Cutting-Edge Topics and Approaches in Education and Applied Linguistics

Cutting-Edge Topics and Approaches in Education and Applied Linguistics

Edited by

Cihat Atar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I: Studies in Education

Section II: Studies in Applied Linguistics

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CLI:	Cross-linguistic influence
GEP:	Graduate Employability Program
HCI:	Human Computer Interaction
HLI:	Higher Learning Institutions
KDK:	Korean Digital Kitchen
Ln:	Language regardless of chronological order
MLQ:	Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
RomVLT:	Romanian Vocabulary Test
VLT:	Vocabulary test
VS:	Vocabulary size

INTRODUCTION

Some of the chapters in this book have emerged from the ICPESS conference held in Sarajevo in May 2017, which invited Turkish Ministry of National Education undersecretary representatives, the head of board of regents Turkiye Maarif Vakfi (Turkish Education Foundation) Prof. Dr. Birol Akgün and also representatives from Bosnia-Herzegovina Ministry of National Education. The conference brought together valuable studies from the fields of Applied Linguistics and Education. The quality of the studies combined with the cutting-edge methodologies used in some of those studies has provoked us to edit a book in which studies that either 1) have a very recent and up-to-date topic 2) and/or utilize the most recent methodologies/approaches in their fields are included. Consequently, in addition to the selection of the quality presentations in the ICPESS conference, some other researchers whose studies are valid and innovative in their fields were invited to contribute to this book. So, this book set out to form a collection of studies which present the cutting-edge topics and/or approaches and methodologies in the fields of Education and Applied Linguistics. Regarding the focus of this book, it will provide chapters with various topics, methodologies and approaches. This means that this book offers the readers a variety of topics and methodologies, which in turn makes this book a handbook for readers who would like to learn about some of the recent issues in Education and Applied Linguistics. In this sense, the readers of this book will be able to read and learn about different topics, approaches and methodologies that have prevailed in their fields recently.

This book addresses to two main themes: cutting-edge topics and/or approaches/methodologies in Education and Applied Linguistics. In the recent decades, especially as a result of globalization, learning another language and educating people with appropriate skills that addresses to the requirements of the modern world have become significant issues. Today, around 2 billion people learn and use English to some extent and this number is expected to rise. In the same vein, rapid technological advancements in the recent decades have made it mandatory to adjust education systems with the requirements of this era. Currently, in the fields of Education and Applied Linguistics various new approaches are being applied. However, edited books solely focusing on the cutting-edge

topics, approaches and methodologies in Applied Linguistics and Education are not common. Rather, most of the books tend to focus on a certain topic (i.e. vocabulary acquisition, internationalization of education) and present studies focusing on a single theme. This is of course fair and valid considering their focus. However, this book aspires to contribute to the field in another way: This edited book will provide the readers with the chance to read, analyse and apply the recent topics, approaches and methodologies in Education and Applied linguistics in various sub-fields. In this sense, we believe that this book will be a reference book for students, practitioners and researchers who would like to learn about the various recent developments in the fields concerning the focus of this book.

The main objective of this book is to explore and unpack the cutting-edge topics and approaches involved in the fields of Education and Applied Linguistics and to develop an awareness regarding the trends in research into learning and teaching practices in general, with regard to different paradigms, methodologies and epistemologies. The collection consists of this introduction, 9 chapters and a conclusion. While the first five chapters in this collection focus on the issues related to Education, the second part focuses on Applied Linguistics via four chapters. The common theme of this book, cutting-edge topics and methodologies, however, runs throughout the book.

In the first group of studies on Education, the first chapter explicates the consequences of the recent regulation in Turkey regarding school principals in public schools. This chapter aims to find out if there are any differences between the principals assigned after the regulation compared to the principals that worked before the regulation. The second chapter focuses on an interesting phenomenon: academic honesty in a higher education setting. This chapter studies the topic via phenomenology which provides qualitative and in-depth findings from the study data. The next chapter reviews the graduate employability programs in Malaysia which is a developing country. Developing countries tend to be successful at achieving the massification of higher education, but ensuring employability is quite tough. Considering this problem, this chapter analyses the experience in Malaysia, which offers valuable implications for other developing countries. Chapter four focuses on media literacy which has recently gained a rapid popularity in the field. Media literacy is an indispensable skill in our current era and this chapter goes one step further and offers some suggestions regarding the integration of media literacy and critical thinking which is another significant skill. The final chapter shares the concern regarding critical thinking with chapter four, but this chapter

specifically focuses on democratic attitudes of prospective teachers through the relational screening model. The chapter studies prospective teachers from various departments and it offers insights into how democratic attitudes can be achieved using a critical pedagogy approach.

The second group of studies are from Applied Linguistics field. Chapter six introduces a recent development in second language teaching field: a Real-world learning environment, a digital kitchen, created through the integration of technology into language learning environments. The digital kitchen project is an outcome of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Human Computer Interaction combined with task based learning. Chapter seven goes beyond the traditional studies focusing on vocabulary size measurements that usually focus on a second language. This chapter skilfully demonstrates the complex nature of the role of vocabulary in language learning and it suggests a holistic framework for investigating vocabulary size in multiple languages. The next chapter starts with the comparison of incidental and intentional vocabulary learning/teaching practices in language classrooms. Through a review into these approaches, a complementary account is presented and some suggestions for practitioners and researchers in the field are made. The final chapter focuses on a theme which is omnipresent in the field: the use of games in second/foreign language classrooms. The chapter contributes to the literature by framing various issues that need to be considered while using games in classrooms and in this sense, it has the potential to be of use for practitioners.

SECTION I:

STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Chapter One

School Principals' Leadership Styles from Teachers' Perspectives[1]

Süleyman Akkaş
and Ferdane Denkci Akkaş

Introduction

Administration and leadership are the two concepts which have been a focus of interest since the first days of humankind and which were initially considered as a kind of art, but now have been accepted as a field of scientific study (Aydın, 2007; Memduhoğlu, 2013; Yukl, 1989). In the historical development of societies from the hunter-gatherers to agricultural ones and then to the industrial and today the information societies, it can be clearly seen that the concept of administration has undergone contemporaneous changes (Barutçu & Akatay, 2000; Fişek, 2005; Memduhoğlu, 2013; Özer & Beycioğlu, 2013). That is, there has been a transformation from the concept administration towards leadership since these two terms are considered as two distinct concepts and in today's world various organizations seek for leaders rather than administrators claiming that leadership expresses the recent changes, developments and demands within the field more appropriately (Beycioğlu, 2009; Bolden, 2004; Bolden, 2005; Cemaloğlu, 2013).

When the related literature is reviewed, it is seen that there is not a compromised definition for leadership, but there are rather some common prominent qualities of leaders mentioned by the scholars in the field (Acar, 2002; Beycioğlu, 2009; Bolden, 2004; Karip, 1998; Kort, 2008; Paksoy, 1993; Storey, 2004; Şişman, 2014). Therefore, it would not be wrong to define leadership as a process or the ability to influence the followers to motivate and lead them towards specific targets of the organization

---

[1] This paper is a revised version of a study presented at the 7th International Congress of Education Supervision in Izmir in 2015.

(Northouse, 2007, p. 3). Today, leadership is related with having a vision which requires the leader to see the big picture and to cope with the constant changes of his/her time (Bertocci, 2009). When considered from this perspective, it is obvious that leadership has a key role in the triumph of the individual, the organization as well as the nation (Bolden, 2004; Lord & Brown, 2004; Paksoy, 1993).

Full-Range Leadership Theory which is an expansion of Bass' Transformational Leadership Theory (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003) is one of the prevalent theories within the literature concerning the situational leadership theories and Littlewood (1992) is the first scholar who introduced this popular theory to the educational organizations (Baloğlu, Karadağ & Gavuz, 2009). According to the situational leadership theories, it is accepted that a leadership style which works perfectly at a time may fail in a different context or situation. Therefore, it is aimed to study the influential leadership styles for specific situations and suggested that leaders should analyse the context first to determine and adopt the appropriate style for that specific situation (Bakan & Büyükbeşe, 2010; Bertocci, 2009; Beycioğlu, 2009; Bolden, 2004; Goodson, McGee & Cashman, 1989; Horner, 1997; Yukl, 1989).

Full-Range Leadership Theory suggests that there are basically three leadership styles which can be utilized accordingly depending on the requirements of the context: transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez faire leadership (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Oğuz, 2011):

- *Transformational leadership:* Transformational leaders mainly focus on the future, creativity, innovation and change (Bakan & Büyükbeşe, 2010). They have the charisma to set a vision and mission for the organization, and gain the respect and trust of their followers. They tend to use a symbolic language to highlight intelligence, rationalism and problem-solving skills which the followers are expected to own. They consider each follower individually and guide them effectively. They get their power from their followers. Therefore, they can lead the followers for a collaborative and continuous change within the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Çelik, 1998; Karip, 1998; Tura, 2012).
- *Transactional leadership:* Transactional leaders focus on the performance of the followers in exchange for rewards which are generally money or status. They primarily aim to maintain the organization and its functions with its existing conditions (Arslan & Uslu, 2014; Aydın, Sarıer & Uysal, 2013). Therefore, they

determine the responsibilities of the followers, provide them with a plan and check their progress to reward and punish. They get their power from the authority and rely on it to make the followers work for the achievement of the organization (Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Oğuz, 2011; Şahin, 2004; Tura, 2012).

- *Laissez faire leadership:* Leaders with a laissez faire style tend to avoid any administrational responsibility and power; therefore, such leaders are said to be passive and so appropriate for the employees who seek for autonomy in accordance with the organizational objectives. They prefer leaving all the power and authority to their inferiors which may also lead to anarchy among the followers. As a result, they evade making decisions and grasping the nettle, and generally cannot be reached in a time of crisis (Baloğlu, Karadağ & Gavuz, 2009; Can & Özer, 2011; Erol & Köroğlu, 2013; Kılıç, Keklik & Yıldız, 2014; Tengilimoğlu, 2005; Tura, 2012).

The Ministry of National Education has been revolutionizing the education system in Turkey over the last ten years. The ballyhooed educational reform is the Primary Education Law enacted in 2012 with the aim of increasing compulsory education from 8 to 12 years which is divided into three equal periods and therefore colloquially called as "*4+4+4 education system*" (Cerit, Akgün, Yıldız & Soysal, 2014; Güven, 2012; Memişoğlu & İsmetoğlu, 2013).

Following this radical change, a new regulation about the assignment of school administrators was issued by the Ministry in June 2014. According to the 6th article of this regulation, candidate administrators are to meet some requirements to apply for the position. The ones who meet those requirements are accepted for an interview and the 20th article of the regulation determines the criteria concerning the content of the interview:

- knowledge of legal regulations concerning government agencies and educational institutions (50%)
- ability to think analytically and analyse (10%)
- ability to represent and level of competence (10%)
- ability to reason and to comprehend (10%)
- communication skills, self-confidence and persuasion (10%)
- general knowledge (10%).

The ones who can get 70 and over are considered to be successful and assigned as administrators in schools if required. The same regulation also

forbids any administrator from working in the same position for more than 8 years.

Due to the new criteria required for school administrators determined by this regulation, almost all school principals and vice-principals were discharged from their positions on the grounds that they did not meet the expected requirements in 2014. Shortly, new administrators were put on which got reaction and resulted in controversial circumstances about their managerial competence. It is a well-known fact that the leadership styles adopted by educational administrators are crucial for schools as the main educational organizations since the research points out the direct relation between the traits and behaviours of the leaders and schools' accomplishment, students' achievements and staff's job satisfaction (Karadağ, Başaran & Korkmaz, 2009). Educational administrators are expected to become school leaders who influence and motivate school members to work for a better education. Bearing all these in mind, it is thought that this study would provide comprehensible results by comparing the former and the current school principals in terms of their leadership styles to see if the new criteria have made any difference.

Method

This study aims to determine the leadership styles of both the former and the current school principals employed at the primary and middle schools in Buca, İzmir from the teachers' perspective as well as to reveal any significant difference in terms of some variables.

Research Questions

This study aims to seek the answers to the following research questions:

1. What leadership styles do the former and current school principals have by teachers' views?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the leadership styles of the former and current school principals by teachers' views?

3. Do the teachers' views concerning the leadership styles of their former and current school principals vary significantly in terms of their gender, school type, field or experience?

Research Design

This is a study with a descriptive survey model and the data were collected with quantitative data collection techniques. Descriptive survey research aims to reveal a large group of people's opinions, perceptions or beliefs about an issue; therefore, it is more suitable for exploratory or explanatory purposes and it enables the researcher to describe a large population, which would be impossible to do directly (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2005; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006; Rubin & Babbie, 2011).

Sampling

The data were collected from 240 teachers employed at primary and middle schools where the school principals were changed after the implementation of the new regulation in Buca, Izmir during 2014-2015 academic year.

Table 1-1. Sample of the study

Variables		N
Gender	*Female*	160
	Male	80
School type	*Primary school*	147
	Middle school	93
Field	*Primary school teacher*	138
	Social sciences	54
	Science and maths	30
Experience	*0-5 years*	17
	6-10 years	47
	11-15 years	61
	16-20 years	69
	21-25 years	17
	26+ years	19
Total		240

As can be seen in Table 1-1, 160 of the participants were female and 80 of them were males. 147 of them worked at a primary school while 93 of them worked at a middle school in Buca, İzmir. 138 of the teachers

worked as a primary school teacher whereas 54 of them taught a course from social sciences and 30 taught a course from science and maths. It is also understood that the sample includes teachers with distinct experience background, but the majority had 11-20 years of teaching experience.

Data Collection Instrument

The data were collected from the participant teachers via *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) developed by Bernard and Bass (1985) and adapted to Turkish by Akdoğan (2002). The Cronbach Alfa Coefficient is .89 for the whole scale. The MLQ is a five-point Likert scale which consists of 36 items and three factors each of which represents a leadership style: transformational leadership (19 items), transactional leadership (12 items) and laissez faire leadership (5 items). The Cronbach Alfa Coefficient values for the factors were calculated as respectively .94, .72 and .70. The participants were asked to express the frequency of the behaviours presented by each item in the scale as follows: 1= Never, 2= Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4= Usually and 5= Always both for their former and current school principals.

Data Analysis

The data were analysed via SPSS 17 software. First, the assumption of normality was checked for the following statistical procedures since their validity depended on this. Therefore, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was conducted to assess the normality of the data and the results are given in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2. The Results for Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Values		MLQ
N		240
Normal Parameters	x	3.19
	sd	.529
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.098
p		.000*

* p>.05

As can be understood from Table 1-2, the data significantly deviate from a normal distribution (p=.00) and so nonparametric tests are warranted in the analysis since having normal data which is an underlying assumption in parametric testing cannot be achieved (Gupta, 1999, p. 49; Hinton, 2004, p. 210; Hinton, Brownlow, McMurray & Cozens, 2004, p. 98). As a result, Mann Whitney U Test, Kruskal Willis Test and Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test were conducted to analyse the data and the test results were considered statistically significant at the level of p<.05.

Findings

The findings of the study are presented in this section in accordance with the research questions. The first research question was stated as "*What leadership styles do the former and current school principals have by teachers' views?*". The means of MLQ scores both for the former and the current school principals are shown in Table 1-3.

Table 1-3. Means for the MLQ

Factors	Former Principal		Current Principal	
	x	sd	x	sd
Transformational Leadership	3.46	.84	3.18	.99
Transactional Leadership	3.08	.57	3.09	.71
Laissez Faire Leadership	2.38	.86	2.56	.94

According to Table 1-3, the mean score (x) of former principals is 3.46 for transformational leadership, 3.08 for transactional leadership and 2.38 for laissez faire leadership. Also, it is seen that the mean score (x) of current principals is 3.18 for transformational leadership, 3.09 for transactional leadership and 2.56 for laissez faire leadership. These findings indicate that the teachers perceive both the former and current principals as transformational leaders more than transactional or laissez faire ones. Moreover, it is seen that both groups of the principals are almost equally viewed as transactional leaders by the teachers.

The second research question was expressed as "*Is there a statistically significant difference between the leadership styles of the former and current school principals by teachers' views?"*. The results for Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test which was conducted to determine any significant difference between the leadership styles of both administrative groups are given in Table 1-4.

As can be seen in Table 1-4, the teachers' views concerning their former and current principals' leadership styles differ significantly in terms of transformational leadership (p=.007) in favour of the former principals and in terms of the laisses faire leadership (p=.019) in favour of the current principals whereas no significant difference is observed in terms of transactional leadership style (p=467). That is, the former school principals are perceived as more transformational leaders while the current ones are viewed as more laissez faire leaders and this difference is statistically significant at the level of p<.05.

The third and last research question was formulated as "*Do the teachers' views concerning the leadership styles of their former and current school principals vary significantly in terms of their gender, school type, field or experience?"*. The results for Mann Whitney-U Test which was conducted to reveal if there is a significant difference in the teachers' views in terms of their gender are shown in Table 1-5.

Table 1-5 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the views of the female and male teachers concerning their former and current principals' leadership styles. The results for Mann Whitney-U Test which was conducted to reveal if there is a significant difference in the teachers' views in terms of the school type they were employed at are shown in Table 1-6.

Chapter One

Table 1-4. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test Results

Variables		Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	z	p
Transformational Leadership	*Current Principals- Former Principals*	Negative Ranks	115	116.90	13443.50	-2.684	.007*
		Positive Ranks	95	91.70	8711.50		
		Ties	30				
		Total	240				
Transactional Leadership	*Current Principals- Former Principals*	Negative Ranks	93	105.83	9842.00	-.727	.467
		Positive Ranks	11	99.71	11068.00		
		Ties	36				
		Total	240				
Laissez Faire Leadership	*Current Principals- Former Principals*	Negative Ranks	72	92.51	6660.50	-2.346	.019*
		Positive Ranks	110	90.84	9992.50		
		Ties	58				
		Total	240				

* p<.05

School Principals' Leadership Styles from Teachers' Perspectives

Table 1-5. Mann Whitney-U Test Results

	Variable	**Gender**	N	Mean of Ranks	Sum of Ranks	U	z	p
Former Principals	*Transformational Leadership*	Female	160	116.63	18660.50	5780.500	-1.222	.222
		Male	80	128.24	10259.50			
		Total	240					
	Transactional Leadership	Female	160	122.89	19663.00	6017.000	-.756	.449
		Male	80	115.71	9257.00			
		Total	240					
	Laissez Faire Leadership	Female	160	122.80	19648.00	6032.000	-.728	.467
		Male	80	115.90	9272.00			
		Total	240					
	Transformational Leadership	Female	160	121.71	19474.00	6206.000	-.383	.702
		Male	80	118.08	9446.00			
		Total	240					
Current Principals	*Transactional Leadership*	Female	160	122.12	19539.00	6141.000	-.511	.609
		Male	80	117.26	9381.00			
		Total	240					
	Laissez Faire Leadership	Female	160	123.38	19740.00	5940.000	-.910	.363
		Male	80	114.75	9180.00			
		Total	240					

* $p<.05$

Table 1-6. Mann Whitney-U Test Results

Variable	School Type	N	Mean of Ranks	Sum of Ranks	U	z	p
Transformational Leadership	Primary S.	147	116.73	17160.00			
	Middle S.	93	126.45	11760.00	6282.00	-1.057	.291
	Total	240					
Former Principals							
Transactional Leadership	Primary S.	147	111.47	16385.50			
	Middle S.	93	134.78	12534.50	5707.50	-2.538	.011*
	Total	240					
Laissez Faire Leadership	Primary S.	147	119.28	17533.50			
	Middle S.	93	122.44	11386.50	6655.50	-.344	.731
	Total	240					
Transformational Leadership	Primary S.	147	136.00	19992.00			
	Middle S.	93	96.00	8928.00	4557.00	-4.350	.000*
	Total	240					
Current Principals							
Transactional Leadership	Primary S.	147	109.58	16108.50			
	Middle S.	93	137.76	12811.50	5230.50	-3.066	.002*
	Total	240					
Laissez Faire Leadership	Primary S.	147	103.64	15235.50			
	Middle S.	93	147.15	13684.50	4357.50	-4.742	.000*
	Total	240					

* p<.05

As can be understood from Table 1-6, the teachers' views about their former principals' transactional leadership style differ significantly in terms of the school type in favour of the ones who are employed at the middle schools (p=.011). That is, the principals of the middle schools are believed to have a more transactional leadership style by the teachers. When it comes to the current principals, Table 1-6 shows that there is a significant difference in the teachers' views concerning all three leadership styles in terms of the school type. The teachers employed at primary schools think that their principals have a more transformational leadership style (p=.00) whereas the ones employed at the middle schools perceive their principals rather transactional (p=.002) or laissez faire leaders (p=.00).

The results for Kruskal Wallis-H Test which was conducted to reveal if there is a significant difference in the teachers' views concerning their principals' leadership styles in terms of their educational field are shown in Table 1-7.

Table 1-7 shows that the teachers' views concerning their current principals' leadership styles differ significantly for two factors in terms of their educational field: transactional leadership (p=.031) and laissez faire leadership (p=.013). Mann Whitney-U Test was implemented as a post hoc analysis to reveal the groups which cause this significant difference and it is seen that the teachers instructing social sciences perceive their currents principals more transactional leaders than the primary school teachers whereas according to science and maths teachers, when compared to the primary school teachers, their principals are more laissez faire leaders. It is understood from the findings in Table 1-7 that there is no significant difference in the teachers' views concerning their former principals.

Finally, the results for Kruskal Wallis-H Test which was conducted to reveal if there is a significant difference in the teachers' views concerning their principals' leadership styles in terms of their teaching experience are shown in Table 1-8.

Table 1-7. Kruskal Wallis-H Test Results

Variables		Groups	N	Mean of Ranks	X^2	df	p
	Transformational Leadership	Primary education	138	108.03	1.078	2	.583
		Social sciences	54	117.77			
		Science and Maths	30	116.18			
		Total	222				
Former Principals	*Transactional Leadership*	Primary education	138	103.71	5.849	2	.054
		Social sciences	54	120.69			
		Science and Maths	30	130.77			
		Total	222				
	Laissez Faire Leadership	Primary education	138	109.85	.250	2	.883
		Social sciences	54	114.66			
		Science and Maths	30	113.42			
		Total	222				
	Transformational Leadership	Primary education	138	117.36	3.957	2	.138
		Social sciences	54	106.87			
		Science and Maths	30	92.87			
		Total	222				
Current Principals	*Transactional Leadership*	Primary education	138	103.62	6.962	2	.031*
		Social sciences	54	130.76			
		Science and Maths	30	113.07			
		Total	222				

School Principals' Leadership Styles from Teachers' Perspectives

	N	Mean of Ranks	X²	df	p
Laissez Faire Leadership					
Primary education	138	101.69			
Social sciences	54	125.81	8.669	2	.013*
Science and Maths	30	130.85			
Total					

* p<.05

Table 1-8. Kruskal Wallis-H Test Results

Variables	Groups	N	Former Principals				Current Principals			
			Mean of Ranks	X²	df	p	Mean of Ranks	X²	df	p
Transformational Leadership	0-5 years	17	119.97				93.03			
	6-10 years	47	115.70				110.49			
	11-15 years	61	128.20				121.18			
	16-20 years	69	118.38	1.090	5	.955	120.95	7.094	5	.214
	21-25 years	17	117.54				141.56			
	26+ years	19	120.03				136.11			
	Total	240								
Transactional Leadership	0-5 years	17	109.76				117.91			
	6-10 years	47	128.78				142.10			
	11-15 years	61	135.98				129.57			
	16-20 years	69	114.99	7.897	5	.162	110.18	10.478	5	.063
	21-25 years	17	96.80				97.81			
	26+ years	19	113.63				109.97			
	Total	240								

	0-5 years	17	120.09				128.53		
	6-10 years	47	124.39				133.53		
	11-15 years	61	123.35				119.89		
Laissez Faire	16-20 years	69	116.54	3.899	5	.564	119.18	9.186	5	.102
Leadership	21-25 years	17	103.06				86.89		
	26+ years	19	141.26				135.58		
	Total	240							

* p<.05