



**RESEARCH PAPER**

**Leadership Behavior of Secondary School Heads in relation with School Performance**

<sup>1</sup>Muhammad Nadeem Anwar\* <sup>2</sup>Ghulam Zainab <sup>3</sup>Tariq Saleem Ghayyur\*

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
<p><b>Received:</b> February 28, 2022</p> <p><b>Accepted:</b> April 10, 2022</p> <p><b>Online:</b> April 15 21, 2022</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Leadership Behavior, Performance School Heads</p> <p><b>*Corresponding Author</b>  nadeem.anwar@uos.edu.pk</p>	<p>School performance is largely dependent on the behavior of the leadership of heads and effective behavior yield better school results. The present endeavor was to examine the relationship of leadership behavior and academic achievements of secondary school students in terms of headmasters' role in the promotion of academic performance. A descriptive-correlational survey design was used to test the null hypothesis. The behavior of school heads was assessed as per the views of teachers. A self-developed research tool i-e questionnaire was distributed to 225 secondary school teachers conveniently taken from 40 secondary schools. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS software. The results indicated that a positive relationship of learning behavior, facilitating behavior, and creating behavior with academic performance of schools was found except in influencing leadership behavior, a strong negative relationship has appeared. It implies that learning behavior, facilitating behavior, and creating the behavior of heads have a significant positive impact on the performance of schools.</p>

**Introduction**

Regardless of type and size, every organization requires leadership, because it is a basic ingredient to the survival and success of the organization. Leadership is the ability to motivate workers and provides the right direction to meet the desired ends. According to Edwards (2019), leadership is the process that leads to a positive influence on individuals and groups for a common purpose. It means a leader does not self-centered nevertheless he influences others in a positive way and does the right things right with the help of other workers and colleagues. Armstrong (2004) explicated leadership as the power and confer authority through which a leader influence and leads employees towards the attainment of desired objectives. It may be done by using certain skills through which a leader can influence the employees, staff, and colleagues. Hoy and Miskel (2013) stated that leadership is the process of influencing others' behavior towards the achievement of predetermined goals by using available resources within a stipulated time and situation. Kouzes & Posner (2006) stress that leadership is referred to as skills used to transform vision into realities, values into action, risks into rewards, and obstacles into innovation. They further explained that leadership has the ability to work on challenging opportunities and convert them into success. Leadership, in a nutshell, the function of significant characteristics of inspiration, originality, taking the challenge, people-centered, and primarily to be determined all the time to do the right thing.

Education means getting knowledge, skill, and attitude informal educational institutions. A formal education system runs under an organizational structure wherein some designated personnel is playing their responsibilities and roles to achieve desired

results. For effective functioning, these institutions as an educational entities, need leadership who has the ability to influence teachers to get quality teaching-learning and students' performance. A plethora of literature shows that in school education structure the headmaster is considered an important person who can look after the school affairs effectively in developing a conducive learning environment and effective innovations, enabling quality teaching-learning process and promoting the academic performance of school because of their leadership role (Dinham, 2007).

Research on school leadership has categorically indicated that the headmaster is responsible for the students' achievements, school performance, school effectiveness, school improvement, and overall success of the school (Dinham, 2007 Townsend, 2007). In a research study, Day et al. (2006) declared that competent and active school leadership is one of the important elements which impacted teachers' commitment, job satisfaction, and motivation to remain enabled in their teaching. The importance of a headteacher is explained by various researchers as the person who makes optimal use of resources, frames school-related policies, administrating and supervising all the academic and co-curricular activities (Hussain et al., 2011), guiding and supervising the teaching-learning process, and preparing productive students with relevant knowledge and skills (Afshari et al., 2008), furthermore, Gronn (2002) added that there are several significant roles executed by heads in school organizations such as developing and maintaining teamwork, guiding teachers and students, maintaining school discipline, building teachers' morale etc.

The school headmaster has to perform diverse roles along with routine duties. Therefore, school heads should have leadership behavior so that they could be able to attain the stated goals. Various researchers emphasized widely such as Lussier and Achua (2010) stated that school heads should have important abilities in order to be an effective leader, Winters (1997) proclaims that smart, active, visionary and ethically grounded heads are the major indicators of successful schools. Cassette (1962) says that the school heads are the responsible personality therefore, the school performance and school heads' competencies and qualities are directly relating. In a similar context, Zhao (2010) also contended that school head and academic performance are interrelated.

### **Literature Review**

The behavior thinkers of leadership have studied the activities of a leader as contrasting to personality traits (King, 1990). The principle focus on completion of the routine tasks was the early view of behavior theory. It was concerned with the understanding of individual and group cohesiveness (King, 1990). In 1930, behaviorists introduced three leadership behaviors e.g. (a) laissez-faire, (b) authoritarian, and (c) democratic. In 1940 Ohio State University had initiated a study on leadership behavior and constructed a questionnaire called "Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)". It was comprised of two categories (a) initiating structure, and (b) consideration (Lussier & Achua, 2010). Based on such studies further, two categories had appeared e.g., (a) production-centered leadership behavior, and (b) employee-centered leadership behavior. Douglas McGregor, in 1960 presented X and Y leadership views. Theory X deals with behavior like employees' dislike to perform their tasks, not being ready to win their responsibility, required direction in performing tasks, and being less motivated. Under circumstances, leadership used closed supervision and no reward practices to control their behavior (Northouse, 2015). Whereas theory Y is concerned with employees who happily perfume tasks and liked to do work, they enjoy taking initiative because of self-motivation, and are ready to accept the task and complete with the least direction (Northouse, 2015).

In 1971 instrumental leadership behavior and supportive leadership behavior were exposed. Researches on leadership behavior pointed out that all these categorizes have ignored the change orientation of leadership behavior. Globalization and technology advancements, as well as diversity at the workplace, have made the environment of organizations turbulent and uncertain; therefore, every leader from any organization, including schools, needs to be ready for change (Mulford, 2008). Consequently, leaders need to adapt change-oriented leadership behaviors in order to make their schools successful. In 1980 status of school leadership was acknowledged in uplifting students' academic achievement. A training program for school leadership development, called "One Term Training Opportunities" (OTTOs) was initiated in England with the assistance of the Secretary of State for Education. The basic thrust of the said program was provided training in "the increasingly difficult and complicated tasks of management" It was based on "visits to schools and other institutions", "seminars", "private study" and "interaction with commerce, education, and industry managers".

Plethora of literature indicated that students and school performance depend on a variety of leadership behavior in relation to school leadership. Most recently, Day, & Sammons, (2016) mentioned the various types of behavior of school leadership in their study on "Successful School Leadership" such as "providing vision", "developing, consultatively, a common purpose", "facilitating the achievement of educational and organizational goals", being responsive to diverse needs and situations", having a future orientation", "providing educational entrepreneurship", linking resources to outcomes", supporting the school as a lively educational place", working creatively with, and empowering, others", ensuring that the processes and content of the curriculum are contemporary and relevant", "ensuring that management practices reflect leadership actions", carrying out restructuring so that the school organization is more effective and efficient", collaboratively designing and carrying out strategic plans", "meeting accountability requirements", "making sure the organization is running smoothly", and "working effectively with people". Day, & Sammons, (2016) have united into a set of the following four leadership behavioral indices which cover a range of above administrative tasks of a school leader actions.

- a. Influencing characteristics including compelling towards work, motivating through negative means, public speaking, negotiating
- b. Learning characteristics including thinking, quick reading, anticipation, and information processing
- c. Facilitating characteristics including carefully listening, recognizing hidden potential, building teams, and addressing personal issues
- d. Creating characteristics including inspiring, motivating, envisioning, empowering, and entrepreneur

The above discussion revealed that effective and successful school headteachers should have some leadership behavior. These characteristics might be a blend of influencing, learning, facilitating, and creative, which may also be called social, personal, and professional. Possession and execution of these leadership dimensions may be able the school heads to attain the stated goals. In short, improvement and better academic performance of schools depend on how school heads expedite the leadership behavior according to the situation and lead the schools (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). The majority of the countries have admitted the importance of school leadership and its impact on school improvement and performance. They have initiated various reforms, projects, training

workshops, and developed training manuals (Sanzo, Sherman, & Clayton, 2011). If we talk about Pakistan, public school leadership is criticized due to low academic performance, less vision, lacking leadership attitude, and required competencies (Khan, 2013). On the other side, Shah, et al. (2011) exposed that in Pakistan, the educationists, practitioners, and even researchers have the least interest in school leadership development. Even, for example, a birds-eye view of educational policies and five-year plans we cannot find any provisions for the development of school leadership.

### **Hypotheses**

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between influencing leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between learning leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between facilitating leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.

Ho4: There is no significant relationship between creating leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.

### **Material and Methods**

The design of this research was based on a descriptive-cum-correlational survey in order to examine the relationship between school heads' leadership behavior and academic performance in secondary school. This study was carried out in a government secondary school in the Sargodha District.

### **Participants**

All the secondary school teachers were the population and the sample comprised 225 secondary school teachers conveniently taken from 40 secondary schools in the Sargodha district of Pakistan.

### **The Research Tool**

Self-developed questionnaire (HLB: Heads Leadership Behavior) was the research tool used for data collection. It has two parts: in part-I previous three years' result of SSC (i.e. 2018, 2019, and 2020) declared by the Sargodha board of intermediate and secondary education, was solicited. The mean of three years of SSC result was calculated and taken as academic performance of secondary schools. Part II consisted of 34 items about the school heads' leadership behavior related to four leadership behavior: influencing, learning, facilitating, and creative. These items were based on the literature and previous studies about school leadership. Items were constructed using a Likert-type scale with five options ranging from "not at all typical for my school head", "not very typical for my school head", "somewhat typical for my school head", "fairly typical for my school head", and very much typical for my school head". Before administering the questionnaire, it was validated with three purposes: (1) to refine the wording, (2) to make it understandable, and (3) to reflect the true representation of the construct under study. The reliability of the scale, determined by Cronbach's alpha, was found to be 0.87, according to Gay (2010) a measuring instrument that has reliability greater than 60 percent is considered as good.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

Owing to the closure of schools due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the researchers posted 300 questionnaires to selected schools along with returned envelop. After multiple reminders, 239 questionnaires were received, out of which 225 were found completed in all respects and used for data analysis. Analysis of data was done with help of the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS)-22. Descriptive and correlational analyses were done using at 5% ( $p < 0.05$ ) level of significance.

## Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows the result of the alpha scores and descriptive examination of the scale used to measure the heads leadership behavior

**Table 1**  
Descriptive analysis of the sample in HLC scale

Leadership behavior	$\alpha$	Mean	SD	Min	Median	Max
Influencing	0.822	2.87	0.91	1.00	2.97	4.82
Learning	0.607	4.11	0.54	2.32	4.16	5.01
Facilitating	0.737	3.45	0.73	1.16	3.60	4.82
Creating	0.720	3.03	0.69	1.32	3.08	5.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.887</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>4.53</b>

The mean and median of HLB 3.40 and 3.43 reveal that secondary schools' heads generally have leadership behavior. Learning dimension has highest mean and median scores (i-e  $M=4.11$ ;  $Mdn=4.16$ ), the influencing characteristics was found lowest scores of mean and median (i-e  $M = 2.87$ ;  $Mdn = 2.97$ ), followed by the creative (i-e  $M = 3.03$ ;  $Mdn = 3.08$ ), whereas facilitating (i-e  $M = 3.45$ ;  $Mdn = 3.60$ ). The SD of the whole scale was 0.42 and scale variation from SD 0.54 to 0.91 was found, however, a large variation has not been seen in teachers' responses to the different leadership behavior.

## Relationship of Leadership behavior and Academic Performance of Schools

Before testing each hypothesis, the researchers have found a general relationship between leadership behavior with the academic performance of schools.

**Table 2**  
Regression analysis of Leadership behavior and Academic Performance of Schools

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of estimate	Change statistics	F statistic
1	0.625	0.338	0.242	2.678	R Square Change 0.326	11.167

The data in Table 2, as calculated using the regression analysis, revealed that the value of R-square (i-e 0.338) indicated that the leadership behavior contributed less than a half (i-e 33.8%) to the academic performance of secondary schools. However, the value of regression coefficient (R) (i-e 0.625) or 62.5%. It indicates a strong relationship between leadership behavior and the academic performance of schools. Therefore, the contribution of leadership behavior to the academic performance of schools was found to be below average. It means the academic performance of schools needs more than leadership behavior to have an effective school. It can be inferred that nevertheless, the leadership

behavior has significantly very much typical, leadership behavior alone couldn't impact on academic performance of secondary schools. Academic performance needs the combination of multifarious elements such as the use of instructional materials, quality of teachers, optimal use of available resources, school culture, nature and status of students and heads experiences, etc., which are crucial to school academic performance.

### Testing of Hypothesis

Table 3 shows the Pearson correlation coefficient between the academic performance of secondary schools and the different Leadership behavior.

**Table 3**  
**Correlation between Leadership behavior and Academic Performance of Schools**

Leadership behavior	Academic Performance of Schools
Influencing Leadership behavior	-0.681
Learning Leadership behavior	0.513
Facilitating Leadership behavior	0.732
Creating Leadership behavior	0.352

$p < 0.05$ , level of significance.

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between influencing leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.

Table 2 revealed that the value of the Pearson correlation coefficient was found to be -0.681 at  $p < 0.05$ . It indicates the null hypothesis (Ho1) "There is no significant relationship between influencing leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools" is rejected. Results imply a strong negative relationship between influencing the leadership behavior of heads and the academic performance of schools. It could be gleaned that the more the school head is influencing behavior, the academic performance also is poorer. In influencing leadership behavior, the school heads get things done by influencing and using authority and power.

Ho2: *There is no significant relationship between learning leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.*

It is evident from Table 3, the null hypothesis (Ho2), "There is no significant relationship between learning leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools", is rejected because of the value of Pearson correlation coefficient i-e 0.513 at  $p < 0.05$ . The analysis infers that a positive relationship between learning leadership behavior and academic performance in secondary schools was found. It means the more the school heads deploy learning leadership behavior, the better the academic performance of schools becomes.

Ho3: *There is no significant relationship between facilitating leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.*

According to the results given in table 3, a strong positive relationship between facilitating leadership behavior and academic performance of schools was found based on the value of Pearson correlation coefficient i-e 0.732 at  $p < 0.05$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho3), "there is no significant relationship between facilitating leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools" is rejected. It could be gleaned

that the more the school heads apply to facilitate leadership behavior, the better the school's results become.

*Ho4: There is no significant relationship between creating leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools.*

Based on the result of table 3, the value of Pearson correlation coefficient i-e 0.352 at  $p < 0.05$  revealed a positive relationship between creating leadership behavior and the academic performance of schools. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho4), "there is no significant relationship between creating leadership behavior and academic performance of secondary schools" is rejected. It could be implied that the more the school heads apply creating leadership behavior, the better the school's results become.

## **Conclusion**

Previous research and literature both exposed that school leadership plays a significant role in the performance of teachers and the academic achievement of students. School heads' behavior is an indispensable ingredient in influencing, facilitating, and motivating teachers to achieve higher academic performance in school. This study was conducted to examine the relationship of some selected school leadership behavior with the academic performance of the secondary school. The behavior of school heads was assessed as per the views of teachers. A positive relationship between learning behavior, facilitating behavior, and creating behavior with academic performance of schools was found except in influencing leadership behavior, a strong negative relationship has appeared. It implies that learning behavior, facilitating behavior, and creating the behavior of heads have a significant positive impact on the performance of schools. It means in these schools the academic achievements of students are better because the heads think carefully while taking any decision, quick read what is under the carpet, always eager to address the problems of teachers, and do good for teachers and students' learning, motivate and empower teachers and focus on change and innovation. A negative relationship between influencing behavior with performance, however, indicating that it does not fit effective leadership and school performance. Many studies disclosed that the headmaster/headmistress tends to be more influential to younger or new teachers; behavior issues of teachers, school culture, and disciplinary issues. Due to the direct impact of school leadership on school performance, the majority of the countries around the globe have originated projects and training in order to document the best behavior and practice of school heads that are contributory to school performance (Crum & Sherman, 2008; Sanzo, Sherman, & Clayton, 2011). Nevertheless, in Pakistan, the academicians, practitioners, and researchers are not as much of passionate about school leadership development. This manuscript has contributed to the existing literature on leadership in the context of schools in Pakistan and revealed that facilitating, learning, and creating are the most imperative behaviors of school heads in better academic performance of schools.

## **Recommendations**

Through this study, it may be recommended that in induction training or promotion link training emphasis should be given to the development of leadership attitude and behavior. It may be done by inculcating and giving them an opportunity to acquire leadership traits, skills, and knowledge.

## References

- Afshari, M., Bakar, K. A., Luan, W. S., Samah, B. A., & Fooi, F. S. (2008). School leadership and information communication technology. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 7(4), 82-91.
- Armstrong, M. 2004. Human resource management theory and practice. London: Bath Press Ltd.
- Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement: High school principals' reflections on their successful leadership practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(5), 562-580.
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful School Leadership*. Education Development Trust. Highbridge House, 16-18 Duke Street, Reading Berkshire, England RG1 4RU, United Kingdom.
- Day, C., Stobart, G., Sammons, P., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Smees, R. and Mujtaba, T. (2006). *Variation in teachers' work, lives and effectiveness*. Research Brief RB743, (VITEA). London: Department for Education and Skills
- Dinham, S. (2007). How schools get moving and keep improving: Leadership for teacher learning, student success and school renewal. *Australian Journal of Education*, 51(3), 263-275.
- Edwards, A. K. (2019). *Teachership: Professional Citizenship, Leadership and Entrepreneurship among Teachers*. Exceller Books.
- Gronn, P. (2002). *The New educational leaders: Changing leadership practice in an Era of school reform*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Hoy W. K & Miskel C.G (2013). *Educational Administration: Theory, research and Practice*. (9th Ed). McGraw Hill, New York.
- Hussain, A., Saadi, A.M., Salfi, N.A., Rashid, K., Mahmood, N., Ayub, M., & Hussain, A. (2011). Leadership qualities of head teachers at secondary level as viewed by the teachers in private sector in Pakistan. *The International Journal of Learning*, 17(11), 373-383
- Khan, A. (2013). A qualitative study of foreign funded capacity development program of head teachers- Lessons from Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(12), 107- 123.
- King, A. S. (1990). Evolution of leadership theory. *Vikalpa: The Journal of Decision Makers*, 15(2), 43-54.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *The leadership challenge (Vol. 3)*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2010). *Leadership: Theory, application, & skill development (4th ed.)*. Delhi: South-Western Cenage Learning.
- Mulford, B. (2008). *The leadership challenge: Improving learning in schools*. Australian Education Review, ACER Press



- Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sanzo, K. L., Sherman, W. H., & Clayton, J. (2011). Leadership practices of successful middle school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(1), 31-45
- Shah, S. M. H., Sultana, N., Hassain, K. S., & Ali, I. (2011). Impact of professional development on the performance of secondary school principals: A managerial perspective. *International Journal of Management*, 28(4), 92-105.
- Townsend, T. (2007). *International handbook of school effectiveness and improvement*. Dordrecht: Springer
- Winters, C. A. (1997). Learning disabilities, crime, delinquency, and special education placement. *Adolescence*, 32(126), 451-462.
- Zhao, Y. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(5), 422-431.