

LEADERSHIP STYLES IN GOVERNMENT HIGH SCHOOLS: EVIDENCE FROM KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN

Muhammad Naeem, Department of Management Sciences, Islamia College
University, Peshawar. Email: m.naeem00@yahoo.com

Waseef Jamal, IM Sciences, Peshawar.

Email: waseef.jamal@imsciences.edu.pk

Muhammad Naveed, Islamia College Peshawar.

Email: naveed.hr@hotmail.com

Fayaz Ali Shah, Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences,
Islamia College University, Peshawar. Email: fayaz@icp.edu.pk

Muhammad Khan Riaz, COMSATS University Islamabad, Attock Campus
Email: riaz@ciit-attock.edu.pk

Abstract. *Leadership is considered prime source for development of a learning organization. School leadership is a critical issue for developing schools as learning organizations which in turn produce well-equipped human resources for the development of the knowledge economy. This study was carried out in the seven districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa public sector schools to investigate the leadership styles. The results revealed that although school leaders are more transformational than transactional but not up to the desired level. Higher scores were reported for Idealized Influence, Inspirational motivation and contingent reward respectively. Laissez-faire leadership style is the least exercised style. Overall, male was found more transformational than female, but on individual (dimensions) styles they differed. Result showed an interesting relationship of age with styles that in early and late ages, school leaders preferred to exercise charismatic (idealized influence) but in the mid ages they were inclined to use contingent reward. It is suggested that for school leader's degree or a diploma in Education Planning and Management (EPM) shall be included in their eligibility criteria, their department shall have successive planning, their appraisal shall take in to consideration their leadership behaviors, they shall be involved in incentivized research activities, and shall be given autonomy in school management. At the end limitations and future directions are also discussed.*

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, School leadership, Full Range Leadership Theory – FRLT

1. Introduction

Education is the oldest mean for investment in man as it enhances the quality of work resulting in economic growth (Schultz, 1962). Education was described as source for increase in individual income but also as an engine for economic growth (Weisbrod, 1962) and is positively related to investment in human capital (Knabb & Stordard, 2005; Schiller, 2008; Mincer, 1958). School is being considered the place for educating society effective schooling ensures economic growth (Afzal, Farooq, Ahmad, Begum & Quddus, 2010; Barro, 1991; Benhabib & Spiegel, 1994). In the rural areas of Pakistan, it is found that ‘social’ and private rates of return to low quality primary schooling versus no schooling were 18.2 percent and 20.5 percent respectively. It is also estimated that ‘social’ rates of return to high-quality versus low-quality primary schooling in rural Pakistan were 13.0 percent (Behrman, Ross & Sabot, 2008).

The cited studies signify the role of schooling for economic growth of an area, resulting in growing interest in school leadership in the 21st century. Similarly, in the rapidly growing and daunting world, being proactive and sound strategic planning are the key driving forces for an organization to survive, grow and lead. However, this argument leads to a dilemma of how an administrative setup can possess the requisite planning, resources and leadership styles to thrive in such a challenging environment. After thorough research and pondering it can be concluded that myriad factors including leadership are involved for uplifting the organization. Leadership plays an instrumental role in shaping the environment and has an influential impact in transforming the organization.

After decades of the research, leadership still remains in limelight and plays a key role in catering the demands of the newly rapidly growing world. Yukl (2010) defined leadership as “*the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives*”. The research further elaborates that leader plays an instrumental role by extending his support to the subordinates for the achievement and accomplishment of organizational future goals

In the absence of dynamic leadership the subordinates will always be in a state of absolute dismay and despair, subordinates without proper guidance, counseling and clear direction will always miss the required path and will move on with an ambiguous and messed-up strategies in their minds. The role of leader in any circumstances cannot be neglected. Setting the vision, leading from front, consoling others to be cooperative, showing commitment are some of the key attributes of the leaders. Moreover, it can be inferred that in the absence of the leader the organization will fail to possess having the qualities of motivation, dedication, commitment and progressive workforce.

Increasingly growing transformation in the business world has put the organizations in a state of extreme challenging situation from every dimension, and hence to be proactive and respond to each challenge is need of the hour. The survival and sustainability of any organization in such a volatile scenario is not a piece of cake but in fact is a hard nut to crack. Organizations questions that what are the appropriate ways through which the element of pro-activeness and adaptability can be incorporated in the values of organizational structure. Leaders are responsible to take the organizations to a level where goals and objectives can be accomplished in a true spirit. All this can only be ensured once essential abilities like , knowledge vision and commitment are possessed by the leader and subordinates. For improvement of schools, leadership of school is a significant contributor (Mulford & Sillins, 2003; Stewart 2006). Schien (1992) stated that journey of today’s principal started from manager in 1950s to instructional leader of 1980s to the transformational leader in 1990s. Effectiveness of schools can be enhanced by using number of strategies and techniques by effective leader. One of such leadership strategies is to confer teachers with authority and then to trust them (Harris, 2002). Provision of opportunities for teachers to develop their capacity through collaboration and sharing knowledge are important leadership strategies to motivate teachers (Hopkins and Reynolds, 2001; Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2008).

Only equipped principals could handle a complex and rapidly changing environment. They could implement reforms which would lead to sustainable improvement in student achievement (Fullan, 2002). Leadership style of the school principal is most crucial factor for school improvement (Botha, 2006; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Lok and Crawford (2004) stated that leadership shows significant contribution in the failure and success of organizations. Vera and Crossan (2004) concluded that different leadership practices are a source for development of learning organization. Irrespective of organization’s size or structure, most leaders try to improve performance of subordinates for achievement of organizational goals (McCull-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002). Fernandez, Cho and Perry (2010) believed that scholars are still trying to understand leadership and its influence on organizations and its subordinates.

Primarily the debate on leadership style is started by Burns (1978). Then Bass (1985), based on the work of Burns developed his transformational leadership model, which according to him has four dimensions namely idealized influence (charisma), intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individual consideration. Later, Bass and Avolio (1990) developed “Full Range Leadership Theory – FRLT” which includes both transformational as well as transactional dimensions.

It is also argued that leadership which focuses on symbols, images, stories, and rhetoric to motivate and enable their followers is an attribute of a charismatic leadership (Avolio, 2010). Inspiration in this context is the driving force for motivating, encouraging and triggering the emotions of the followers to sideline the individual's self-interest for the progression and uplifting the morale and performance of teams (Bass, 1985). A true leader leads the entire team from the front in order to compel the followers to help in accomplishments of the tasks and organizational objectives efficiently (Bass, 1999). To exercise this ability of intellectual stimulation, the leadership himself should be creative as Estes and Ward (2002) opined that creative people are able to adjust concepts and generate new ways of looking at things. While playing the role of mentor, leader is not supposed to drop professionalism (Atkinson & Pilgreen, 2011). These four are transformational dimensions of leadership and educational leader must be transformational as Hallinger (2003) concluded that educational leader has to focus on promotion of the skills to innovate. Leader should not emphasize on direct coordination, control, supervision of curriculum rather he has enhanced the capacity of his institution to foresee the upcoming changes and become proactive to those changes.

Transactional leadership has three dimensions namely contingent reward, management-by-exception and laissez-faire. The contingent reward dimension describes that to what extent a leader recognizes and rewards the efforts of his team members (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Researchers argued that contingent reward consist of two types of rewards; one is pay-increase, promotions (monetary); and second is praise and recognition. It was also named as personal recognition (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). While management-by-exception means that whether leader act to either resolve or prevent problems as they aroused. The first situation (resolving a problem) is passive side while last situation (preventing a problem) is active side of management-by-exception. In laissez-faire style, leaders let the team members to take decisions by their own (Bass & Avolio, 1990). These dimensions are mostly based on tangible attributes.

Literature highlighted the role of education, effective school leadership for economic growth of an area. Most of these studies are conducted in west with few exceptions from developing countries (Khan, 2004; Kizilbash, 1998). In case of Pakistan and challenges it is facing; the role of quality education and school leadership takes the center stage for bringing peace and stability in the country. Khan (2004) stated that there are very few training programs for school leaders which are mostly funded by international donors. These programs have very little impact. To be in teaching profession and leadership position in Pakistani school, one has to acquire professional certificates and degrees like Primary Teaching Certificate, Certificate of Teaching etc.

1.1 Organizational Demography

Demographics in organizational studies are debated a lot. Organizational demography is defined as the distribution of employees (organizational members) based on a specific demographic attribute, characteristics or trait (Mittman, 1992; Pfeffer, 1983). Basis of organizational demography is rooted in structuralist sociological theories (e.g. Social Categorization Theory -SCT, Social Exchange Theory -SET). According to these theorists' members and propositions of social groups interact with each other as per their group requirements (Blau, 1977; Simmel, 1955). These theories assume that positions among which social actors are distributed influence on their social life, values and cultural norms. It was hypothesized by Blau (1977) that that differentiation along significant dimensions of social position creates social structure. These structures reflect and influence social actors' role inter-relations, social interactions, and associations. These are also conceptualized as a multi-dimensional space comprised of different positions. On these positions the population is distributed. These positions are characterized by demographic attributes like age, gender, experience, education, occupation, locality and many more (Blau, 1977).

1.2 Context of the Study

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) is a province of Pakistan with an estimated population of 26.62 million. 50% population (age 9 year plus) are literate, in male the literacy rate is 69% while in female it is 31% (Mustafa, 2012). There are 1960 Government High Schools with enrollment of 6, 25,209 students in 25 districts of province (KP-ESE, 2014a, 2014b). Education Sector Plan -ESP (2012) summarized that 34% female and 66% male are working in public sector. Quality and availability of human resource are the major issues faced by education sector in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP). One objective of ESP 2012 is the empowerment of school for development school improvement plan. To achieve this school leadership should be transformed. The study is an attempt to investigate the leadership styles most frequently used by head teacher in public sector high schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In this study the seven districts (Peshawar, Kohat, Swat, Haripur, Bannu, Dera Ismeal Khan, & Battagram) of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa were selected. In these districts there are 656 Govt. high schools, in which 350 were randomly selected from the list provided by Department of Elementary and Secondary Education of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (53.5% of the target population).

2. Methodology

2.1 Sampling and Demographics

In the seven districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa 350 questionnaires were distributed among headmasters/ headmistress. 190 questionnaires were returned (response rate= 54.28 %). Among respondents 19 were from Battagram, 38 from Kohat, 17 from Hariapur, 68 from Peshawar, 20 from Swat, 17 from Bannu, and 11 from D.I. Khan. 33.1% were having qualification of master's with M. Ed, while 50.8% were M.A. with B.Ed., 6.2 % were Bachelors with B.Ed, 5.4% were only Masters, and 4.6% were having Bachelors with C.T. Female were 44.6% Head teachers from urban area schools were 68% . Majority of the respondents were of age range 41 to 50 years (52%). While from 31-40 years were 22.8% and above 50 years were 21.3% years while the younger head teachers were only 4%.

2.2 Instruments

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is originally developed by Bass (1985) using interviews of senior executives in South Africa. It has been revised many times to make it more reliable and validate (Bass and Avolio, 1993). Bass and Avolio (1992) have developed an abbreviated version of MLQ called MLQ-6S. For this study MLQ-6S is adopted. It has 21 items for seven styles of leadership (for each style there are three items). Responses are taken on a 0 to 4 Likert scale (0 for Not at all and 4 for frequently / always). Cronbach's Alpha values for seven dimensions range from .67 to .78 which is in desired range (Cronbach's, 1951).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Overall Leadership Styles of Head Teachers

Respondents are high overall on transformational dimensions ($M = 8.11$, $SD = 1.54$, $p < .00$) than transactional dimensions ($M = 7.38$, $SD = 1.78$, $p < .00$). 36.9% were highly, 53.9% were moderately and 9.2 % were least transformational, while 44% were highly, 56.2% were moderately and 20.8% were least transactional.

They mostly used idealized influence style ($M = 8.33$, $SD = 2.17$, $p < .00$), then contingent reward style ($M = 8.19$, $SD = 2.01$, $p < .00$), inspirational motivation ($M = 8.11$, $SD = 2.20$, $p < .00$) and intellectual stimulation ($M = 8.11$, $SD = 2.08$, $p < .00$), these were followed by individual consideration ($M = 8.02$, $SD = 1.85$, $p < .00$), management by exception style ($M = 7.71$, $SD = 2.45$, $p < .00$). While least used style of leadership was Laissez-faire style ($M = 6.39$, $SD = 2.82$, $p < .00$).

Although male was more transformational ($M = 8.42$, $SD = 1.21$, $p < .00$) than female ($M = 7.92$, $SD = 1.39$, $p < .00$), but the individual dimension analysis of the leadership revealed a complex situation, where male and female differed. ANOVA revealed that male and female head teachers differ significantly on all leadership styles. While due to age they only differ on inspirational motivation style ($F = 1.422$, $p < .05$) and on management by exception style ($F = 1.458$, $p < .05$). Results showed that the most used style of male head teachers was contingent reward ($M = 8.68$, $SD = 1.61$, $p < .00$), followed by Idealized influence ($M = 8.64$, $SD = 2.02$, $p < .00$), inspirational motivation ($M = 8.56$, $SD = 1.86$, $p < .00$), intellectual stimulation ($M = 8.38$, $SD = 1.74$, $p < .00$), individual consideration ($M = 8.36$, $SD = 1.59$, $p < .00$) and management by exception ($M = 8.32$, $SD = 2.66$, $p < .00$). The least preferred style of male head teachers was Laissez-faire Leadership ($M = 8.56$, $SD = 1.86$, $p < .00$). While female head teachers most used style was Idealized influence ($M = 7.95$, $SD = 2.3$, $p < .00$), followed by intellectual stimulation ($M = 7.78$, $SD = 2.41$, $p < .00$), individual consideration ($M = 7.60$, $SD = 2.06$, $p < .00$), contingent reward ($M = 7.59$, $SD = 2.28$, $p < .00$), inspirational motivation ($M = 7.55$, $SD = 2.47$, $p < .00$), and management by exception ($M = 6.95$, $SD = 2.77$, $p < .00$). The least used style was of female head teachers is Laissez-faire Leadership ($M = 5.62$, $SD = 2.85$, $p < .00$).

Spearman correlation analysis showed that gender has significant negative associations with inspirational motivation style ($\rho = -.212$, $p < .01$), individual consideration style ($\rho = -.202$, $p < .01$), contingent reward ($\rho = -.262$, $p < .01$), management by exceptions ($\rho = -.231$, $p < .01$), and Laissez-faire Style ($\rho = -.237$, $p < .01$). Age is significantly positive correlated with inspirational motivation style ($\rho = .176$, $p < .05$), intellectual stimulation ($\rho = .142$, $p < .05$), individual consideration style ($\rho = .157$, $p < .10$), and Laissez-faire Style ($\rho = .142$, $p < .05$). Education is significantly but negatively related with Laissez-faire Style ($\rho = -.283$, $p < .01$) only. Experience has a positive significant correlation with only contingent reward ($\rho = .033$, $p < .10$). While the urban – rural (location of school) is significantly but negatively correlated with individual consideration ($\rho = -.256$, $p < .01$) only.

Age group-wise analysis showed that head teachers the age of up to 30 years, mostly use Idealized influence followed by contingent reward; individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and management by exception, inspirational motivation while least used style of this group was Laissez-faire. The group of aged head teachers (of above 50 years of age) also mostly use Idealized influence, followed by inspirational motivation, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, and management by

exception. This age group too uses Laissez-faire least. While the age groups of 31-40 years and 41-50 years, both mostly use contingent reward while least use style was Laissez-faire. But they differ for the rest of the styles as 31-40 years age group use inspirational motivation as second most use style, followed by intellectual stimulation, Idealized influence, individual consideration and management by exception. While the group of head teachers with ages from 41-50 use Idealized influence as their second most used style followed by intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, individual consideration and management by exception.

ANOVA revealed that male and female head teachers differ significantly due to education on management by exception ($F = 2.598, p < .05$) and laissez-faire style ($F = 4.696, p < .01$). Due to experience they differ significantly on contingent reward ($F = 1.743, p < .05$) and due to location ($F = 7.895, p < .01$) they differ significantly on individual consideration style.

The regression analysis showed that idealized influence and intellectual stimulation are not significantly influenced by any of the demographic variable. While gender ($\beta = -.156, p < .05; F = 2.253, p < .05$) and age ($\beta = -.296, p < .05$) have impacts on inspirational motivation style. Individual consideration has only one significant predictor i.e. location ($\beta = -.221, p < .05; F = 2.684, p < .05$). Gender only ($\beta = -.253, p < .05; F = 2.2, p < .10$) influenced significantly the contingent reward. Similarly, it is also the only one ($\beta = -.301, p < .05$) significant influencing demographic variable for management by exception style ($F = 2.742, p < .05$). While for Laissez-faire Leadership style ($F = 3.394, p < 0.01$) has gender ($\beta = -.176, p < .05$), age ($\beta = .315, p < .05$), and education ($\beta = -.178, p < .05$) as its valid predictors.

Table 1 *Transformational and Transactional Categorization (High, Moderate, Low)*

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Transformational Leadership	High	70	36.9	36.9
	Moderate	102	53.9	90.8
	Low	18	9.2	100.0
Transactional Leadership	High	44	23.1	23.1
	Moderate	107	56.2	79.2
	Low	39	20.8	100.0

Table 2 Leadership Dimensions' Categorization (High, Moderate, Low)

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Idealized Influence	High	91	47.7	47.7
	Moderate	83	43.8	91.5
	Low	16	8.5	100.0
Inspirational Motivation	High	88	46.2	46.2
	Moderate	77	40.8	86.9
	Low	25	13.1	100.0
Intellectual Stimulation	High	83	43.8	43.8
	Moderate	82	43.1	86.9
	Low	25	13.1	100.0
Individual Consideration	High	80	42.3	42.3
	Moderate	91	47.7	90.0
	Low	19	10.0	100.0
Contingent Reward	High	85	44.6	44.6
	Moderate	86	45.4	90.0
	Low	19	10.0	100.0
Management-by-Exception	High	77	40.8	40.8
	Moderate	82	43.1	83.8
	Low	29	15.4	99.2
Laissez-faire	High	51	26.9	26.9
	Moderate	72	37.7	64.6
	Low	67	35.4	100.0

Table 3 Correlation Results

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Gender	1											
2. Age	-.44***	1										
3. Education	.16*	-.25***	1									
4. Experience	-.23***	.81***	-.15*	1								
5. Location	.17*	-.13	.03	-.07	1							
6. Idealized Influence	-.14	.10	-.07	.08	-.080	1						
7. Inspirational Motivation	-.21**	.18**	-.06	.11	-.114	.36***	1					
8. Intellectual Stimulation	-.14	.14**	-.08	.09	-.140	.45***	.51**	1				
9. Individual Consideration	-.20**	.16**	-.04	.10	-.26***	.44***	.43**	.52*	1			
10. Contingent Reward	-.26***	.06	.04	.03*	-.07	.43***	.50**	.42*	.47*	1		
11. Management –by-Exception	-.23***	.10	-.07	.01	.024	.51***	.30**	.44*	.32*	.42**	1	
12. Laissez-faire Leadership	-.24***	.14**	-.28***	.02	-.11	.32***	.19**	.35*	.29*	.25**	.36***	1

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.1 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 Summary of ANOVA

	ID	IsM	IS	IC	CR	ME	LF
Gender	-0.12	-.16**	-0.11	-0.12	-.25**	-.30**	-.18*
Age	0.10	.39**	0.09	0.19	0.08	0.13	.32*
Education	0.03	0	-0.05	-0.06	0.09	-0.00	-.18**
Experience	-0.04	-0.17	-0.08	-0.09	-0.06	-0.18	-.29*
Location	-0.07	-0.04	-0.09	-.22**	-0.04	0.09	-0.04
R² Change	0.04	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.13
F Values	0.93	2.25**	0.83	2.68**	2.2*	2.74**	3.39***

ID= Idealized Influence; IsM= Inspirational Motivation; IS= Intellectual Stimulation; IC= Individual Consideration; CR= Contingent Reward; ME= Management by-Exception; LF= Laissez-faire Leadership

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

Results of the study revealed that idealized influenced style is the most preferred style used by head teachers and laissez-faire is the least preferred style. There are significant differences in the preferences for leadership styles due to gender. Female most used style is idealized influence, followed by intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, and inspirational motivation. While male mostly use contingent reward as their most used leadership style, followed by idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual consideration. These findings may be attributed to the masculinity-femininity concept, according to which female are characterized with care and affection while male is characterized with use of power (Hofstede, 1980; Reynolds, White, Brayman, & Moore, 2008). These finding corroborated the results of Eagly and Johnson (1990). They in their meta-analytical study argued that there are differences in the leadership styles of male and female is due to the difference in their context and setting.

Differences in leadership styles about age of school leaders are also interesting. Young (up to age of 30 years) and old (above 50 years) school leaders' most preferred style is idealized influence while those in middle age (from 31 to 50 years) preferred contingent reward style mostly. These findings could be explained as, in early ages and late years of the life, people want to be charismatic. They try to influence their team members by their personality and skills. They demand that their team should idealize them. While leaders in their mid-ages exhibited contingent reward leadership styles as in this age leaders are aware of the fact reward and recognition is the best way to make team worked. These findings can also be attributed to the individualism concept as Riaz and Jamal (2012) argued that in mid ages people become more individualistic and so they value materialistic rewards (Cai & Fink, 2002). Along with this, the significant positive co-relation of age with three transformational (inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration) showed that as school leaders get older, they tend to transform their organization by motivating their team members; stimulate their faculty of intellect and also become involved personally with them. While absence of significant co-relation with idealized influenced exhibited that they want to use their skills rather personality or personal charisma. Results of styles with age are depicting a complex situation. It can be concluded that relationship between age and leadership dimensions may not be linear rather it may be U-shaped as age-based group wise results reported. This phenomenon needs more careful and in-depth analysis.

Education has a strong negative co-relation with laissez-faire style wherein leader delegates decision making to team member. In Khyber Pakhtunkhwa ethnic groups are mostly collectivist (Riaz, 2012) and collectivist did not want to delegate authorities to sub-ordinates, therefore the school leaders in KP did not adopt this style of leadership. Experience has a positive relationship with contingent reward while location of the school has strong negative co-relation with individual consideration, which means that leaders in rural area invested their personal efforts in their team as compared to urban areas school leader. This is an interesting finding as in most of the rural areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, monitoring of schools is not that much effective as compared to urban area. This could be explained in such way that in rural areas people are more collectivists (Riaz, 2012) and collectivist proffered team goals over personal goals and they are very cohesive in their in-groups (Cai & Fink, 2002).

According to the Full Range Leadership Theory - FRLT, each leader has at one point of time used different dimensions of both transformational and transactional nature (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Therefore, school leaders must develop a blend of these dimensions as per their contextual requirement. The study of Ngui and his colleagues (2006) concluded that each leadership dimension has varying degree of impact on the teachers' workplace attitudes and behaviors. These exhibited through their organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors and job satisfaction. According to them, if school leaders want to be effective, they must have a right combination of transformational as well as transactional leadership styles. This will enhance their team members' productivity in terms of beneficial learning of students.

4.1 Limitations, implications and directions for future research

The study has several limitations. Firstly, being a self-report study, it is prone to social desirability bias. Secondly, the study only captured the status quo. Thirdly, the sample is although random but is from only seven districts of the province. For these limitations' authors suggested that a two-stem sequential mixed method study. In first part of the study, utilizing the survey method and a random sample from all 26 districts of the province, data should be collected. This will capture the status quo in the whole province. Then in the sequential second part some case studies may be selected through purposive sampling for in-depth analysis to dig out deeply the answers how and why.

The study contributed both the body of knowledge and practitioner kit. It is one among the very preliminary studies on school leadership in the province. The results showed that although schools tend to be transformational but not to that extent which is needed for the transformation of the education sector in the

province. Thus, here we present some policy implications in the light of this study.

- Firstly, school leaders have degrees / certificate in education (teaching) e.g. BEd, MEd, CT, PTC. But in these, there little material regarding school management and leadership, therefore it is suggested for school leaders the degree or post-graduate diploma in Education Planning and Management (EPM) should be included in eligibility criteria. Along with degree, they shall go through refresher courses of school management and leadership on regular basis.
- Secondly, in the appraisal of school leaders, items related to their leadership behaviors and performance should be included.
- Thirdly, the department of elementary and secondary education should devise a succession planning so that new breed of leadership may be developed for smooth transitions of leadership in schools.
- Fourthly, these school leaders should be involved in the research e.g. student performance, learning styles, community- school liaison for enhancing productivity and efficiency of their schools, and this should be incentivized.
- Fifthly they should be made part of policy making and decision making, this will give them sense of ownership, which in turn will affect their commitment and productivity positively.
- Finally, they should be given autonomy to some extent in managing their schools. Their performance should be monitored properly but should not to be intervened un-necessarily by the educational bureaucracy.

Authors also suggested that in future the phenomenon of school leadership may be studied in relation to cultural values i.e. masculinity, power distance, individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and time orientation; leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship, conflict styles, organizational citizenship behaviors and from the prospective of psychological contract between school leader and team members.

References

- Afzal, M., Farooq, M. S., Ahmad, H. K., Begum, I., & Quddus, M. A. (2010). Relationship between school education and economic growth in Pakistan: ARDL bounds testing approach to cointegration. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 48(1), 39-60.
- Atkinson, T. N., & Pilgreen, T. (2011). Adopting the Transformational Leadership Perspective in a Complex Research Environment. *Research Management Review*, 18(1), 42-63.
- Avolio, B. J. (2010). Pursuing authentic leadership development. *Handbook of Leadership Theory and Practice*, 17(1) 739-768.
- Bass, B. M., (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. Free Press, New York.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.
- Bass, B. M. & B. J. Avolio, (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change Development*, 4(1), 231-272.
- Barro, R. J. (1991). Economic growth in a cross section of countries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(2), 407-443.
- Barro, R. J., & Sala-i-Martin, X. (1995). *Economic Growth*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Behrman, J. R., Ross, D., & Sabot, R. (2008). Improving quality versus increasing the quantity of schooling: Estimates of rates of return from rural Pakistan. *Journal of Development Economics*, 85(1), 94-104.
- Blau, P. M. (1977). *Inequality and Heterogeneity*. Free Press, New York.
- Benhabib, J., & Spiegel, M. M. (1994). The role of human capital in economic development evidence from aggregate cross-country data. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 34(2), 143-173.
- Botha, N. (2006). Leadership in school-based management: a case study in selected schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(3), 341-353.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper and Row, New York.
- Cai, D., & Fink, E. (2002). Conflict style differences between individualists and collectivists. *Communication Monographs*, 69(1), 67-87.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.

- Eagly, A. and B.T. Johnson, (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 233-256.
- Estes, Z., & Ward, T. B. (2002). The emergence of novel attributes in concept modification. *Creativity Research Journal*, 14(2), 149-156.
- Education Sector Plan, (2012). Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Govt. Retrieved from: <http://kpese.gov.pk/Downloads/Education%20Sector%20Plan.pdf> (Accessed on: November 11, 2012)
- Fernandez, S., Cho, Y. J., & Perry, J. L. (2010). Exploring the link between integrated leadership and public sector performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 308-323.
- Fullan, M., (2008). *The Role of Leadership in the Promotion of Knowledge Management in Schools*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-352.
- Harris, A. (2002). Distributed leadership in schools: leading or misleading? Keynote Address to the Annual Conference of the British Educational Leadership. *Management & Administration Society (BELMAS)* (available at: www.shu.ac.uk/bemas/harris2002.html).
- Hopkins, D., & Reynolds, D. (2001). The past, present and future of school improvement: Towards the third age. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(4), 459-475.
- Khan, H., (2004). Better school management in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan: The role of head teacher. In: Kandasamay, M. and L. Blaton (Eds.), *School Administrators: Core Actors in Educational Improvement, an Analysis of Seven Asian Countries*. International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris, (pp, 59-113).
- Kizilbash, H. H. (1998). Teaching Teacher to Teach. In Hoodbhoy, P. (Ed.), *Education and State, Fifty Years of Pakistan*. Oxford University Press, Karachi, pp: 102-135.
- Knabb, S. D., & Stoddard, C. (2005). The quality of education, educational institutions, and cross country differences in human capital accumulation. *Growth and Change*, 36(3), 354-373.
- KP-ESE, (2014a). Enrollment of govt. high schools by district in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Retrieved on April 25, 2014, from: <http://www.kpese.gov.pk/Downloads/School%20Statistics/High%20Schools%20Enrollement.pdf>

- KP-ESE. (2014b). Number of Govt. High Schools by Location. Retrieved on April 25, 2014 from: <http://www.kpese.gov.pk/Downloads/School%20Statistics/High%20Schools.pdf>.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School leadership and management*, 28(1), 27-42.
- Leithwood, K., Leonard, L., & Sharratt, L. (1998). Conditions fostering organizational learning in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(2), 243-276.
- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-338.
- McCull-Kennedy, J. R., & Anderson, R. D. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5), 545-559.
- Mittman, B. S. (1992). Theoretical and methodological issues in the study of organization demography and demographic change. In Tolbert, P. S. & Bacharach, S. B. (Eds.), *Research in the Sociology of Organization*. (pp. 3-53). Greenwich: JAI Press
- Mincer, J. (1958). Investment in human capital and personal income distribution. *Journal of Political Economy*, 66(4), 281-302.
- Mulford, B., & Silins, H. (2003). Leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes—What do we know? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(2), 175-195.
- Mustafa, G., 2012. Educational Policy Analysis Report of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Retrieved on April 25, 2014 from: [http://unesco.org.pk/education/documents/situationanalysis/Policy Analysis Report of KP.pdf](http://unesco.org.pk/education/documents/situationanalysis/Policy%20Analysis%20Report%20of%20KP.pdf)
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.
- Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational demography. In Cummings, L. L. & Staw, B. M. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. (pp. 299-357). Greenwich: JAI Press.

- Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(3), 329-354.
- Reynolds, C., White, R., Brayman, C., & Moore, S. (2008). Women and secondary school principal rotation/succession: A study of the beliefs of decision makers in four provinces. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de L'éducation*, 31(1), 32-54.
- Riaz, M.K. and W. Jamal, (2012). Conceptualizing the relationship between individualism-collectivism and conflict management styles at individual level. *Research Journal of Economics and Business*, 5, 34-38.
- Schultz, T. W. (1962). Reflections on investment in man. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5, Part 2), 1-8.
- Simmel, G., (1955). *Conflict and the Web of Group- Affiliations*. Free Press, New York.
- Wart, M. V. (2003). Public sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 214-228.
- Vera, D., & Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 222-240.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*, 36(5), 661-683.
- Weisbrod, B. A. (1962). Education and investment in human capital. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5, Part 2), 106-123.
- Yukl, G., 2010. *Leadership in Organizations* (7th Ed.) Prentice Hall, New Jersey.