Relationship of Leadership Behavior with School Effectiveness: An Evidence of Public Primary Schools

Ehsan Mahmood[*]
Javid Iqbal[**]
Saadia Adnan[***]

Abstract

This study intended to examine relationship between public primary school heads' leadership behaviors and school effectiveness indicators. Proper permission from Punjab Education Department was obtained to conduct this research study in Public Primary Schools. Study employed stratified random sampling technique to select 480 heads and their subordinate teachers from eight districts of the Punjab. Survey approach was considered appropriate to collect data for this co-relational study. An Urdu version of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5X-Short) developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) was utilized in both leader (Head) and rater (Teacher) forms to determine heads' leadership behaviors. School Effectiveness Measurement Questionnaire developed by Iqbal (2005) was administered to measure school effectiveness. Overall, 467 heads and their subordinate 1296 teachers rated the questionnaires. The study results portrayed considerable relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and indicators of school effectiveness. Specifically, 'idealized influence-behavior' showed significant relationship with indicators of school effectiveness. Only single factor of the transactional leadership 'contingent reward' showed significant relationship with indicators of school effectiveness. 'Management by exception-passive' the component of transactional leadership and 'Laissez-faire leadership' showed negative relationship with school effectiveness indicators.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Laissez-faire Leadership, School Effectiveness.

[*]   Area Education Officer, Federal directorate of Education, Islamabad.
      Email: drehsanmahmood@gmail.com
[**] Principal, Islamabad Model School for Boys Nogazi F-17, Islamabad.
      Email: ranajaved1969@yahoo.com
[***] Director Academics, Federal Directorate of Education, Islamabad.
      Email: saadiaadnan@gmail.com

Introduction

School heads play fundamental role in forming effective schools and transforming school activities to administer change by keeping up constancy in the school programs (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). They perform as change managers and the institutional effectiveness is openly vitalized by their leadership practices (Marks & Printy, 2003). Heads commune basic beliefs, value, and professional expectations through their interactions with the staff members and school effectiveness depends upon their expressions, dealings, and even nonverbal practices (Deal & Peterson, 2009). Proficient school heads execute formal school leadership responsibilities along with particular focus on institutional objectives and learning culture (Cotton, 2003). School leaders present both task-oriented and relation-oriented dynamic leadership, which is supportive of subordinates, and set direction to carry out high performance standards (Hoy & Miskel, 2000).

Over the last two decades the discussion about effective school is on the highest priority of educational research (Johnson, Livingston, Schwartz, & Slate, 2000). The researchers have the opinion that principals' leadership style specifically impacts school environment (Griffith, 2004). In view of this acknowledged significance of principals' leadership role, the scholars have presented numerous leadership theories which assist educational managers to constitute their successful leadership styles which may enhance school's effectiveness (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). However, current leadership studies have directed educational managers to conceptualize leadership from the viewpoint of modern leadership models. The transformational and transactional leadership model is the eminent among these latest models of leadership (Bass, 1985a; Burns, 1978; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990). Many researchers have recently conducted their research studies suggesting that the leaders who demonstrate transformational leadership style have strong impact on students' achievement, teachers' self-efficacy, school culture and school effectiveness (Michael, 2003; Oluremi, 2008; Ross & Gray, 2006).

This study was also conducted in the Punjab province to investigate public primary schools heads' leadership style behaviors based on conceptual framework of full range leadership model i.e. transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership, stated by Avolio and Bass (1995); and to determine its relationship with school effectiveness.

Review of Related Literature

Transformational and Transactional leadership model was anticipated by James McGregor Burns (1978), and transformational administration is the particular style of leadership in light of the fact that the proof has demonstrated it to be an administration style that produces results beyond expectations (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990). This theory was additionally supported by Bass (1985), who explained Burns' concept of Transformational and Transactional leadership more explicitly (Hoy and Miskel, 2000). In the course of recent years numerous authors have shown practical interest for testing this new worldview of transformational and Transactional leadership theory (Bass and Avolio 1994). Avolio and Bass (1995) further altered this idea and presented a full range leadership model including transformational, transactional and laissez-fair leadership.

Transformational Leaders center upon basic beliefs, convictions and fundamental needs of the subordinates (Luthans, 2008). Transformational leaders can spur their subordinates to upgrade anticipated productivity by setting testing targets, engaging the subordinates, and focusing on the fundamental needs and self-improvement of the subordinates (Bass, 1985; Bass and Riggo, 2006). The transformational initiative model is included five practices: (a) **idealized influence (attributed)** indicates to the social charisma and leaders' good example for the subordinates who regard, respect and trust their leader and like to tail them (b) **idealized influence (behavior)** refers to the leader's emphasis on most significant qualities, convictions and an aggregate sense of mission; these leaders take risks and express exclusive requirements of moral and good conduct (c) **inspirational motivation** alludes to the manners in which leaders produce solidarity by giving importance and challenges to the subordinates' performance; the leader's collective elite expectation and well-spoken future vision, use non-verbal communication and images to spur their subordinates, (d) **intellectual stimulation** refers to leaders' dealings that advance discernment, knowledge, and critical thinking abilities; such leader urge subordinates to be inventive and imaginative in their reasoning, dependably esteem subordinates' inventive, problem solving and innovative skills (e) **individualized consideration** refers to leaders' activities as a guide or mentor that add agreeable to subordinates by giving exceptional consideration to their essential needs, and make in them feeling of self-actualization (Bass and Riggo, 2006).

The transactional leadership is shared nature of initiative in which leader get administrations of subordinates by giving them a few

advantages in a social trade which is called transaction (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2000) Transactional authority is included three practices: (a) **contingent reward** refers to leaders behaviors that identified with elucidating work necessities, subordinates' jobs and duties, and promising them with mental or material reward on the achievement of legally binding understanding (b**) management by exception (active)** refers to leaders' dynamic watchfulness who recognize the principles and standard for consistence and dependably endeavor to bound the subordinates work as per those set guidelines and standards, and take corrective actions as rapidly as possible,(c) **management by exception (passive)** refers to leaders' evasion from clarifying desires, indicating understandings, and giving standards and objectives to be accomplished by subordinates. These leaders remember the set guidelines and standards and meddle just if the standards are not met (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). The leaders who show **Laissez-faire leadership** delay action, postpone activity, forsake duties, avoid deciding, taking stand on grave issues and don't include subordinates when difficult issues emerge (Luthans, 2008).

School Effectiveness is likewise an essential origination in the field of social sciences and it is a rich expansion to instructive research which gives establishments to look into centering the issues identified with criteria of school effectiveness for example inputs, procedures, settings and results (Creemers, 1994). School Effectiveness is the limit of a school to support up school capacities or how much school plays out its capacities by giving a fixed measure of information (Cheng, 1996). The investigation of transformational leadership in school perspective is nearly new as Leithwood (1994) and his partners brought transformational leadership model into school setting (Stewart, 2006). Leithwood (1994) contends that principals having transformational leadership practices can confront the difficulties of the 21st century.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) researched the impacts of transformational leadership on organizational conditions in the schools. The examination results showed significant relationship of transformational leadership with school policy and procedure, arranging activities, acknowledgment of purpose and objectives, data gathering, and principals' instructional administrations. An examination directed by Wu (2000) showed significant relationship of transformational leadership practices with school effectiveness. Wang (2002) investigated the connection between principals' leadership styles and effectiveness of special education schools and pointed out impacts of transformational leadership on school effectiveness.

Jen, Ni, and Duh-Ming (2005) investigated the relationship between

principals' transformational leadership practices and school effectiveness in Kindergartens. Results delineated that dominant part of the principals' transformational leadership practices especially 'inspirational motivation' and 'individualized consideration' exhibited critical association with indicators of school learning environment. Oluremi (2008) researched relationship of principal leadership practices and school culture. The outcomes uncovered that 'individualized consideration' the element of transformational leadership exhibited critical association with school culture; while, laissez-faire leadership showed negative consequences for school culture. The examination finding of Tsai (2010) investigated effect of principals' transformational leadership on the effectiveness of secondary schools and reasoned that display of transformational leadership influences school effectiveness.

Research Questions

Following three research questions were postulated to conduct this study.
1. Is there any relationship between heads' transformational leadership behaviors and school effectiveness constructs?
2. Is there any relationship between heads' transactional leadership behaviors and school effectiveness constructs?
3. Is there any relationship between heads' laissez-faire leadership and school effectiveness?

Methodology

This study was completed through survey adopting following methodological steps:

Population and Sample of the Study

The study population was consisted of all the 45453 public primary school heads (22314 Male Heads & 23139 Female Heads) of the Punjab province. Overall, 480 schools (240 Boys Schools & 240 Girls Schools) from eight districts of the Punjab were selected utilizing equal sized stratified random sampling technique. Sample was selected in equal numbers of boys' and girls' school due to their approximately equal existence with the proportion of 49.1% Boys & 50.9% Girls respectively. Sixty schools (30 boys & 30 Girls) from each district were selected and

keeping in view existence in urban and rural areas the school were further divided into 3 urban schools and 27 rural schools in the proportion of 10% urban and 90% rural according to their approximate existence in population (N=4314 Urban School & N=41139 Rural Schools).

Instruments

Following two instruments were used to conduct this study.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5x-Short)

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5X-Short) based on full range leadership model developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) was utilized in leaders (Heads) as well as raters (Teachers) forms to measure heads' leadership behaviors. Proper permission to utilize this instrument was taken from Mind Garden, Inc. USA. This instrument consists of 36 items which measures five behaviors of transformational leadership i.e. 'idealized influence-attributed', 'idealized influence-behavior', 'inspirational motivation', 'intellectual stimulation' and 'individualized consideration', and three transactional leadership behaviors i.e. 'Contingent reward', 'management-by-exception active' 'management-by-exception passive' and one factor of 'laissez-faire leadership'. This instrument was developed on five-point Likert scale having: not at all (0), once in a while (1), sometimes (2), fairly often (3) and frequently, if not always (4) as alternative responses.

School Effectiveness Measurement Questionnaire

School Effectiveness Measurement Questionnaire (SEMQ) developed by Iqbal (2005) was utilized to determine School Effectiveness. School Effectiveness Measurement Questionnaire (SEMQ) consists of 36 items based on ten indicators of school effectiveness given by De-Roche (1987) i.e. 'school site management and democratic decisions', 'clear goals and consensus about goals', 'collaborative planning', 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success', 'maximized learning time', 'instructional leadership', 'order and discipline', 'school wide staff development and stability', 'co - operative and friendly atmosphere', 'evaluation'. It was developed on five-point Likert scale indicating: Never (0), Rarely (1), Some Times (2), Often (3) and Always (4) as alternative responses.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the respondent (467 Heads & 1296 Teachers) were utilized to determine relationship between heads' leadership behaviors and school effectiveness indicators. The correlation magnitude was determined using 'Pearson product-moment' correlation. The minimum level of significance was $\rho < 0.05$ which is acceptable measure for educational research (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003).

Table 1
Relationship of transformational leadership behaviors with school effectiveness indicators

		SMDD	CGCG	CP	HASRAS	MLT	IL	OD	SWSDS	CFA	EV
IIA	Pearson r	0.047	-0.044	0.122**	0.056	0.075	-0.090	-0.030	-0.005	0.121**	0.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.306	0.341	0.009	0.230	0.107	.052	0.516	0.916	0.009	0.672
IIB	Pearson r	0.225**	0.213**	0.280**	0.225**	0.188**	0.111*	0.106*	0.147**	0.201**	0.193**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.016	0.022	0.001	0.000	0.000
IM	Pearson r	0.240**	0.090	0.207**	0.219**	0.125**	0.040	0.106*	0.074	0.194**	0.151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.051	0.000	0.000	0.007	.0390	0022	0.111	0.000	0.001
IS	Pearson r	0.209**	0.106*	0.220**	0.228**	0.140**	0.011	0.030	0.098*	0.170**	0.119*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.809	0.514	0.033	0.000	0.010
IC	Pearson r	0.204**	0.075	0.145**	0.142**	0.092*	0.010	0.054	0.053	0.144**	0.124**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.106	0.002	0.002	0.047	0.827	0.245	0.256	0.002	0.007
	N	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 1 presents the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and school effectiveness indicators and depicts that:
'Idealized influence attributed' demonstrated positive relationship with 'collaborative planning' ($r = 0.122$, $\rho = 0.009$), 'co-operative and friendly atmosphere' ($r = 0.121$ at 0.01, $\rho = 0.009$)
'Idealized influence behavior' demonstrated positive relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions' ($r = 0.225$, $\rho = 0.00$), 'clear goals and consensus about goals' ($r = 0.213$, $\rho = 0.00$), 'collaborative planning '($r = 0.280$, $\rho = 0.00$), 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success'($r = 0.225$ at 0.01, $\rho = 0.00$), 'maximized learning time' ($r = 0.188$, $\rho = 0.00$),'instructional leadership' ($r = 0.111$, $\rho = 0.016$), 'order and discipline' ($r = 0.106$, $\rho = 0.022$), 'school-wide staff

development and stability' (r = 0.147, ρ = 0.001), 'co-operative and friendly atmosphere' (r = 0.201, ρ = 0.00), 'evaluation' (r = 0.193, ρ = 0.00).

'Inspirational motivation' demonstrated positive relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions' (r = 0.240, ρ = 0.00), 'collaborative planning' (r = 0.207, ρ = 0.00), 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success'(r = 0.219, ρ = 0.00), 'maximized learning time' (r = 0.125, ρ = 0.007), 'order and discipline' (r = 0.106, ρ = 0.022), 'co-operative and friendly atmosphere' (r = 0.194, ρ = 0.00), and' evaluation' (r = 0.151, ρ = 0.001).

'Intellectual stimulation' demonstrated positive relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions' (r = 0.209, ρ = 0.00), 'clear goals and consensus about goals' (r = 0.106, ρ = 0.022), 'collaborative planning' (r = 0.220, ρ = 0.00),'high academic standard and recognition of academic success' (r = 0.228, ρ = 0.000), 'maximized learning time' (r = 0.140, ρ = 0.002),'school wide staff development and stability' (r = 0.098, ρ = 0.033), 'co-operative and friendly atmosphere' (r = 0.170, ρ = 0.000), 'evaluation' (r = 0.119, ρ = 0.01).

'Individualized consideration' demonstrated positive relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions' (r = 0.204, ρ = 0.000), 'collaborative planning'(r = 0.145, ρ = 0.002), 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success' (r = 0.142, ρ = 0.), 'maximized learning time' (r = 0.092, ρ = 0.047), 'co-operative and friendly atmosphere' (r = 0.144, ρ = 0.002), and 'evaluation' (r = 0.124, ρ = 0.007)

Table 2
Relationship of transactional leadership behaviors with school effectiveness indicators

		SMDD	CGCG	CP	HASRAS	MLT	IL	OD	SWSDS	CFA	EV
CR	Pearson r	0.246**	0.151**	0.231**	0.146**	0.127**	0.036	0.116*	0.061	0.126**	0.160**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.002	0.006	0.441	0.012	0.188	0.007	0.001
MBEA	Pearson r	0.106*	0.046	0.034	0.084	-0.008	0.030	-0.030	-0.062	0.068	0.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.022	0.317	0.469	0.068	0.861	0.516	0.519	0.181	0.143	0.992
MBEP	Pearson r	-0.113*	-0.042	-0.123**	-0.143**	-0.029	-0.076	0.058	-0.052	-0.030	-0.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.014	0.371	0.008	0.002	0.530	0.102	0.209	0.258	0.516	0.736
	N	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 presents the relationship between transactional leadership behaviors and school effectiveness indicators and depicts that:

'Contingent reward' demonstrated positive relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions' (r = 0.246, ρ = 0.000), 'clear goals and consensus about goals' (r = 0.151, ρ = 0.001), 'collaborative planning' (r = 0.231, ρ = 0.00), 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success' (r = 0.146, ρ = 0.002), 'maximized learning time'(r = 0.127, ρ = 0.006), 'order and discipline' (r = 0.116, ρ = 0.012), co-operative and friendly atmosphere' (r = 0.126, ρ = 0.007), and 'Evaluation' (r = 0.160, ρ = 0.001).

'Management - by - exception active' demonstrated positive relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions'(r = 0.106, ρ = 0.022). 'Management - by - exception passive' demonstrated negative relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions' (r = -0.113, ρ = 0.014), 'collaborative planning' (r = -0.123, ρ = 0.008), and 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success' (r = -0.143, ρ = 0.002).

Table 3
Relationship of laissez-faire leadership with School Effectiveness Indicators

	SMDD	CGCG	CP	HASRAS	MLT	IL	OD	SWSDS	CFA	EV
Pearson r	-0.186**	-0.121**	-0.167**	-0.140**	-0.051	-0.023	-0.099*	-0.112*	-0.135**	-0.033
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.002	0.274	0.619	0.033	0.015	0.003	0.481
N	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763	1763

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 presents the relationship between 'laissez-faire leadership' (LF) and school effectiveness indicators and depicts that:

'Laissez-faire leadership' demonstrated negative relationship with 'school site management and democratic decisions' (r = - 0.186, ρ = 0.000), 'clear goals and consensus about goals' (r = - 0.121, ρ = 0.009), 'collaborative planning' (r = - 0.167, ρ = 0.000), high academic standard and recognition of academic success'(r = - 0.140, ρ = 0.002),'order and discipline' (r = - 0.099, ρ = 0.033), 'school wide staff development and stability' (r = - 0.112, ρ = 0.015), and 'co-operative and friendly atmosphere' (r = - 0.135, ρ = 0.003).

Conclusions

The results deriving from data analysis portrayed that transformational leadership behaviors and 'contingent reward' the component of transactional leadership found correlated positively with indictors of

school effectiveness. However, 'Management - by - exception passive' of transactional leadership and 'Laissez-faire leadership' found negatively correlated with major indictors of school effectiveness. Detailed analysis further indicated that heads who demonstrated 'idealized influence - influenced only two indicators of school effectiveness in planning strategies for goal achievement and created conducive and friendly school environment.

Heads who demonstrated 'idealized influence' (behavior) showed strong relationship with all the indicators of school effectiveness. These heads participated teachers in decision making, provided vision of goals and ensured collective efforts for goal achievement, planned activities for objective achievement, targeted high standards with struggles to achieve that standards, utilized maximum school time for learning, supervised teachers and provided support in pedagogical process, followed rules and regulations to ensure disciplined environment, promoted staff professional development and stability within schools, created conducive and friendly school environment, and evaluated students and teachers' performance according to standardized norms.

Heads who demonstrated 'inspirational motivation' and shaped team essence by providing challenges to the teachers' performance, communicated extraordinary performance targets and enunciated the future vision showed relationship with seven school effectiveness indicators. These heads participated teachers in decision making, planned strategies for goal achievement, targeted high academic standards with determinations to achieve that standards, utilized maximum school time for learning, followed rules and regulations to ensure disciplined environment, created conducive and friendly school environment, and evaluated students and teachers' performance according to standardized norms.

Heads who demonstrated 'intellectual stimulation' and performed such actions that promoted intellect, wisdom, and the capability of problem solving among teachers, stimulated teachers to be creative and innovative in their thinking, and openly encouraged different ways of problem solving showed relationship with eight school effectiveness indicators. These heads participated teachers in decision making, planned strategies for goal achievement, targeted high academic standards with struggles to achieve that standards, utilized maximum school time for learning, promoted staff professional development and stability within schools, created conducive and friendly school environment, and evaluated students and teachers' performance according to standardized norms.

Heads who demonstrated 'individualized consideration' and acted as a mentor and paid special consideration to teachers' basic necessities showed relationship with six school effectiveness indicators. These heads participated teachers in decision making, planned strategies for goal achievement, targeted high academic standards with struggles to achieve that standards, utilized maximum school time for learning, created conducive and friendly school environment, and evaluated students and teachers' performance according to standardized norms.

Heads who demonstrated 'Contingent reward' and elucidated roles and job requirements of the teachers and assured them reward on the accomplishment of their agreement showed relationship with eight indicator of school effectiveness. These heads participated teachers in decision making, provided vision of goals and ensured collective efforts for goal achievement, planned strategies for goal achievement, targeted highest academic standards with struggles to achieve that standards, utilized maximum school time for learning, followed rules and regulations to ensure disciplined environment, created conducive and friendly school environment, and evaluated students and teachers' performance according to standardized norms.

Heads' who demonstrated 'Management - by - exception active' and specified rules and standard for compliance and always tried to bound the teachers work according to those rules and standards, took corrective action on deviation from rules showed relationship only with 'school management and democratic decisions' These heads only participated teachers in decision making to ensure proper management.

Heads who exhibited 'management by exception-passive' and avoided identifying agreements, elucidating expectations, and providing goals and standards to be achieved by the teachers, and intervened only if standards were not fulfilled showed negative relationship with 'school management and democratic decisions', 'collaborative planning' and 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success'. It revealed that these heads did not shared teachers in decision making, did not planned policies for goal achievement, targeted no academic standards and made no struggles to realize that standards.

Heads who observed 'laissez-faire leadership showed negative relationship with 'school management and democratic decisions', 'clear goals and consensus about goals', 'collaborative planning', 'high academic standard and recognition of academic success', 'order and discipline', 'school wide staff development and stability' and 'co-operative and friendly environment'. It demonstrated that such leaders did not participated teacher in decision making, had no vision of goals and

collective efforts for goal achievement, strategies for goal achievement were unplanned, no academic standards were targeted and no efforts were made to achieve that standards, rules and regulations were not followed to ensure disciplined environment, they did not focus on staff professional development and stability within schools, no conducive and friendly school environment was created, and students and teachers' performance was not evaluated according to standardized norms.

Discussion

Present study findings revealed that transformational leadership style behaviors were mainly associated with school effectiveness indicators; the idealized influence-behavior demonstrated significant relation with school effectiveness indicators. A study conducted by Leithwood & Jantzi (1990) pointed out that transformational leadership develops organizational performance. The strong indication of the significant effects of idealized influence- behaviors on school effectiveness opposed the previous research findings of Zembat et.al (2010) which highlighted that idealized influence- behaviors has no considerable effects on school effectiveness indicators. This study supported the results of the studies (Oluremi, 2008; Layton, 2003; Michael, 2003; Daniels, 2005) which demonstrated significant effects of transformational leadership behaviors on school performance indicators i.e. school culture, school effectiveness, and school learning environment. This study indicated significant effects of transactional leadership behavior 'contingent reward' on school effectiveness indicators which is supported by Avolio and Bass (1995) which revealed that combined effects of transformational leadership behaviors and 'contingent reward' the aspect of transactional leadership style showed significant effects on organizational effectiveness. Barnett (2005) further reinforced that 'contingent reward' the aspect of transactional leadership style demonstrated major effects on school environment.

Iqbal (2005) conducted a study in 280 secondary schools of the Punjab and pointed out that private schools were better in effectiveness as compared to public schools. Task oriented and authoritative leadership styles of secondary school heads demonstrated considerable effect on school effectiveness. Jafari and Aghaz (2008) explored the impact of transformational leadership on organizational culture conducting a study in Education Ministry Institutions and concluded that the transformational leadership style affects organizational culture.

Present study revealed that transformational leadership style behaviors

mostly demonstrated significant impact on school effectiveness; the idealized influence-behavior showed significant relationship with school effectiveness indicators it is supported by study results of Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) which demonstrated that transformational leadership enhances institutional performance. The results of present study were also aligned with results of (Daniels, 2005; Layton, 2003; Michael, 2003; Oluremi, 2008) which indicated significant relationship of transformational leadership with school performance factors i.e. school learning environment, school culture and school effectiveness. This study results depicted significant relationship of transactional leadership behavior 'contingent reward' with school effectiveness. It is strongly supported by Avolio and Bass (1995) which revealed that combined effects of transformational leadership and 'contingent reward' the factor of transactional leadership impacts organizational effectiveness. Barnett (2005) also supported this evidence that 'contingent reward' showed significant impact on school performance conditions.

Recommendations

On the basis of study findings following recommendations are made for improvement of school effectiveness.

1. Transformational leadership behaviors 'idealized influence' (behavior), 'inspirational motivation', 'intellectual stimulation', 'individualized consideration' and 'contingent reward' the dimension of transactional leadership demonstrated significant impact on school effectiveness Hence, it is recommended that heads should be developed with transformational leadership behaviors as well as 'contingent reward'. Heads should exhibit principally 'idealized influence - behavior' and 'contingent reward' and have clear vision of goals and objectives, as well as capability to deal exchange of rewards for teachers' efforts. They should act as mentor and emphasize their attention on the basic needs of the teachers. They should inspire their subordinate teachers by providing meaning and challenges to their work.

2. Heads should not demonstrate 'management - by - exception passive' and 'laissez-faire leadership' as these practices showed adverse effects on school effectiveness. So, it is recommended that heads should not keep themselves away from making decisions, clarifying expectation and providing goals to be achieved.

References

Antonakis, j., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 261-295.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). *The full range leadership development manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire.* Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden Inc.

Barnett, A. M. (2005). *The impact of transformational leadership style of the school principal on school learning environments and selected teacher outcomes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

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

Bass, B. M. (1985a). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organization Dynamics, 13*, 26-40.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M., & Riggo, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership.* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Cheng, Y. C. (1996). *School effectiveness and school-based management*. London: The Flamer Press.

Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student's achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Creemers, B. (1994). *Towards a theory of educational effectiveness in effective classrooms.* London: Cassell.

Daniels, K. N. (2005). *The influence of principal's leadership style on school variables in urban middle schools*. Doctoral thesis, UNC.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2009). *Shaping school culture: Pitfalls, paradoxes, and promises.* New York, NY: Wiley.

De-Roche, F. E. (1987). *An Administrator's guide for evaluating programmes and personnel: An effective approach.* Toronto: Allyn & Bacon Inc.

Gall, G. D., Gall, J. P., Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research, an introduction*, (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration 42*(3), 333-356.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2000). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Iqbal, M. (2005). *A comparative study of organizational structure, leadership style and physical facilities of public secondary schools in the Punjab and their effects on school effectiveness.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Jafari, H. A., & Aghaz, A. (2008). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. Quarterly *Management knowledge, 21(80)*, 77-92.

Johnson, J. P., Livingston, M., Schwartz, R. A., & Slate, J. R. (2000). What makes a good elementary school? A critical examination. *Journal of Educational Research, 93*, 339–353.

Layton, J. K. (2003). *Transformational leadership and middle school principal.* Doctoral thesis, Purdue University. *Dissertation Abstract International, 64*, (OA), 6553.

Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (1990). *Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, Victoria, BC.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(4), 498-518.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2004). *Educational administration concepts and practices*. (5th ed.). Thomson Learning Inc: Belmont.

Luthans, F. (2008). Organizational behavior. (10th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(3), 370–397.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A., (2005). *School Leadership that works: From Research to Results.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Michael, C. M. (2003). *The relationship of transformational leadership of administrators in America's middle college high schools and their feeder institutions to selected indicators of effectiveness.* Doctoral thesis, Marshal University, USA.

Oluremi, O. F. (2008). Principals' leadership behaviour and school learning culture in Ekiti state secondary schools. *The Journal of International Social Research, 1*(3), 301-311.

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 179-199.

Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the work of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy.*

Tsai, C. S. (2010*). Relationship among principals' transformational leadership, school brand image, and school effectiveness: Empirical study of public comprehensive and vocational high schools*. Unpublished master thesis.

Wang, J. S. (2002). *A study of the relationship between principal's transformational leadership and school's effectiveness in special educational schools*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, National Changhua University of Education: Changhua, Taiwan.

Wu, M. H. (2000). *A study of elementary school principals' transformational leadership and school effectiveness*. Unpublished master's thesis, National Taichung Teacher College: Taichung, Taiwan.

Zembat, R., Koyigit, S., Tugluk, M. N., Dogan, H. (2010). The relationship between the effectiveness of preschools and leadership styles of school managers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, (2),* 2269-2276.