

## **RELATIONSHIP OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR WITH LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

*M.M.S. Akhtar<sup>1</sup>, E. Mahmood<sup>2</sup>, J. Iqbal<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Education & Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

<sup>2</sup>Islamabad Model College for Boys I-10/1 Islamabad.

<sup>3</sup>Islamabad Model School for Boys G-9/1 Islamabad.

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study aimed at determining impact of transformational, transactional leadership behaviors and laissez-faire leadership on leadership outcomes in terms of teachers' willingness to give extra efforts, teachers' perception of their heads' effectiveness and their satisfaction with heads' leadership. The data were collected including both the boys and girls schools in the eight districts of the Punjab. Overall 467 heads and their 1296 subordinate teachers responded on leader and rater form of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) respectively. Data were analyzed by employing 'Pearson r product moment correlation' and 'multiple regression analysis' statistical techniques. All the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors portrayed positive relationship with leadership outcomes. 'Idealized influence-behavior' the component of transformational and 'management by exception-active' the component of transactional leadership emerged as the strongest predictors of teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. Whereas, 'inspirational motivation' the component of transformational leadership and 'contingent reward' the component of transactional leadership emerged as the strongest predictor of teachers' perception of their heads' effectiveness and their satisfaction with heads' leadership.*

**Keywords:** *Heads' Effectiveness, Laissez-faire Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Teachers' Extra Efforts, Teachers' Satisfaction.*

### **1) INTRODUCTION**

Leadership has always been an issue of great interest since the early days when people used to gather in groups for the execution of set goals (Robbins & Sanghi, 2006). It is a process of social influence in which intentional influence is exerted by one person over the other to structure activities and relationships in a group or an organization (Northouse,

2010; Yukl, 2010). Besides the influence factor, leadership has been defined in terms of group process, specific behaviors, role clarification, interactions, compliance and goal achievement or a combination of any two or more of these factors (Luthan, 2008). The effective leaders are committed in transforming, reforming, restructuring the institutions, controlling change and maintaining stability in certain institutional programs (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). The earlier studies of leadership focused on universal personality traits of the leaders and termed as trait theories of leadership; then researchers turned their attention towards the behaviors of the leaders and this era of behavioral leadership theories moved towards the contingency models and emphasized on the situational aspect of leadership (Bateman & Snell, 2002). In recent years, researchers have been encouraged to conceptualize leadership from the perspective of new approaches. Among these approaches the transformational and transactional leadership paradigms are prominent (Sivanathan & Fekken, 2002). The concept of transformational and transactional leadership has its origin in work of James McGregor Burns (1978); it was further extended and refined by Barnard M. Bass (1985) to build a full range leadership model which focuses on complete range of leadership i.e. transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Hoy & Miskel, 2008). The transformational leadership includes five behaviors i.e. idealized influence-attributed, idealized influence-behavior, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration; whereas, transactional leadership includes three behaviors i.e. contingent reward, management by exception-active and management by exception-passive (Bass & Riggo, 2006).

Many researchers of current era showed great interest in exploring transformational and transactional leadership and elucidated its impact on performance of organizations and employee related factors (Laohavichien, Fredendall, & Cantrell (2009). Numerous studies have predicted the relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with employees' satisfaction, their willingness to give extra efforts in different settings such as business, healthcare, and education institutions (Chen & Silversthorne, 2005). This might be the reason that various researchers of the recent past investigated the relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with subordinates' willingness to give extra efforts and their satisfaction with the leaders (Bennett, 2009). Consistent with the recent studies, effort has been made in

this study to explore the relationship of transformational, transactional leadership behaviors and laissez-faire leadership with leadership outcomes in terms of teachers' willingness to give extra efforts for desirable educational outcomes, teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness and teachers' satisfaction with their heads' leadership.

## 2) LITERATURE REVIEW

Many studies on leadership explored significant dimensions of leadership and presented different theories and models of leadership. Among those the full range leadership model is considered the most prominent and effective one, as it explains leadership in terms of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Riggo, 2006). This model was anticipated by James McGregor Burns (1978), and was further developed by Bass (1985), who elaborated Burns' idea of transformational and transactional leadership more specifically (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In transformational leadership, leaders and their subordinates are united to achieve some higher order common goals, and this occurs when "one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns, 1978, p. 20). Transformational leadership inspires the subordinates to transcend their interests for the betterment of the organization and it produces deep and extra ordinary effects on subordinates' concerns (Robins, Judge, & Sanghi, 2009). Transformational leadership is also based on rousing subordinates to perform more than what they actually thought possible by addressing motivation and inspiring subordinates' values and esteem (Sarros, Gray, & Densten, 2002; Felfe, Tartler, & Leipmann, 2004). The transformational leadership model is comprised of five behaviors: (a) **idealized influence (attributed)** refers to the social charisma and role model of the leaders for the subordinates who admire, respect, and trust their leaders and like to follow them, (b) **idealized influence (behavior)** refers to the action of leaders that are focused on most important values, beliefs and a collective sense of mission; these leaders take risks and demonstrate high standards of ethical and moral conduct, (c) **inspirational motivation** refers to the ways leaders create team spirit by providing meaning and challenges to the subordinates' performance; the leaders communicate high performance expectations and articulate the future vision, use body language and symbols to inspire and motivate their subordinates, (d) **intellectual stimulation** refers to leaders' actions that promote intelligence, rationality, and the ability of problem solving;

such leaders stimulates subordinates to be creative and innovative in their thinking, always value their innovative and creative ideas of their subordinate and openly encourage different ways of problem solving, (e) **individualized consideration** refers to leaders' actions as a coach or mentor that contribute to subordinates' satisfaction by supporting and paying personal attention to their fundamental needs, and develop in them the sense of self-actualization (Bass & Riggo, 2006).

On the other hand, the transactional leadership is a kind of mutual nature of leadership, in which leaders provide benefits to the subordinates and in return leaders get benefits from them in a social exchange called a transaction (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Transactional leadership is based on exchange between leader and subordinates, and it is an agreement in which both the parties contract with each other to work and get rewards (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). Transactional leaders guide and clarify the subordinates about their roles and job requirements, and they only observe and ensure that rules and standards are being followed, and take corrective measures accordingly (Robbins, Judge & Sanghi, 2009). Transactional leadership is comprised of three behaviors: (a) **contingent reward** refers to leaders' behaviors related to clarifying roles, job requirements and promising subordinates with material or psychological reward on the fulfillment of their contractual agreement, (b) **management by exception (active)** refers to the active vigilance of leaders who specify the rules and standard for compliance and always try to bound the subordinates work according to those rules and standards, and take corrective measures as quickly as possible, (c) **management by exception (passive)** refers to leaders' avoidance from specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing standards and set goals to be achieved by subordinates. Such type of leaders also keeps in mind the set rules and standards and interfere only if the standards are not met (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). **Laissez-faire** leaders display delays of action, abdicate responsibilities, avoid making decisions and taking stand on serious issues. These leaders delay in responding urgent decisions and do not involve themselves when serious issues arises (Luthan, 2008).

Transformational leaders have a tendency to encourage and motivate their subordinates to take on more responsibility by enhancing their sense of accomplishment and satisfaction with their task (Emery & Barker, 2007). Transformational leaders can improve the performance capability

of their subordinates by formulating higher order expectations and creating a greater willingness to face more challenging jobs. Transactional leadership is also related positively to subordinates' performance when leaders clarify expectations and recognize achievements that positively add to higher levels of performance (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson 2003). Subordinates' satisfaction has a remarkable status in effectiveness of organizations and transformational leaders have more satisfied subordinates than any other kind of leaders. Transformational leaders being inspirational can challenge their subordinates to think and provide contribution and their subordinates are more satisfied due to their leaders' genuine concern for their needs and interests (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leadership is significantly correlated with subordinates' perceptions of leaders' effectiveness, their higher level of commitment and motivation. Subordinates of transformational leaders seemed to be extremely satisfied and motivated that increases the commitment and mission articulated by the leader (Givens, 2008).

Barnett, McCormick and Connors (2001) pointed out strong association of transformational leadership behavior 'individualized consideration' with teachers' satisfaction, teachers' perception of leader effectiveness and teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. Layton (2003) determined the impact of transformational leadership behaviors on teachers' satisfaction, teachers' effectiveness and teachers' willingness to give extra efforts and depicted that principals' transformational leadership behaviors were found to be positively correlated with teachers' satisfaction, teachers' effectiveness and teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. Griffith (2004) examined the effects of principals' transformational leadership behaviors on teachers' satisfaction and showed that 'inspirational motivation', 'individualized consideration' and 'intellectual stimulation' have significant impact on teachers' satisfaction. Mumford, Antes, Caughron and Friedrich (2008) concluded that 'charisma' the dimension of transformational leadership is an important factor in determining leaders' role as a facilitator and motivator for the task achievement and satisfaction of followers. Bodla and Nawaz (2010) found by conducting a study in higher education institutions of Pakistan that all the components of transformational leadership are positively correlated with followers' satisfaction except the 'individualized consideration'. Khan, Ramzan, Ahmad and Nawaz (2011) explored the relationship between leadership behaviors of faculty members and students' satisfaction and willingness to give extra efforts. Results indicated a positive correlation between

transformational, transactional leadership behaviors and students' satisfaction and willingness to give extra efforts whereas, laissez-faire leadership showed negative relationship with students' satisfaction and willingness to give extra efforts. Cemaloglu, Sezign, and Kiling (2012) determined the effects of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership on teachers' satisfaction. The study results demonstrated significant impact of transformational and transactional leadership on teachers' satisfaction. Sadeghi and Pihie (2012) investigated the impact of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors of academic department heads on leadership effectiveness in Malaysian Research Universities. The study results demonstrated that idealized influence (attributed), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward and management-by-exception active are significant predictors of leadership effectiveness.

### **3) RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Following three research questions were postulated to find out relationship between leadership behaviors and leadership outcomes.

- i) What relationship does exist between heads' transformational leadership behaviors and leadership outcomes?
- ii) What relationship does exist between heads' transactional leadership behaviors and Leadership outcomes?
- iii) What relationship does exist between heads' laissez-faire leadership and leadership outcomes?

### **4) LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

This study was completed by collecting data from heads and teachers of public primary schools. A questionnaire 'MLQ 5X-Short' was used in both forms (Head and Teacher) to collect data, which was subjected to the accuracy of the participants' responses. Most of the questionnaires were responded through mail and a large numbers of questionnaires were completed with the help of District Teacher Educators. Therefore, the accuracy of all the provided information depended upon the accuracy of the respondents' replies to the queries thus posed. However, the reliability of data depicted its accuracy and validity.

## **5) RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This descriptive survey study was an ex-post facto type i.e. it dealt with such variables the manifestation of which has already occurred. The variables were not under the direct control of the researcher and not manipulated. A survey was conducted to collect the data from the participants. This study was conducted in public primary schools of the Punjab province.

### **5.1) Population and Sample**

The population of this study comprised of all the 45453 heads (22314 Male & 23139 Female) of public primary schools functioning in the Punjab (AEPAM, 2008). The study was conducted in eight districts of the Punjab keeping in view the geographical location of the districts; the schools were randomly identified in each district. This study was conducted in 480 schools (240 Boys & 240 Girls) of eight districts of the Punjab, as beyond a certain point (N=5,000) the population size is almost irrelevant and a sample size of 400 is adequate (Gay, 1992). However, the selected sample (N=480) was designed to make study results more reliable and confident. Sample was selected from the population in equal proportion of boys and girls school as they exist in the population (N=22314 Male) and (N=23139 Female) schools in the proportion of 49.1% & 50.9% respectively (AEPAM, 2008). Each selected district was a stratum consists of 60 schools using equal sized stratified sampling technique; which was further divided into two subgroups of 30 male and 30 female schools including 3 urban and 27 rural schools in the proportion of 10% and 90% as they approximately exist in the population (N=4314 Urban) and (N=41139 Rural) in the proportion of 9.5% and 90.5% respectively (AEPAM, 2008). The above sample selection procedure in 480 schools resulted in the responses of overall 467 heads and their concerned subordinate teachers (N=1296). Overall, the response rate remained 97% that consisted of male (N=232) and female heads (N=235) in the proportion of 49.7% and 51.3% respectively; whereas male (N=631) and female teachers (N=635) responded the instruments in the proportion of 51% and 49% of the total respondent teachers respectively.

## **5.2) Instrument**

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, MLQ, (5X-Short) was used in both versions i.e. leader form & rater form to collect data from heads and teachers respectively. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5X-Short) consists of 45 items which include five transformational leadership behaviors i.e. 'idealized influence-attributed', 'idealized influence-behavior', 'inspirational motivation', 'intellectual stimulation', 'individualized consideration', three transactional leadership behaviors i.e. 'contingent reward', 'management by exception-active', 'management by exception-passive', one laissez-faire leadership factor and three factors of leadership outcomes in terms of teachers' willingness to give extra effort, teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness and teachers' satisfaction with heads' 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.

## **6) ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

The descriptive statistics 'Mean' and 'Standard Deviation' were used to identify the nature of each leadership style/ behavior. To answer research questions No.1, 2 and 3 'Pearson r product moment correlation' was employed to find out relationship of leadership behaviors with leadership outcomes and 'multiple regression' technique to determine the contribution of leadership behaviors in predicting leadership outcomes included in the model. Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS-16) was used for analyzing the data.

### **6.1) Identification of Leadership Styles/ Behaviors**

Leadership styles/ behaviors were determined by utilizing mean scores of combined (Heads+ Teachers) data as shown in Table 1. Descriptive statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation) depicts that heads' transformational leadership style (M=2.78) prevailed over transactional leadership style (M=2.40) and laissez-faire leadership (M=1.24); which portrays that transformational leadership style found as the most prominent leadership style of the public primary school heads.



**Table 1: Description of Leadership Style/Behaviors**  
(N = 1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)

Leadership Style	Mean			SD		
	Heads	Teachers	Combined	Heads	Teachers	Combined
<b>Transformational</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.46</b>
Idealized Influence-Attributed	2.54	2.37	2.41	0.72	0.6	0.64
Idealized Influence-Behavior	2.98	2.87	2.90	0.47	0.6	0.57
Inspirational Motivation	2.99	2.93	2.94	0.48	0.6	0.57
Intellectual Stimulation	2.93	2.87	2.88	0.49	0.62	0.59
Individualized Consideration	2.88	2.73	2.77	0.50	0.67	0.63
<b>Transactional</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.3 8</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.45</b>
Contingent Reward	2.94	2.88	2.89	0.46	0.056	0.54
Management by Exception-Active	2.79	2.41	2.51	0.61	0.62	0.64
Management by Exception-Passive	1.6	1.86	1.79	0.82	0.86	0.86
<b>Laissez-faire(LF)</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.89</b>

## 6.2) Contribution of Transformational Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers' Willingness to give Extra Efforts

All the transformational leadership behaviors idealized influence-attributed ( $r = 0.296$ ), idealized influence-behavior ( $r = 0.338$ ), inspirational motivation ( $r = 0.289$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $r = 0.281$ ) and individualized consideration ( $r = 0.311$ ) found positively correlated ( $\rho < 0.01$ ) with teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. The multiple regression analysis of all transformational leadership behaviors in predicting teachers' willingness to give extra efforts produced  $R^2 = 0.163$ ,  $F = 68.386$ ,  $p < 0.01$  accounted for 16.3% of the variance. The significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) having positive values of  $b$  and standardized beta values for idealized influence-attributed ( $\beta = 0.161$ ), idealized influence-behavior

( $\beta = 0.166$ )) and individualized consideration ( $\beta = 0.127$ ) had significant positive regression weights which showed unique impact/contribution of these predictors to the teachers’ willingness to give extra efforts (Table 2). The idealized influence-behavior (IB) with highest beta value ( $\beta = 0.166$ ) indicated the strongest contribution to the teachers’ willingness to give extra efforts in the model indicating that the heads with higher scores on this scale had subordinate teachers those were willing to give extra efforts after controlling for the other variables in the model. Whereas, the Idealized influence-attributed (IA) with ( $\beta = 0.161$ ) showed moderate contribution to the teachers’ willingness to give extra effort in the model. Individualized consideration (IC) having lowest value of beta ( $\beta = 0.127$ ) showed that the contribution of this predictor to the teachers’ willingness to give extra effort was less than other two factors. The other two predictors inspirational motivation (IM) and intellectual stimulation (IS) showed no contribution in predicting teachers’ willingness to give extra efforts in the model.

*Table 2: Contribution of Transformational Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers’ Willingness to give Extra Efforts (N=1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)*

Model	Predictor	Correlation with EE	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔF	B	β	p-value
1	Constant		0.163	68.386	0.700		0.000*
	IA	0.296**			0.174	0.161	0.000*
	IB	0.338**			0.201	0.166	0.000*
	IM	0.289**			0.047	0.039	0.210
	IS	0.281**			0.034	0.029	0.347
	IC	0.311**			0.139	0.127	0.000*

\*significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* correlation significant at 0.01 level

R<sup>2</sup> = R square, ΔF = change in F value, b = un-standardized coefficients, β = standardized coefficients

### **6.3) Contribution of Transformational Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers’ Perception of Heads’ Effectiveness**

All the transformational leadership behaviors idealized influence-attributed ( $r = 0.376$ ), idealized influence-behavior ( $r = 0.515$ ), inspirational motivation ( $r = 0.540$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $r = 0.532$ ) and individualized consideration ( $r = 0.490$ ) found positively correlated

( $p < 0.01$ ) with teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness. The multiple regression analysis of all transformational leadership behaviors in predicting teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness produced  $R^2 = 0.407$ ,  $F = 241.48$ ,  $p < 0.01$  accounted for 40.7% of the variance. The significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) having positive values of  $b$  and standardized beta values for idealized influence-attributed ( $\beta = 0.118$ ), idealized influence-behavior ( $\beta = 0.144$ ), inspirational motivation ( $\beta = 0.204$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $\beta = 0.188$ ) and individualized consideration ( $\beta = 0.160$ ) had significant positive regression weights which showed unique impact/contribution to the teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness (Table 3). The inspirational motivation (IM) with highest beta value ( $\beta = 0.204$ ) indicated the strongest contribution to the teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness in the model, indicating that the heads with higher scores on this scale were perceived as effective heads by their subordinate teachers after controlling for the other variables in the model. Whereas, the Idealized influence-attributed (IA) having lowest value of beta ( $\beta = 0.118$ ) showed that the contribution of this predictor to the teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness was less than other four factors. The other three predictors intellectual stimulation (IS), individualized consideration (IC) and idealized influence-behavior (IB) moderately contributed in predicting the teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness.

**Table 3: Contribution of Transformational Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers' Perception of Heads' Effectiveness (N = 1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)**

Model	Predictor	Correlation with EFF	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔF	b	B	p-value
2	Constant		0.407	241.48	0.262		0.000*
	IA	0.376**			0.123	0.118	0.000*
	IB	0.515**			0.169	0.144	0.000*
	IM	0.540**			0.237	0.204	0.000*
	IS	0.532**			0.212	0.188	0.000*
	IC	0.490**			0.168	0.160	0.000*

\*significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* correlation significant at 0.01 level

$R^2$  = R square,  $\Delta F$  = change in F value,  $b$  = un-standardized coefficients,  $\beta$  = standardized coefficients

### 6.4) Contribution of Transformational Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers’ Satisfaction with Heads’ Leadership

All the transformational leadership behaviors idealized influence-attributed ( $r = 0.320$ ), idealized influence-behavior ( $r=0.508$ ), inspirational motivation ( $r=0.530$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $r=0.518$ ) and individualized consideration ( $r=0.468$ ) found positively correlated ( $p<0.01$ ) with teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership. The multiple regression analysis of all the five transformational leadership behaviors in predicting teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership produced  $R^2 = 0.379$ ,  $F = 214.476$ ,  $p < 0.01$  accounted for 37.9% of the variance. The significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) having positive values of  $b$  and standardized beta values for idealized influence-attributed ( $\beta=0.057$ ), idealized influence-behavior ( $\beta=0.164$ ), inspirational motivation ( $\beta=0.214$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $\beta=0.186$ ) and individualized consideration ( $\beta=0.145$ ) had significant positive regression weights which showed unique impact/contribution of all the predictors to the teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership (Table 4).The inspirational motivation (IM) with highest beta value ( $\beta=0.214$ ) indicated the strongest contribution to the teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership in the model, indicating that the heads with higher scores on this scale had most satisfied subordinate teachers after controlling for the other variables in the model. Whereas, the Idealized influence-attributed (IA) having lowest value of beta ( $\beta=0.057$ ) showed that the contribution of this predictor to the teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership was less than other four factors. The other three predictors intellectual stimulation (IS) idealized influence-behavior (IB) and individualized consideration (IC) moderately contributed to the teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership.

*Table 4: Contribution of Transformational Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers’ Satisfaction with Heads’ Leadership (N = 1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)*

Model	Predictor	Correlation with SAT	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔF	b	B	p-value
3	Constant		0.379	214.476	0.329		0.000*
	IA	0.320**			0.062	0.057	0.007*
	IB	0.508**			0.203	0.164	0.000*
	IM	0.530**			0.265	0.214	0.000*
	IS	0.518**			0.222	0.186	0.000*
	IC	0.468**			0.162	0.145	0.000*

*\*significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* correlation significant at 0.01 level*

$R^2$  = R square,  $\Delta F$  = change in F value,  $b$  = un-standardized coefficients,  $\beta$  = standardized coefficients

### 6.5) Contribution of Transactional Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers' Willingness to give Extra Efforts

The transactional leadership behaviors contingent reward ( $r = 0.308$ ) and management by exception-active ( $0.386$ ) found positively correlated ( $p < 0.01$ ) with teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. Whereas, management by exception-passive showed no relationship with this factor. The multiple regression analysis of all transactional leadership behaviors in predicting teachers' willingness to give extra efforts produced  $R^2 = 0.177$ ,  $F = 126.316$ ,  $p < 0.01$  accounted for 17.7% of the variance. The significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) having positive values of  $b$  and standardized beta values for two predictors contingent reward ( $\beta = 0.182$ ) and Management by exception-active ( $\beta = 0.313$ ) had significant positive regression weights which showed unique impact/contribution of these predictors to the teachers' willingness to give extra efforts in the model (Table 5). Management by exception-active (MBEA) with highest beta value ( $\beta = 0.313$ ) indicated the strongest contribution to the teachers' willingness to give extra efforts in the model, indicating that the heads with higher scores on this scale had subordinate teachers those were willing to give extra efforts after controlling for the other variables in the model. The contingent reward (CR) with beta value ( $\beta = 0.182$ ) also showed contribution to the teachers' willingness to give extra in the model. Management by exception-passive (MBEP) showed no significant contribution in predicting this factor in the model.

*Table 5: Contribution of Transactional Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers' Extra Efforts (N = 1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)*

Model	Predictor	Correlation with EE	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta F$	B	B	p-value
4	Constant		0.177	126.316	0.780		0.000*
	CR	0.308**			0.234	0.182	0.000*
	MBEA	0.386**			0.338	0.313	0.000*
	MBEP	0.044			0.009	0.012	0.594

\*significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* correlation significant at 0.01 level

$R^2$  = R square,  $\Delta F$  = change in F value,  $b$  = un-standardized coefficients,  $\beta$  = standardized coefficients

### 6.6) Contribution of Transactional Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers’ Perception of Heads’ Effectiveness

All the transactional leadership behaviors contingent reward ( $r = 0.541$ ), management by exception-active (0.324) and management by exception-passive (0.160) found positively correlated ( $p < 0.01$ ) with teachers’ perception of heads’ effectiveness. The multiple regression analysis of all transactional leadership behaviors in predicting teachers’ perception of heads’ effectiveness produced  $R^2 = 0.319$ ,  $F = 274.767$ ,  $p < 0.01$  accounted for 31.9% of the variance. The significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) having positive values of  $b$  and standardized beta values for these three predictors contingent reward ( $\beta = 0.481$ ), management by exception-active ( $\beta = 0.126$ ) and management by exception-passive ( $\beta = 0.110$ ) had significant positive regression weights which showed unique impact/contribution to the teachers’ perception of heads’ effectiveness in the model (Table 6). The contingent reward (CR) with highest beta value ( $\beta = 0.481$ ) indicated the strongest contribution to the teachers’ perception of heads’ effectiveness in the model, indicating that the heads with higher scores on this scale were considered as effective heads by their subordinate teachers after controlling for the other variables in the model. Management by exception-active (MBEA) with beta value ( $\beta = 0.126$ ) showed moderate and Management by exception-passive (MBEP) with beta value ( $\beta = 0.110$ ) less contribution to the teachers’ perception of heads effectiveness in the model.

**Table 6: Contribution of Transactional Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers’ Perception of Heads’ Effectiveness (N = 1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)**

Model	Predictor	Correlation with EFF	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔF	B	B	p-value
5	Constant		0.319	274.767	0.613		0.000*
	CR	0.541**			0.596	0.481	0.000*
	MBEA	0.324**			0.132	0.126	0.000*
	MBEP	0.160**			0.085	0.110	0.000*

\*significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* correlation significant at 0.01 level

$R^2$  = R square,  $\Delta F$  = change in F value,  $b$  = un-standardized coefficients,  $\beta$  = standardized coefficients

### 6.7) Contribution of Transactional Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers' Satisfaction with Heads' Leadership

All the transactional leadership behaviors contingent reward ( $r = 0.527$ ), management by exception-active ( $0.336$ ) and management by exception-passive ( $0.065$ ) found positively correlated ( $p < 0.01$ ) with teachers' satisfaction with heads' leadership. The multiple regression analysis of all transactional leadership behaviors in predicting teachers' satisfaction with heads' leadership produced  $R^2 = 0.297$ ,  $F = 247.571$ ,  $p < 0.01$  accounted for 29.7% of the variance. The significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) having positive values of  $b$  and standardized beta values for the two predictors contingent reward ( $\beta = 0.466$ ) and management by exception-active ( $\beta = 0.149$ ) had significant positive regression weights which showed unique impact/contribution to the teachers' satisfaction with heads' leadership in the model (Table 7). The contingent reward (CR) with highest beta value ( $\beta = 0.446$ ) indicated the strongest contribution to the teachers' satisfaction with heads' leadership in the model, indicating that the heads with higher scores on this scale were found to have satisfied subordinate teachers with their leadership after controlling for the other variables in the model. Management by exception-active (MBEA) with beta value ( $\beta = 0.149$ ) also showed contribution in predicting teachers' satisfaction with heads' leadership in the model. Management by exception-passive (MBEP) showed no contribution to this factor in the model.

*Table 7: Contribution of Transactional Leadership Behaviors in Predicting Teachers' Satisfaction with Heads' Leadership (N = 1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)*

Model	Predictor	Correlation with SAT	$R^2$	$\Delta F$	$b$	$B$	p-value
6	Constant		0.297	247.571	0.725		0.000*
	CR	0.527**			0.613	0.466	0.000*
	MBEA	0.336**			0.165	0.149	0.000*
	MBEP	0.065**			0.013	0.015	0.442

\*significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* correlation significant at 0.01 level

$R^2$  = R square,  $\Delta F$  = change in F value,  $b$  = un-standardized coefficients,  $\beta$  = standardized coefficients

**6.8) Contribution of Laissez-faire Leadership in Predicting Teachers’ Satisfaction with Heads’ Leadership (N=1763: 467 Heads +1296 Teachers)**

Laissez-faire leadership demonstrated weak negative correlation( $r = -0.059$ ) with teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership. The multiple regression analysis of Laissez-faire leadership in predicting teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership produced  $R^2 = 0.004$ ,  $F = 6.240$ ,  $p < 0.01$  accounted for 0.4% of the variance (Table 8). The significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) having negative value of  $b$  and standardized beta( $\beta = -0.059$ ) for Laissez-faire leadership showed significant negative weight to the teachers’ satisfaction with heads’ leadership indicating that heads with higher scores on this scale had less satisfied subordinate teachers. Laissez-faire leadership showed no contribution in predicting teachers’ willingness to give extra efforts and teachers’ perception of heads’ effectiveness in the model.

*Table 8: Contribution of Laissez-faire Leadership in Predicting Teachers’ Satisfaction with Heads’ Leadership (N = 1763:467 Heads + 1296 Teachers)*

Model	Predictor	Correlation with SAT	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta F$	b	B	p-value
7	Constant		0.004	6.240	2.993		0.000*
	LF	-0.059**			-0.047	-0.059	0.013*

*\*significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* correlation significant at 0.01 level*

$R^2$  = R square,  $\Delta F$  = change in F value,  $b$  = un-standardized coefficients,  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient

**7) CONCLUSIONS**

The findings of the study revealed that transformational leadership style of public primary school heads prevailed over the transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. It indicated that transformational leadership style emerged as the preferential leadership style of the public primary school heads. This evidence of transformational leadership depicted that heads focused on the personal needs and growth of their



subordinate teachers. The study results are consistent with (Bottery 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Engen, 2003) that effective and successful leaders use transformational leadership style particularly in educational administration. The findings of the study also supported the previous research (Bodla & Nawaz, 2010) which concluded that faculty heads' transformational leadership style prevailed over transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership style in public as well as in private sector universities. It is also consistent with (Jones & Rudd, 2008) who concluded that academic program leaders in colleges of agriculture have more transformational leadership style than transactional and laissez-faire leadership.

The 'inspirational motivation' was observed as the most prominent behavior of heads which showed that heads motivated teachers by providing meaning and challenges to their work, and projected future vision. The heads also exhibited most often the 'idealized influence - behavior', 'intellectual stimulation', and 'individualized consideration' which showed that heads focused on most important values, beliefs and collective sense of mission. Heads also created innovative thinking in subordinate teachers, acted as a coach, and paid special attention to their fundamental needs. The 'contingent reward' behavior of transactional leadership was also prominent behavior of heads which indicated that heads most often clarified roles and task requirement to teachers, and provided them with rewards on the successful completion of contractual agreements.

All the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors except 'management by exception-passive' demonstrated significant relationship with teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. The transformational leadership behaviors 'idealized influence-attributed', 'idealized influence-behavior' 'individualized consideration' and transactional leadership behaviors 'contingent reward' and 'management by exception-active' showed unique impact on teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. 'Idealized influence-behavior' the component of transformational and 'management by exception-active' the component of transactional leadership demonstrated the strongest impact on teachers' willingness to give extra efforts. This indicated that the heads that focused on most important values, beliefs and a collective sense of mission, specified rules and standard for compliance and always tried to bind the subordinates

work according to those rules had subordinate teachers who were willing to give extra efforts for desirable educational outcomes.

All the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors also demonstrated significant relationship with teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness and teachers' satisfaction with their heads' leadership. All the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors showed unique impact on teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness and teachers' satisfaction with their heads' leadership. Especially, the 'inspirational motivation' the component of transformational leadership and 'contingent reward' the component of transactional leadership showed the strongest impact on both these factors. This indicated that the heads that created team spirit by providing meaning and challenges to the subordinates' performance and clarified roles, job requirements and promised subordinates with material or psychological reward on the fulfillment of their contractual agreement were perceived as effective heads and have satisfied subordinate teachers.

These findings demonstrated that teachers working under those heads who exhibited transformational leadership behaviors, 'Contingent reward' and 'management - by - exception active' of transactional leadership were satisfied with their heads' leadership, effective for school activities and willing to give extra efforts for achievement of desired educational objectives. This is consistent with the results of (Layton, 2003) that transformational leadership was significantly related to teachers' satisfaction, teachers' perception of leadership effectiveness and teachers' increased willingness to give extra efforts for the accomplishment of desired educational outcomes. Parallel to the findings of this study, Barnett (2005) further supported that 'contingent reward' the dimension of transactional leadership style showed significant effects on school environment and teachers' related variables. Relationship of laissez-faire leadership with teachers' satisfaction with their heads' leadership showed that the heads who demonstrated laissez-faire leadership had less satisfied subordinate teachers. Laissez-faire leadership showed no impact on teachers' willingness to give extra efforts and teachers' perception of their heads' effectiveness.

## **8) IMPLICATIONS**

Empirical results authenticated the notion that effective transformational and transactional leadership may lead towards teachers' satisfaction, teachers' perception of heads' effectiveness and teachers' increased willingness to give extra efforts for the accomplishment of desired educational outcomes. Therefore, the educational leaders must take the following factors into account:

- 1) Heads should have clear vision of goals and objectives, act as a coach and role model, and focus on most important values, beliefs and collective sense of mission.
- 2) Heads should motivate the teachers by providing meaning and challenges to their work, and project future vision.
- 3) Heads should create innovative thinking in subordinate teachers and pay special attention to their fundamental needs.
- 4) Heads should clarify roles and task requirement to teachers, and provide them with rewards on the successful completion of contractual agreements.
- 5) Head should specify the rules and standard for compliance and always try to bound the subordinates work according to those rules and standards, and take corrective measures as quickly as possible.
- 6) Heads should avoid delaying of action in decision making process, abdicating responsibilities, and showing no interest in serious issues.

## **REFERENCES**

- Academy of Educational Planning and Management. (2008). *Pakistan Education Statistics 2006-07*. National Educational Management System. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.
- 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*, vol.14 No.3, pp. 261-295.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.)*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden Inc.

- Bennett, T. (2009). *The relationship between the subordinate's perception of the leadership style of its managers and the subordinate's perceptions of manager's ability to inspire extra effort, to be effective, and to enhance satisfaction with management*, Proceedings of the Academy of Strategic Management, Vol. 8, No. 1.
- Barnett, K., McCormic, J., & Conners, R. (2001). Transformational leadership in schools: Panacea, Placebo or problem, *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 22-46.
- 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. Retrieved, August, 21<sup>st</sup>, 2008, from <http://www.liberary.uws.edu.au>.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B.J. Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003) Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology* Vol. 88, No. 2, 207-218.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggo, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bateman, T. S., & Snell, S. A. (2002). *Management competing in the new era* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: MacGraw-Hill.
- Bodla, M. A., & Nawaz. M. M. (2010). Transformational leadership style and its relationship with satisfaction, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, Vol. 2 No. 1, 370-381.
- Bodla, M. A., & Nawaz. M. M. (2010). Comparative study of full range leadership model among faculty members in public and private sectors higher education institute and universities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 208-214.
- Bottery, M. (2001). Globalization and UK competition state: No room for transformational leadership in education? *School Leadership and Management*, 21(2), 199-218.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cemaloglu, N., Sezgin, F., & Kilinc, A. C. (2012). Examining the relationship between school principals' transformational, transactional leadership styles and teachers' organizational commitment, *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, Vol. 2 No. 2, 53-64.
- Chen, J., & Silverthorne, C. (2005). Leadership effectiveness, leadership style and employee readiness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 280-288.

- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van-Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing men and women. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591.
- Emery, C.R., & Barker, K.J. (2007). The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication & Conflict*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 77-90.
- Givens, R.J. (2008). Transformational Leadership: The Impact on Organizational and Personal Outcomes, *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, Vol. 1 No. 1, 4-24.
- Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 42 No.3, 333-356.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (8<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Jones, D., & Rudd, R. (2008). Transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership: An assessment of college pf agriculture academic program leaders' (Dean) Leadership Styles. *Journal of Agriculture Education*, 49(2), 88-97.
- Khan, M. M., Ramzan, M., Ahmad, I., & Nawaz (2011). "Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles of teaching faculty and predictor of satisfaction and extra efforts among the students: Evidence from higher education institutions", *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, Vol. 1 No.4, 130-135.
- Laohavichien, T., Fredendall, L., and Cantrell, R. (2009). The effects of transformational and transactional leadership on quality improvement, *The Quality Management Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 7-24.
- Layton, J. K. (2003). *Transformational leadership and middle school principal*. Doctoral thesis, Purdue University. Dissertation Abstract International, 64, (OA), 6553.
- Lunenburg, F.C., & Ornstein, Allan C. (2004). *Educational administration concepts and practices. (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Thomson Learning inc: Belmont.
- Luthans, F.(2008). *Organizational behavior. (10<sup>th</sup> ed)*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

- Mumford, M. D., Antes, A.L., Caughron, J.G. and Friedrich, T. L. (2008), Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership", Multi-level influences on emergence and performance, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.19 No.2, 144-160.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership, theory and practice* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Robbins,S.P. &. Sanghi.S.(2006). *Organizational behavior (1st ed)*.India: Dorling Kindersley (Pvt) Ltd.
- Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A., Sanghi, S. (2009). *Organizational behaviour (13<sup>th</sup> ed)*. New Delh.Doring Kindersley pvt. Ltd.
- Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z.A.L. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* Vol. 3 No. 7,186-197
- Sarros, J.C., Gray, J.H., & Denstan, L. (2002). Australian Business leadership Survey, Management research series No. 1.
- Sivanathan, N., & Fekken, G.C. (2002). Emotional intelligence, moral reasoning and transformational leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 3/4, pp. 198-204.
- Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.