success of an organization. Eisenbeiss et al. (2015) examined leadership and performance at the top level of an organization and determined that it depends on a strong ethics program for the corporation. In 2004, Felfe and Schyns studied the similarities between transformational leadership and correlations of outcomes of the organization. However, Schuh et al. (2013) proposed that transformational leaders are not really the best or most effective leaders. Again, while transformational leadership is important, so is ethical leadership.

A search for studies on Head Start leadership revealed only one study and two dissertations. Gonzalez (2015) explored the idea of leadership from the director’s and the teacher’s perspectives and compared the two. Gray-Pierre’s (2014) dissertation used a
case study approach to examine leadership from a collaborative perspective. Valencia (2013) concluded that Head Start leaders are not agile and ready to manage change.

Although a wealth of literature on leadership in the corporate sector exists, less can be found regarding leadership in the nonprofit sector and very little examining Head Start leadership. This study thus helps fill the identified literature gap and contributes to the field of early childhood education and Head Start. On a related note, studies of leadership in the K–12 literature have noted a direct tie between effective leadership and the academic achievement of students. Effective school principals facilitate improved student achievement. This study will build upon the K–12 knowledge base in its exploration of Head Start/Early Head Start leadership.
Chapter Three

**Design and Methodology**

This study aimed to measure the transformational leadership style of leaders in Head Start and Early Head Start programs. The research question to be answered was:

Does transformational leadership contribute to quality in Head Start/Early Head Start programs?

**Variables and Objectives**

The independent variable in this study was transformational leadership. The dependent variables included quality of the program as defined by accreditation, quality of Head Start and Early Head Start programs as defined by monitoring results, quality of the program as defined by Head Start CLASS Instructional Learning Format Scores, and quality of Early Head Start as defined by health indicators of children.

The study also explores the relationship between leadership scores and experience and leadership scores and education. The objective of this research is to determine if transformational leadership affects quality in Head Start programs.

**Researcher Position**

The researcher is currently a director of a NAEYC-accredited program as well as an Early Head Start director and serves on a Head Start Association Directors group as secretary. She has additional background in reviewing grant programs and a knowledge of the accreditation process. She has been the start-up director of two Early Head Start programs, in which the grantee agency was awarded the grant with no other expertise or staff to operate the program. Start-up included hiring and training all staff, becoming fully operational and fully enrolled in less than one year. In two other centers, she was the
turnaround manager, taking a Head Start program and a state-funded preschool from the brink of losing the grant to fully operational, expanded, and achieving accreditation by NAEYC, including recognition by the Black Child Development Institute as a Point of Proof for Black children.

**Research Design**

**Quantitative Research**

This research was quantitative in nature as the design explores a research problem by analyzing trends or explaining a relationship among variables (Creswell, 2012). This process involves collecting numerical data from a large number of people using instruments that have predetermined questions and answers. Data analysis includes comparing trends, analyzing relationships, and using statistical analysis to relate variables.

**Survey Research**

This study also employs survey research, used in quantitative research to measure the opinions, characteristics, or behavior of segments of the population. Quantitative information was collected from respondents using predetermined questions and answers. The researcher then conducted an analysis using statistics to interpret the meaning of the data collected. Of the two types of survey research design, cross-sectional and longitudinal, longitudinal was discarded as data were not collected from the same group of people over time, nor was there a need to examine how the behavior, opinions, or characteristics of the subjects changed over time. Rather, in this study, the author used cross-sectional survey research, collecting data once and administering the survey in a short amount of time (Creswell, 2012).
The study used a custom survey and an existing, valid, and reliable survey of transformational practices. Several methods of analyzing transformational leadership were possible. The researcher first considered the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 2004) but abandoned the idea. Although the MLQ-5 is shorter than the original MLQ, having only 45 items instead of 63, it was still too long for the purpose of the study. Additionally, it yielded six individually scored subscales. Thus, the author considered the length of the questionnaire, the complicated scoring, and the presence of six subscales too involved for this study, seeking instead one scale of transformational leadership that had an uncomplicated scoring system.

After making this determination, the author discovered the Global Transformational Leadership (GTL) scale (Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000) while preparing for the study. The GTL was designed to provide a short, valid, and reliable scale of the measure of transformational leadership for use in research and assessment. One scale uses seven questions that measure vision, charismatic leadership, leading by example, innovative thinking, empowerment, supportive leadership, and staff development (Carless et al., 2000, p. 390), and the questions use a five-point scale for scoring.

Over 1,000 volunteers participated in the validity and reliability testing of the scale. The testing involved other established methods of measuring transformational leadership along with the GTL, including the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Avolio & Bass, 2004) and the Leadership Practices Inventory published by Kouzes and Posner in 1990. The GTL’s validity correlated between .76 and .88 to these measures, respectively. It also has a very high alpha coefficient, revealing that it is a highly reliable
measure of transformational leadership. Scoring is on a five-point scale, meaning that total scores range from 7 to 35. The mean of scores was 25 with a standard deviation of 6.76 (Carless et al., 2000, p. 400).

The remainder of the study survey included race, gender, and state of program location to provide descriptive statistics. Other factors to be measured for leaders included years of experience in leadership, highest level of education, and current position. Factors related to the program itself were the program size, defined by number of sites; percentage of accredited sites and accrediting body; and total funded enrollment.

The survey measured program quality using descriptions of elements of quality such as percentage of children who had health care and percentage of children with a dental home at the end of a program year. The Office of Head Start has identified these descriptors as important indicators of quality programs. Of the four health measures tracked and reported by the Office of Head Start, the two mentioned were the lowest of the four. Only 90% of children nationwide had dental care at the end of the program year, and 96% had medical care. For comparison, 96% of children were up-to-date on immunizations, and 97% had health insurance at the end of the program year (Office of Head Start, 2016e).

Head Start programs are subject to a CLASS review during a program monitoring visit. The survey requested the most recent instructional learning formats score, also requesting the result of the last program review as having concerns/issues, no concerns issues, deficiencies, in designation renewal, or re-competition. This design and instrument was chosen to yield the most data from many leaders in a short period of time.
and would contribute to the literature on leadership in Head Start/Early Head Start programs. A copy of the survey is located in Appendix A.

**Description of Recruitment**

Participants were recruited through a two-stage process. The researcher partnered with the National Head Start Association (NHSA) to reach a cross-section of the program in the United States. Partnering with one national organization allowed the inclusion of a wide variety of regional, racial, and ethnic diversity at one time. Over 1,600 Head Start programs across the country currently serve children in 20,000 classrooms with over 225,000 staff and teachers. Furthermore, the NHSA has over 1,200 member agencies.

**Sampling technique.** The sampling technique involved snowball sampling, a form of nonprobability sampling (Creswell, 2012), contacting Head Start/Early Head Start leaders as defined by program directors, CEOs of their organization, education coordinators, and site directors. These positions are common to every Head Start/Early Head Start program and are instrumental in leading programs at different levels. The author sent an initial invitation to the contact persons in the NHSA database, asking those leaders to forward the email so that more interested subjects could be identified. Gathered responses indicated that participants having a variety of titles completed the survey, denoting that the survey was forwarded as requested.

**Sample size.** A sample size of 500 surveys was sought; however, the final sample size was 142, with 120 completed surveys: a 7% response rate.

**Questionnaire**

The questionnaire or survey consisted of the following data elements:
1. Size of program as defined by number of centers/sites and funded enrollment

2. The quality of the program as defined by:
   a. Percentage of centers/sites accredited by NAEYC
   b. Length of time the sites have been accredited
   c. Percentage of children up-to-date with a schedule of oral health care at the end of the year (Oral Health)
   d. Percentage of children up-to-date on a schedule of age-appropriate preventive and primary health care at the end of the program year (Medical Health)
   e. CLASS Instructional Learning Formats score
   f. Program monitoring review decision:
      i. No concerns
      ii. Some findings
      iii. One or more deficiencies
      iv. DRS or re-competition
   g. Percentage of teaching staff with a bachelor’s degree in early childhood education

The leadership questions included:
1. I communicate a clear and positive vision of the future.
2. I treat staff as individuals and support and encourage their development.
3. I give encouragement and recognition to staff.
4. I foster trust, involvement, and cooperation among team members.
5. I encourage thinking about problems in new ways and question assumptions.

6. I am clear about my values, and I practice what I preach.

7. I instill pride and respect in others and inspire others by being highly competent.

The scoring scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 = never, and 5 = always.

The survey also gathered the current position of the respondent, total cumulative years of experience in a leadership position, and educational level.

Demographics included race, gender identity, ethnicity, state, and region in which the program is located. The Office of Head Start defines regions, yielding 10 geographically based regions. In addition to geographical designations, one region is devoted to Migrant Head Start, and one is devoted to American Indian/Alaska Native programs. Both latter regions could be located anywhere in the United States and are not bound by geography.

The survey was developed and piloted in February 2017 with a small group of 17 Head Start directors at the Illinois Head Start Association Annual Conference. Directors voluntarily completed the first section of non-leadership questions and gave feedback regarding clarity and ease of completion. Some questions were changed or deleted based on this feedback to ensure the validity and reliability of the survey. No identifying information was collected, and no data was analyzed.

**Data Collection**

Data was collected using a survey hosted by Survey Monkey. Surveys have been used in research for many years, and with the advent of the internet, online web-based surveys have made the process easier. All surveys have certain characteristics that make
them prone to higher error rates. Paper-and-pencil or mail-based surveys incur difficulty in finding names, while purchased mailing lists may be out-of-date, resulting in a loss of postal expenditure. Individuals may decide that answering the survey is too much work or takes too much time. For these reasons, the response rate for surveys is typically low, sometimes as low as 1% or as high as 10%. Aware of this possibility, this researcher followed guidelines suggested by Paxson (1995) to increase response rates, including identifying the importance of the research and completing the survey in the introduction, sending an introductory email to let potential participants know they would soon receive a survey in the mail or by email, and collaborating with an organization that would sponsor the survey and was willing to follow up with potential respondents.

Additional Paxson (1995) guidelines included using a survey that was short, concise, and clear. As suggested, an initial version of the survey was piloted in a small group, and questions were revised where needed. Lastly, Paxson suggested that to increase the response rate, follow-up should occur to remind respondents to complete the survey, thank them, and give them something in return, such as a copy of the final results.

The researcher followed all the above recommendations to the greatest extent possible. The national association sent the survey on behalf of the author, embedded in an email with a link to Survey Monkey. This email went to each of the program directors listed as a contact in the NHSA’s membership rolls and included an explanation of the research with a request for the receiving director to forward the message to the education coordinator and site directors within the organization (see Appendix B). The executive director (ED) of the Illinois and Wisconsin Head Start state associations then followed up the initial email. Two emails from the Illinois ED and one from the Wisconsin ED were
sent on behalf of this author. The National Head Start Association sent the email a final time after a winter holiday break. Another technical assistance colleague emailed the survey to her network of ten directors and education coordinators. The survey collection closed in mid-January. The first email sent by the NHSA went to 1,700 members. It was opened by 523 (31%) and clicked by 187 (11.1%). The second went to 1,477, was opened by 379 (26%) and clicked by 152 (10.4%), resulting in 142 respondents opening the survey. One hundred twenty consented and participated in the survey, leading to a 7% response rate.

**Coding and Initial Statistical Analysis**

Once the survey was closed, raw data from Survey Monkey was examined, and Excel tables were saved from Survey Monkey for comparison purposes. The raw data were then transferred to Excel. While the raw data in Survey Monkey only included a score for each leadership question, it did not allow for a summary leadership score. Thus, as the data were transferred to Excel, a column was added, and a sum was calculated for the leadership questions. This column was hand-coded as a summary leadership score. The resulting data were imported into the IBM SPSS 24 statistics program. Data were then checked by running descriptives and frequencies and comparing them to the original, unchanged Survey Monkey Excel tables. Mistakes in coding found in two variables were corrected.

Scatterplots and histograms were performed to test for normality, and the data was not always normally distributed. The original plan of performing a multiple linear regression analysis was abandoned, and further statistical analysis was pursued. The following pages further describe the data.
Limitations to data collection. A large limitation to an online/email survey is that anonymity leads to an inability to contact the pool of participants to remind them to respond. This may greatly limit the number of responses. Partnering with the national association and using their credibility as well as the credibility of state association EDs was an attempt to increase the typical response rate of 10–20%. The date and timing of the survey email may have contributed to a lower response rate. The survey was not sent until December 2, which happened to be the Saturday before a major Head Start Conference and just after Thanksgiving. Sending a request at this time may have limited the interest of respondents, resulting in a much smaller than anticipated sample size of 120 or 7%.

Summary

This study used a quantitative, custom web-based survey design that was sent to a national pool of Head Start and Early Head Start program leaders. A sponsor, the National Head Start Association, sent the survey twice on behalf of the researcher. Snowball sampling was intended and seems to have been implemented by the respondents; a variety of leaders completed the survey, although not in large numbers. The response rate was low—only 7%—but the pool was large enough that the data could be analyzed. The timing may have contributed to the low sample size.

Once coded and initially analyzed, the data contained both categorical and scale variables, which required more in-depth examination of the most appropriate statistical method to be used for further analysis.
Chapter Four

Results and Analysis

Introduction

The researcher originally proposed this study because a burning question needed to be answered: If accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children is a mark of high quality, why do Head Start and Early Head Start directors pursue it at low rates? Might leadership be the key? Research in K–12 literature supports the role of the principal as key to the outcomes of children, including reading and other measures. What measures of quality in addition to accreditation in Head Start/Early Head Start can be measured to determine the impact of leadership on quality in those programs?

This study set out to answer those questions using a web-based quantitative survey design completed by 120 leaders in these programs.

The Research Question

Does transformational leadership contribute to quality in Head Start/Early Head Start programs?

The independent variable in this study is transformational leadership. The dependent variables proposed included the quality of the program as defined by accreditation, quality of the program as defined by Head Start CLASS Instructional Learning Format Scores, quality of Early Head Start as defined by health indicators of children, Quality of Head Start/Early Head Start as measured by the percentage of teaching staff with BA degrees in early childhood education, and quality of Head Start and Early Head Start as defined by monitoring results.
Demographics were used as control variables with several of the partial correlations. Cross tabulations and chi-square test was used for variables when appropriate.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this study was transformational leadership. Bass (1985, 2010) was the first to define transformational leaders, describing them as having charisma, inspiring followers, using intellectual stimulation and considering each employee as an individual, giving personal attention in coaching, and advising. Transformational leaders are highly valued by their followers: They are seen as satisfying and inspirational; they are goal and vision setters, and because of this, their followers are inspired to do more and do better. Transformational leaders can do more with less and can make a large difference in the outcomes of an organization, and for this reason this theory is a perfect fit for this study.

The independent variable, transformational leadership, was measured by how highly the leaders scored themselves on the Global Transformational Leadership Scale (Carless et al., 2000).

There were six dependent variables and, therefore, six sub research questions:

Q1: Is there a relationship between leadership and accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children?

Q2: Is there a relationship between leadership and the results of program monitoring reviews?

Q3: Is there a relationship between leadership and the results of the program’s most recent Instructional Learning Format CLASS observation?
Q4: Is there a relationship between leadership and level of oral health of children?

Q5: Is there a relationship between leadership and the level of well-child (medical) care of children?

Q6: Is there a relationship between leadership and the percentage of teaching staff with BA degrees in Early Childhood Education?

The results to follow will first outline the descriptive statistics of each variable measured on the survey. The next section will display the bivariate correlations and partial correlations controlling for several demographic variables.

**Statistical Analysis**

The pool of respondents as displayed in Table 2 was overwhelmingly female at 89.2% and 9.9% male. One respondent preferred not to answer ($N = 111$).

Table 2

*Gender of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 displays the respondents’ current leadership position within the organization. The most frequent position of the respondents was that of director of the grantee agency at 50%. Of the respondents, 27.7% were executive directors, superintendents, or chief executive officers; 9.8% were education coordinators; and 2.7% were site or center directors ($N = 112$).
Table 3

Respondents’ Current Leadership Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, CEO, or Superintendent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President/Senior Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Early/Head Start Director</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate Early/Head Start Director</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Coordinator/Content Expert</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/Center Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experience levels of respondents varied greatly as described in Table 4. Of the respondents, 15% had five years or less experience, 17% had six to 10 years of experience, 14.3% had 11 to 15 years, 15.2% had 16 to 20 years, 19.6% had 21 to 30 years of experience, and 18.8% had over 30 years of experience in leadership roles ($N = 112$).

Table 4

Total Cumulative Leadership Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 displays the level of education that respondents described. Overall, the level of education was high, with 59.8% attaining a master’s degree and 6.3% possessing
a doctoral degree. Of the respondents, 1.8% had an associate degree, and 32.1% had a bachelor’s degree ($N = 112$).

Table 5

*Respondents’ Highest Level of Education Achieved*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Attained</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions of each respondent’s race and ethnicity is displayed in Table 6. Most respondents identified as White (76.8%). Black or African American comprised 14%. Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander were each 3.6% ($N = 112$).

Table 6

*Race and Ethnicity of the Respondent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnicity of the Respondent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Ethnicity/Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked for the state and region in which they work; most of the respondents were from Illinois (14) and Wisconsin (8), but several other states had similar numbers, such as New York with eight and California with 10. Appendix B displays frequencies for states and Head Start regions.
Table 7

*Program Size as Measured by Number of Children in Funded Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Program by Enrollment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 250</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 to 500</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 750</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751 to 1000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every program size was represented, as were multi-site and single-site programs.

Program size by enrollment is displayed in Table 7. There were 10 (8.3%) small programs, those with 100 or less children; 29 (24.2%) programs with 101 to 250 children; 45 (37.5%) programs with 251 to 300 children; 14 programs (11.7%) with 551 to 750 children; 10 (8.3%) programs that had 751 to 1,000 children; and 12 (10%) were very large programs, with over 1,000 children enrolled ($N = 120$).

When measured by the number of program sites or centers, program size varied widely from very small (one site) to large (over 10 sites). Table 8 displays program size by number of sites. Sixteen (13.3%) programs involved one single site. Twenty-seven (22.5%) had two to five sites, 39 (32.5%) had six to ten sites, and 38 (31.7%) had over 10 sites.
Table 8

*Program Size as Measured by Number of Sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size by Number of Sites</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One, Single site</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership.** Leadership was measured using seven questions, each scored using a five-point scale. The Survey Monkey system automatically assigned a score between one to five for each question, and the questions were summed for a Total Leadership Score. The authors report a mean score for the Global Leadership Scale of 25 with a standard deviation of 6.76 (Carless et al., 2000, p. 400).

Respondents on this survey scored themselves relatively high. The mean is 30.68, with a median of 32. The most frequent score is 34. Table 9 displays the statistics related to the scoring of the leadership scale. There were 114 respondents, the mode was 34, and the standard deviation was 3.77 with the lowest score a 17 and the highest 35.

Table 9

*Total Leadership Score Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Score</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Quality indicators.**

**Program review results.** Table 10 displays the results of program reviews. The majority of leaders (71.8%) reported that their program had no concerns or issues on their last program monitoring review. One program is in re-competition (0.9%) which indicates they are competing with other agencies in their community to keep their program. Six programs (5.1%) have scored low enough on the CLASS or other quality indicator that they are required to re-compete at the end of their five-year grant cycle. Two programs (1.7%) have deficiencies, which put them at future risk of re-competition if not corrected. Twenty-four programs (20.5%) have concerns or issues, which if not corrected may put them at risk.

Table 10

**Results of Last Program Monitoring Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Programs Last Review Results</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program has no concerns or issues</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program has concerns or issues</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program has deficiencies.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is in designation renewal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is in re-competition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accreditation.** Leaders were asked if their program was accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). If yes, the percentage of sites accredited and the length of accreditation was requested. These three questions were asked because Survey Monkey did not support if/then logic, therefore dictating separate questions to further tease out the nature of how long the sites were accredited. Percentage of sites was used because NAEYC accredits a single site, yet the
Office of Head Start reviews an entire grantee whose program might contain more than one hundred sites. Tables 11–13 display these questions separately.

As displayed in Table 11, 24 (20.3%) programs have sites accredited by NAEYC and 94 (79.7%) do not. Table 12 displays that four programs (3.4%) have 10 to 25% of sites accredited, four (3.4%) have 26 to 50% accredited, two (1.7%) have 51 to 75% and 13 (11%) programs have 76 to 100% of their sites accredited.

Table 13 displays the length of time programs have been accredited. Forty-nine sites have been accredited for five years or less (69%), 10 (14.1%) have been accredited for six to 10 years, seven (9.9%) for 11 to 15 years, and one (1.4%) for 16 to 20 years. Of the total, 7% have been accredited for more than 21 years. Over 80% of sites are not accredited (N = 118).

Table 1

Sites Are Accredited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites are accredited</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Percent of Sites That Are Accredited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Sites Accredited</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or not applicable</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76–100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

*Length of Time Sites Have Been Accredited*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–5 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_classroom Assessment Scores_. Leaders were asked for their most recent Instructional Learning Formats scale score from the most recent program monitoring review. This would have required them to look up the score or perhaps ask someone else for the result. It also only applies to programs that serve children ages three through five, (Head Start). It is not used in Early Head Start (age 0–3) program reviews. As displayed in Table 14, the mean for this result is 6.3, with the median 5.0 and mode of 4.0. The standard deviation is 2.58. Statistics from the 2017 Office of Head Start Overview of Grantee CLASS scores indicate that in 2017 mean was 5.35 with a standard deviation of 0.48. The minimum score was 4.00, and the maximum score was 6.50. The cut score for designation renewal for this scale in 2017, the lowest 10%, was any score below a 5.3264 (OHS, 2018). The mean of this sample was much larger than the national sample.
Table 14

Statistics From the Program’s Most Recent Instructional Learning Formats CLASS Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.3465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2.58239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health Indicators. CLASS scores are only used in programs with children aged three to five; there is no classroom observation for the younger ages in the Early Head Start program (ages birth to three). Leaders were asked to report the oral and medical health levels of children in their program, a statistic that is tracked and reported annually on a Program Information Report (PIR). Reporting this statistic required that if not immediately known, the leader would have to look up the information or request it from another person. The data displayed in Table 15 reveals that in 104 programs (87.4%), 76 to 100% of children are up-to-date on a schedule of oral health. This includes a dental exam every six months for every child two years of age and older. Six (5%) programs have 26–50% up-to-date, and nine (7.6%) have 51–75% up-to-date.

Table 15

Percent of Children Up-to-Date on Oral Health Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Children Up-to-Date</th>
<th>Number of programs</th>
<th>Percent of programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26% to 50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 75%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% to 100%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, most programs have children that are up-to-date on a schedule of well-child care. Table 16 displays the results in which 111 (90%) programs have 76 to 100% of their children up-to-date on well-child care. One program (.8%) has less than 25% of children up-to-date, one program (.8%) has 26 to 50% of children up-to-date, and seven programs (5.8%) have 51 to 75% of children up-to-date ($N = 120$).

Table 16

Percent of Children Up-to-Date on Medical Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Children Up-to-Date</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Percent of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% to 50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 75%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% to 100%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Education Level of Teaching Staff.* The programs that displayed a high percentage of teachers with BA degrees in early childhood education (ECE) seemed to be an indicator of quality, according to some literature. Forty-six (38.7%) programs have a high level (76 to 100%) of teaching staff with bachelor’s degrees in ECE. In 33 (27.7%) programs, 51 to 75% of their teachers have a BA, and in 24 (20.2%), 10 to 25% percent of their teaching staff have BA degrees in ECE. In 12 (10.1%) programs, 10 to 25% of teachers have a BA, and four programs (3.4%) have no teachers with BA degrees in ECE.
Table 17

Percent of Teaching Staff with Bachelor’s Degrees in Early Childhood Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Staff with BA</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Percent of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 25%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 50%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 75%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 to 100%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational Analysis

The data contained both categorical and continuous data, limiting the types of possible analysis. Most data were linearly distributed; therefore, Pearson’s $r$ was the most appropriate analysis to perform. A bivariate correlation analysis was performed on the data, and then the researcher further analyzed the data using partial correlations, controlling for different variables. According to Rosenthal (2012), an advantage of this method is the ease of interpretation. A correlation increases in size and strength as it approaches 1.0 or a perfect correlation. A correlation of .10 is small with weak strength of association. A correlation of .30 is medium with moderate association, .50 is large, and .70 is very large with a very strong strength of association. The bivariate regression correlation then predicts one variable’s score on another (Rosenthal, 2012).

Exploration of leadership and accreditation. Accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children was a central question to the genesis of this research.

Q1: Is there a relationship between leadership and accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children?
The data from the leaders’ total leadership score were correlated to the percent of sites accredited. As displayed in Table 18, the Pearson correlation was a very small, weak association of .108 and was not significant at .257.

Table 18

Results of Bivariate Correlation of Leadership Score and Percent of Sites Accredited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent of Sites Accredited</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Sites Accredited</td>
<td>Pearson $r$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Pearson $r$</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership was then analyzed against percent of sites accredited and controlled by the leadership experience. Table 19 displays the results, which were not correlated nor significant. Pearson $r$ was .089, and two-tailed significance was .358. The degree of freedom ($df$) was 108.

Table 19

Partial Correlation of Leadership Score and Percent of Sites Accredited Controlled by Experience of the Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
<th>Percent of Sites Accredited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Years of Leadership</td>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Respondent</td>
<td>Percent of Sites Accredited</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 20 displays a correlation of the variable indicating whether sites were accredited or not, along with the leadership score. This yielded no correlation and no significance, with $r$ of -.037 and two-tailed significance of .702.

Table 20

*Results of Correlation of Variable Sites Are Accredited or Not with Total Leadership Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Sites Are Accredited by NAEYC</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites Are Accredited by NAEYC</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data displayed in Table 21 shows a comparison of leadership and length of accreditation. Pearson $r$ is -.057, showing no to very little correlation, and two-tailed significance is .651, again indicating the data are not significant.

Table 21

*Correlation of Length of Accreditation and Leadership Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
<th>Length of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Accreditation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question was examined based on size of program. Table 22 displays the size of program measured by total funded enrollment and whether the program is accredited or not; more medium-sized (251 to 300) programs, ten in all, are accredited. A chi-square test was performed on these variables.

Table 22

*Total Funded Enrollment x Sites Are Accredited by NAEYC Cross Tabulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites Are Accredited by NAEYC</th>
<th>Total Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101 to 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251 to 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>551 to 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>751 to 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results displayed in Table 23 indicate no correlation, with chi-square = 1.137 and .951 significance.

Table 23

*Chi-Square Test of Funded Enrollment Size of Program by Program is Accredited*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.137a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.03.
Table 24

Results of Chi-Square Test of Sites Are Accredited and the Results of the Most Recent Monitoring Review

Chi-Square Tests of Sites Are Accredited and Results of Recent Monitoring Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value (2-sided)</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 6 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

Table 24 displays results of the attempt at determining whether sites are accredited is correlated with monitoring review results. The results are neither significant nor correlated ($x^2 = 2.644; p = .619$).

**Summary of accreditation results.** The answer to the original burning question from the perspective of this study is that accreditation and leadership do not have a strong relationship. The majority of programs had no accredited sites, and controlling for the experience of the leader yielded an even lower score, possibly indicating that more experienced leaders did not value accreditation, or the return on investment for the time and effort in addition to Head Start regulations was not high enough. Cross tabulations and chi-square tests reveal no correlation nor significance. It appears that medium-sized programs are accredited more often than any other size, and grantee directors are less likely to have accredited programs.
Exploration of program monitoring reviews.

Q2: Is there a relationship between leadership and the results of program monitoring reviews?

This study also explored the relationship between leadership score and the results of the most recent monitoring review as a signal of quality. The Office of Head Start defines the review results are defined and considers them the most important indicator in determining funding.

The results displayed in Table 25 indicate a medium relationship of .313 with moderate strength that is significant at the .001 level \( (r = .313; p > .001) \).

Table 25

**Bivariate Correlation of the Program’s Monitoring Review Results and Total Leadership Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Results of the Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results of Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.313**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. \( P \) > is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 26 displays the results of further analysis completed using years of leadership experience as a control. When controlled for leadership, the correlation was stronger as was the significance. The significance increased from .001 to .000, indicating very high significance \( (r = .334; p > .000, \text{two-tailed}; df = 108) \).
Table 26

Partial Correlation of Results of Monitoring Review and Total Leadership Score

Controlled by Experience of the Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>Results of the Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Years of Leadership Experience of the Respondent</td>
<td>Results of the Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</td>
<td>Correlation 1.000</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Correlation .334</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis controls for the possibility that a more experienced leader is more transformational. Leadership scores and results of the most recent monitoring review were also analyzed while controlling for the leaders’ level of education. Results are displayed in Table 27. A moderate correlation of .323 resulted with a significance of .001 ($r = .323; \text{two-tailed } p > .001; df = 108$).

Table 27

Partial Correlation of Leadership Score and Results of Monitoring Review Controlled by Leaders’ Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
<th>Results of the Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Education Attained</td>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Correlation 1.000</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results of the Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</td>
<td>Correlation .323</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of these three analyses indicate that leadership is moderately correlated with the results of a monitoring review and is significant. When controlling for both experience and education, leadership is still significant. The answer to question two therefore is yes, a relationship exists between leadership and monitoring review results. A higher quality program is correlated with a more transformational leader.

**Exploration of other variables.** The analysis of variables continues with CLASS, health indicators, and education levels of teaching staff.

Q3: Is there a relationship between leadership and the results of the program’s most recent Instructional Learning Format CLASS observation?

As displayed in Table 28, leadership and CLASS scores indicate a small but significant relationship. Pearson’s $r$ for this relationship is .231 at a significance of .022. ($r = .231; p > .05$). Therefore, a small but significant relationship exists between leadership and CLASS score.

Table 28

*Bivariate Correlation of Total Leadership Score and Program’s Most Recent CLASS Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
<th>Program’s Most Recent CLASS Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.231*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s Most Recent CLASS Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.231*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P > 0.05$ level (2-tailed).
Leadership scores and the results of the most recent monitoring review were correlated then controlled by CLASS score. Table 29 displays the results, showing a moderate correlation of .300 and as significant with a .003 level ($r = 0.300, p > 0.05, df = 95$). CLASS scores are used as an indicator for monitoring reviews, further reinforcing that the relationship is reasonable and is a logical conclusion as to why there is a correlation.

Table 29

*Partial Correlation of Leadership Score with Results of Most Recent Monitoring Review While Controlling for CLASS Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>Results of the Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program’s Most Recent CLASS Score</td>
<td>Results of Program’s Most Recent Monitoring Review</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df = 0</td>
<td>df = 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.05 level (two-tailed)*

Early Head Start programs are not subject to a CLASS assessment, therefore, controlling for CLASS controls for the likelihood of only including Head Start programs and includes Early Head Start in the analysis. Leadership scores and monitoring reviews again demonstrate that correlation is present and is significant.

*Health variables.*

Q4: Is there a relationship between leadership and level of oral health of children?
Q5: Is there a relationship between leadership and the level of well-child (medical) care of children?

Table 30 displays results showing that leadership scores and percentage of children up-to-date on well-child care are neither correlated nor significant ($r = -.009; p = .927$). Table 31 displays oral care and leadership ($r = .084; p = .927$). These variables were included because no classroom observation similar to CLASS scores is available for the Early Head Start program, and the Office of Head Start most often uses health indicators for comparison. The level of oral care and health care for children is documented and tracked annually, which may contribute to the high percentages overall for all programs. There is no relationship between leadership and either oral healthcare nor overall well-child healthcare for children in Head Start or Early Head Start, according to these results.
Table 30

**Results of Bivariate Correlation of Leadership and Medical Care**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Children Up-to-Date on Primary Medical Care</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Children Up-to-Date on Primary Medical Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

**Results of Bivariate Correlations of Leadership and Percentage of Children Up-to-Date on Oral Care**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total Leadership Score</th>
<th>Percentage of Children Up-to-Date on Primary Oral Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Leadership Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Children Up-to-Date on Primary Oral Care</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Children Up-to-Date on Primary Oral Care</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6: Is there a relationship between leadership and the percentage of teaching staff with BA degrees in early childhood education?

The percentage of teaching staff with BA degrees is correlated weakly with leadership scores and is not significant (see Table 32). No relationship is evident between leadership and the percentage of teaching staff with BA degrees in early childhood education ($r = .125; p = .184$). This may be a result of the Head Start regulation requiring 50% of teachers to have BA degrees by 2017.
Summary

This study examined leadership in Head Start/Early Head Start programs through a framework of transformational leadership theory. It sought to answer the question *Does transformational leadership contribute to quality in Head Start and Early Head Start programs?* Quality was measured through examining six variables: accreditation through the National Association for the Education of Young Children, federal program monitoring review results, CLASS Instructional Learning Format scale scores, percentage of children up-to-date on oral care, percentage of children up-to-date on well-child care, and percentage of teaching staff with BA degrees in early childhood education. Through a series of bivariate and partial correlations, in addition to cross tabulation and chi-square analysis, the research sub-questions were answered one by one, in order.

Leadership does correlate moderately with program monitoring review results, and controlling for education level and experience of the leader continues to exhibit a moderate strength with high significance, thus answering the overall question positively.
Leadership does not, however, correlate with other measures used in the study; CLASS scores, health care, or BA degrees in teachers show little more than a slight correlation with little to no significance.
Chapter Five

Conclusion

Head Start and Early Head Start programs provide services to almost one million children annually in the United States. Programs are granted Head Start or Early Head Start status if they meet the required federal guidelines, including performance standards. Initially, performance standards did not address the leadership skills of the program directors. Only since 2016 has the Office of Head Start required, at minimum, a bachelor’s degree with coursework in management and administration. Prior to this study, little to no empirical data was available regarding the leadership styles of the leaders of these programs. This study collected and examined information on leaders from a nationwide sample of programs serving children across the United States, filling a gap in the empirical data on the field.

The literature review encompassed leadership literature in early childhood education and K–12 education, as well as nonprofit and corporate leadership. Early childhood education authors have agreed that leadership is important, now and for the future of the field. Literature on leadership in the K–12 arena has shown that leadership is the key to improved test scores in students of all ages, and the building principal is key to improvement. The corporate sector was first to embrace leadership as key to improve organizations, and literature on nonprofit leadership demonstrates similar outcomes.

This study also explored quality, a difficult subject to quantify, using a subjective set of characteristics. The literature has demonstrated the difficulty in defining quality. This study has examined such characteristics as NAEYC accreditation, CLASS scores, health indicators, and percent of teaching staff with BA degrees in ECE. Accreditation
has been held as a higher standard but has shown mixed results in demonstrating long-term outcomes for children. As a marker of better quality than state licensing alone, and as a national set of consistent standards, accreditation was thus used as a variable in the study. Various authors in the literature have attempted to define Head Start/Early Head Start quality, again with limited results. However, the Office of Head Start monitors programs on a regular basis using a defined set of national criteria. This set of monitoring review results defines quality Head Start programs on a national and consistent basis.

Bass’s Transformational Leadership framework states that a transformational leader will influence followers to work harder and better for the organization. The follower of a transformational leader sees this individual as inspiring, setting higher yet attainable goals without relying on contingent rewards, leading to a better organization in the long term. The indicators of quality, along with a short, reliable valid survey of transformational leadership qualities, thus became the variables for this study.

The central question for this study was to examine the relationship of accreditation by NAEYC as a measure of quality to leadership. The survey asked this question three different ways in order to gain an understanding of the variable related to percentage of programs and length of time accredited. Results indicated that there is no correlation and no statistical significance to accreditation, regardless of the wording of the question. In some of the literature, more experienced leaders exhibited a more transformational style. This led to including experience as a control variable. This inclusion still resulted in no statistical significance, leading the researcher to conclude that accreditation by NAEYC and transformational leadership style are not highly related in any way, according to the results of this study. Therefore, the answer to the question is
that there is not necessarily a relationship between leadership and accreditation as an indicator of quality in Head Start/Early Head Start. Why might this be the answer?

The answer may lie in the similarity between NAEYC accreditation and Head Start Program performance standards. These two sets of standards are similar, with Head Start the more robust set, as displayed in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Start Program Performance Standards</th>
<th>NAEYC Accreditation Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Governance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard 10: Leadership and Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301.1 Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301.2 Governing body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301.3 Policy council and policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301.4 Parent committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301.5 Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301.6 Impasse procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.1 Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1302 Subpart A—Eligibility, Recruitment, Selection, Enrollment, and Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.10 Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.11 Determining community strengths, needs, and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.12 Determining, verifying, and documenting eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.13 Recruitment of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.14 Selection process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.15 Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.16 Attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.17 Suspension and expulsion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.18 Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBPART B—PROGRAM STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.20 Determining program structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.21 Center-based option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.22 Home-based option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.23 Family child care option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.24 Locally designed program</td>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option variations</td>
<td>1.A Building Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBPART C—EDUCATION AND</strong></td>
<td>1.B Building Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationships between Teachers and</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.30 Purpose</td>
<td>1.C Helping Children Make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.31 Teaching and the learning</td>
<td><strong>Friends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>1.D Creating a Predictable,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.32 Curricula</td>
<td><strong>Consistent, and Harmonious Classroom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.33 Child screenings and</td>
<td>1.E Addressing Challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessments</td>
<td><strong>Behaviors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.34 Parent and family</td>
<td>1.F Promoting Self-Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement in education and child</td>
<td><strong>Standard 2: Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development services</td>
<td>2.A Essential Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.35 Education in home-based</td>
<td>2.B Social and Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302.36 Tribal language</td>
<td>2.C Physical Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preservation and revitalization</td>
<td>2.D Language Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.E Early Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.F Early Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.G Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.H Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.J Creative Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Appreciation for the Arts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.K Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.L Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard 3: Teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.A Designing Enriched Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Environments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.B Creating Caring Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>for Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.C Supervising Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.D Using Time, Grouping, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Routines to Achieve Learning Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.E Responding to Children’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interests and Needs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.F Making Learning Meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>for All Children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.G Using Instruction to Deepen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Children’s Understanding and Build Their</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBPART D—HEALTH PROGRAM SERVICES

1302.40 Purpose
1302.41 Collaboration and communication with parents
1302.42 Child health status and care
1302.43 Oral health practices
1302.44 Child nutrition
1302.45 Child mental health and social and emotional well-being
1302.46 Family support services for health, nutrition, and mental health
1302.47 Safety practices

SUBPART E—FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM SERVICES

1302.50 Family engagement
1302.51 Parent activities to promote child learning and development
1302.52 Family partnership services
1302.53 Community partnerships and coordination with other early childhood and education programs

Standard 4: Assessment of Child Progress

4.A Creating an Assessment Plan
4.B Using Appropriate Assessment Methods
4.C Identifying Children’s Interests and Needs and Describing Children’s Progress
4.D Adapting Curriculum, Individualizing Teaching, and Informing Program Development
4.E Communicating With Families and Involving Families in the Assessment Process

Standard 5: Health

5.A Promoting and Protecting Children’s Health and Controlling Infectious Disease
5.B Ensuring Children’s Nutritional Well-Being
5.C Maintaining a Healthful Environment

Standard 7: Families

7.A Knowing and Understanding the Program’s Families
7.B Sharing Information Between Staff and Families
7.C Nurturing Families as Advocates for Their Children

Standard 8: Community Relationships

8.A Linking With the Community
8.B Accessing Community Resources
SUBPART F—ADDITIONAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

1302.60 Full participation in program services and activities
1302.61 Additional services for children
1302.62 Additional services for parents
1302.63 Coordination and collaboration with the local agency responsible for implementing IDEA

SUBPART G—TRANSITION SERVICES

1302.70 Transitions from Early Head Start
1302.71 Transitions from Head Start to kindergarten
1302.72 Transitions between programs

SUBPART H—SERVICES TO ENROLLED PREGNANT WOMEN

1302.80 Enrolled pregnant women information, education, and services
1302.82 Family partnership services for enrolled pregnant women

SUBPART I—HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

1302.90 Personnel policies
1302.91 Staff qualification and competency requirements
1302.92 Training and professional development
1302.93 Staff health and wellness
1302.94 Volunteers

SUBPART J—PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

1302.100 Purpose
1302.101 Management system
1302.102 Achieving program goals

8.C Acting as a Citizen in the Neighborhood and the Early Childhood Community

Standard 6: Staff Competencies, Preparation, and Support

6.A Supportive Work Environment
6.B Professional Identity and Recognition
6.C Qualifications of Teaching and Administrative Staff
6.D Ongoing Professional Development
Figure 1. Comparison of Head Start Program Performance Standards (HSPPS) and accreditation standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)(Adapted from HSPPS and NAEYC).

Similarities between the two sets of standards indicate that it may not be difficult for a Head Start program to become NAEYC-accredited, but as in all voluntary tasks, the leader must ask if the effort required will result in any benefit to the program, staff, or children. It seems that for the majority of Head Start leaders surveyed, it did not. In other circumstances, it might. Some states, for example, incentivize child care reimbursement rates for accredited programs, thus raising the level of quality in child care programs that
are not affiliated with Head Start. If a Head Start program participates in the child care reimbursement, the effort will be of benefit to the program in the form of unrestricted funds. This factor was not explored in the study.

Correlating the results of monitoring reviews with leadership scores revealed an outcome that differed significantly. A moderate but significant relationship showed between leadership scores and the results of program monitoring reviews. As program monitoring reviews had fewer problems or issues, the scores of leaders were higher, indicating that leadership does have some importance in leading higher-quality programs. To further explore the relationship, education and experience were used as controlling variables, yielding the same results and indicating that transformational leadership does positively influence program quality as measured by the Office of Head Start.

Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Instructional Learning Format scores were also examined as a quality variable connected to leadership. These results indicate some correlation and significance. CLASS scores are included in the determination of program review results and therefore are part of the preceding variable as well. However, when controlling for CLASS, which effectively includes previously excluded Early Head Start programs, the significance increases, again indicating the importance of transformational leadership.

In an effort to explore every quality variable, percent of children up-to-date on medical visits and dental visits was explored, as was percentage of teaching staff with bachelor’s degrees in early childhood education. None of these variables were correlated or significant with leadership scores. These three variables are required by the funder; thus, they are tracked and reported annually to the Office of Head Start. In addition, they
are the most influenced by the community in which programs are located. Programs located in the rural West or far-north Alaska may not have access to doctors, dentists, and higher education, compared to programs located in large metropolitan areas.

This study is one of the first to contribute to the field of early education, nonprofit social entrepreneurship, and Head Start by using empirical evidence to demonstrate that transformational leadership style does influence the quality of Head Start programs as measured by the Office of Head Start. The relationship is significant and moderate, indicating it is but one factor affecting program quality. Accreditation by NAEYC is important to the field of child care and not as important to Head Start in the definition of quality. According to the data, NAEYC accreditation in Head Start programs is not as important a factor as that of transformational leadership style, indicating that any Head Start program operating with no concerns or issues is of the highest quality. This may be due to the greater breadth of requirements for Head Start programs compared to NAEYC standards. The study does prove that transformational leaders did better in federal monitoring reviews; in addition, those leaders that scored lower on transformational leadership qualities did not do as well on federal monitoring reviews.

**Implications of the Study**

Head Start programs operating within the standards of the Office of Head Start are high in quality, and achieving NAEYC accreditation may not indicate that programs have any added quality. Indeed, due to rigorous standards, Head Start programs may find it easier to achieve NAEYC accreditation than a typical non–Head Start child care program. Leaders of all early care and education, Head Start, and nonprofit social entrepreneur programs will need to make an informed decision whether NAEYC accreditation is worth...
the extra time, effort, and cost to achieve. Over 80% of leaders responding to this study indicated their programs were not NAEYC accredited. For this group of leaders, the benefits did not outweigh the costs to achieve accreditation. For those that did, some other motivating factor was involved in achieving accreditation.

This study has future implications to influence policy within states’ Quality Rating Improvement Systems (QRIS) for child care. As states develop QRIS systems to define quality in each state, they should consider the Head Start programs that pass their federal program monitoring review with no concerns or issues as representing the highest quality, equal to NAEYC accreditation.

Transformational leadership is a valuable style, which can be sought out in the hiring process and coached in the developing leader. This leadership style can be measured, coached, and used in improving local programs. Nonprofit corporations are often the grantees of Head Start/Early Head Start programs, and boards of directors could use questions from the GTL in the interview process for Head Start program directors. Program directors could use the questions in the interview process for site directors, education coordinators, and others in leadership positions within the organization.

National and state associations often offer leadership training opportunities in which information on leadership styles in general, and transformational leadership in particular, could be added to the program. Questions from the GTL or other surveys of transformational leadership could be adapted and used as self-reflection questions.

Head Start/Early Head Start programs are required to perform an annual program self-assessment; questions from the GTL could be used to evaluate the program leader’s style and coach the leader to become more transformational.
Limitations of the Study

This study had some limitations. The data included transformational leadership scores from leaders but not from followers. This was an unavoidable limitation of an internet survey. Future replications should include followers as well as leaders.

The survey requested Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Instructional Learning Formats scale scores. Instructional Support scores were the domain score measured in research, and the study could be improved with the use of Instructional Support scores in any future studies. However, a much stronger correlation exists between leadership score and results of the program monitoring review than between leadership score and CLASS. At this writing, the Office of Head Start may be changing the use of CLASS scores during program monitoring reviews. Additionally, CLASS scores and leadership scores did not yield more than a minor correlation, indicating they were but one component of the program monitoring review results score.

Further Study

This study revealed a moderate but significant relationship between transformational leadership and the quality of Head Start/Early Head Start programs as measured by the Office of Head Start monitoring review results. This study could be replicated at a state or national level on NAEYC-accredited child care programs and leadership. The study should be replicated with a larger sample that includes follower data in addition to leaders’ scores. States with universal preschool programs could be studied as well as state-level child care quality rating system (QRIS) programs.
Summary

This study contributed new information to the field of early childhood education, leadership, Head Start, and nonprofit social entrepreneurship by demonstrating that leaders with a more transformational style are more likely to lead their Head Start programs through a successful federal monitoring review, signifying quality in the program. The study showed that for Head Start programs, accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children does not necessarily mean that programs will be successful in achieving the highest quality as measured by federal monitoring reviews. The study reveals that transformational leadership style is important in achieving quality in Head Start, and hiring managers can adapt and use transformational leadership interview questions in hiring new Head Start Directors and other leaders. Transformational leadership can be taught and coached on several levels, and state and national associations can incorporate information on various leadership styles into their training programs, concentrating on transformational leadership as a tool to help achieve better results on program monitoring reviews.

In closing, this study is important to the field and to future researchers who are examining transformational leadership. Empirical evidence now exists to demonstrate that transformational leadership is important in Head Start programs and in the field of nonprofit social entrepreneurs.
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Appendix A

Leadership in Head Start and Early Head Start Programs Survey

Information on Your Program

4. What is your program’s total funded enrollment? If you have more than one grant, please combine the numbers.
   • Up to 100
   • 101 to 250
   • 251 to 500
   • 551 to 750
   • 751 to 1,000
   • Over 1,000

5. How many centers/sites are in your program?
   • One, single site
   • 2–5
   • 6–10
   • 10+

6. Are any of your sites accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)?
   • Yes
   • No

7. How many of the sites/centers/schools are accredited by NAEYC?
   • None or Not Applicable
   • 10–25%
   • 26–50%
   • 51–75%
   • 76–100%

8. For how long has your program been accredited by NAEYC? If you have more than one site, provide an average for all.
   • 0–5 years
   • 6–10 years
   • 11–15 years
   • 16–20 years
   • 21+ years
9. The following questions are from your most recent Program Information Report (PIR). What percentage of children were up-to-date on a schedule of age-appropriate preventive and primary health care at the end of the program year? (PIR Indicator Report Question C8)
   - 0 to 25%
   - 26% to 50%
   - 51% to 75%
   - 76% to 100%

10. What percentage of children are up-to-date on a schedule of oral health care at the end of the program year? (PIR Indicator Report Question C.20)?
   - 0 to 25%
   - 26% to 50%
   - 51% to 75%
   - 76% to 100%

11. On your most recent Program Monitoring review, what was the program CLASS score on Instructional Learning Formats? (Head Start Programs Only)
   - 1.0 to 1.4
   - 1.5 to 1.9
   - 2.0 to 2.4
   - 2.5 to 2.9
   - 3.0 to 3.4
   - 3.5 to 3.9
   - 4.0 to 4.4
   - 4.5 to 4.9
   - 5.0 to 5.4
   - 5.5 to 5.9
   - 6.0 to 6.4
   - 6.5 to 7.0

12. Please choose one to describe your last program review:
   - There were no concerns/issues.
   - The program had concerns/issues.
   - The program had deficiencies.
   - The program is in designation renewal.
   - The program is currently in re-competition.

13. What percentage of all classroom, FCC teachers, and/or home visitors have a bachelor’s degree in Early Childhood Education?
   - None
   - 10–25%
   - 26–50%
   - 51–75%
   - 76–100%
Leadership Style

14. I treat staff as individuals and support and encourage their development.
   Never Sometimes Often Almost always Always

15. I instill pride and respect in others and inspire others by being competent.
   Never Sometimes Often Almost always Always

16. I am clear about my values, and I practice what I preach.
   Never Sometimes Often Almost always Always

17. I encourage thinking about problems in new ways and question assumptions.
   Never Sometimes Often Almost always Always

18. I foster trust, involvement, and cooperation among team members.
   Never Sometimes Often Almost always Always

19. I give encouragement and recognition to staff.
   Never Sometimes Often Almost always Always

20. I communicate a clear and positive vision for the future.
   Never Sometimes Often Almost always Always

Tell Us About Yourself

21. What is your current position?
   - Executive Director/CEO/Superintendent—answers to the school board or board of directors
   - Vice President/Senior Director—oversees a division or department including Head Start or Early Head Start
   - Head Start/Early Head Start Director of the grantee
   - Head Start/Early Head Start Director of the delegate/partner agency
   - Education Coordinator/Content Area Expert for the grantee or delegate agency
   - Site/Center Director/Principal—responsible for oversight of one licensed center, one school, or one home visiting group
22. What are your total cumulative years of experience in leadership positions such as CEO, vice president, director, education director, and/or site director?
   - 0–5
   - 6–10
   - 11–15
   - 16–20
   - 21–30
   - 30+

23. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
   - Less than high school degree
   - High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
   - Some college but no degree
   - Associate degree
   - Bachelor’s degree
   - Master’s degree
   - Doctoral degree

24. What is your gender identity?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Prefer not to answer

25. In what state or U.S. territory do you currently work?

26. In what Head Start region is your program located?

27. Which race/ethnicity best describes you?
   - American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - Asian / Pacific Islander
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic
   - White / Caucasian
   - Multiple ethnicity / Other (please specify)

Thank You for taking this survey! The final aggregate results of this research will be shared with the National Head Start Association. No individual data will be shared. Thank You!
Appendix B

Emails from NHSA and ILHSA to Members

Head Start Leaders:

One of our very own program directors is working on a doctoral dissertation about leadership and quality in Head Start. Given your role and experience, and hopefully your own interest in understanding how different leadership styles contribute to quality and success in Head Start programs, we hope you will contribute to this research by completing the following brief survey:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HeadStartLDR

This survey is intended for Head Start/Early Head Start directors, delegate directors, education coordinators, CEOs, and site/center directors. The survey itself should only take 15 minutes, but it does require you to have your PIR data accessible to answer all of the questions. Please complete the survey by Friday, December 15th.

If you have any questions, please e-mail Victoria Jones at vjones@nhsa.org.

Jones, Victoria [vjones@nhsa.org]

Subject: Please Watch for A Survey Coming From NHSA/Don’t Miss the Opportunity to Participate in Interesting Research by One of Our Own

Happy Tuesday to All,

I hope you enjoyed the Thanksgiving holiday! I am sure I ate too much of my Mom’s pumpkin pie. But it was worth it.

The National Head Start Association is partnering with an Illinois Head Start/Early Head Start director who is also a student researcher, to help gather data for her doctoral dissertation. The topic of the research is Leadership and Quality in Head Start. When you receive the email from NHSA, please take the survey by clicking the link. The survey itself should only take 15 minutes; you will need some PIR data to answer all the questions. In addition, feel free to forward this email to others in your organization so the researcher can gather as many data as possible. The survey is intended
for Head Start/Early Head Start Directors and delegate directors, Education Coordinators/Managers, CEOs, and site/center directors. Please take it as soon as possible; the deadline is December 15th.

So, look for an email from NHSA! Take this survey! Let’s see what we can learn from the research!

Thank YOU!!!
Take care,
Lauri
Lauri Morrison-Frichtl
Executive Director
Illinois Head Start Association
3435 Liberty Drive
Springfield, IL 62704
PH: 217-241-3511
FAX: 217-241-3508
www.ilheadstart.org
Appendix C

List of States and Region Where Programs Are Located

*State Where Program Located*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Territory</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Virginia 1 .9
West Virginia 3 2.7
Wisconsin 8 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Start Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>