CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Education is a necessity and constructive factor in humans’ life and also every one’s right to get it. Education is one of the important factors which formulate the personality of a person. To get a clear picture of the education and its precise concept, we need to give a keen observation to the ways of well-educated people and then compare them with a lay man. Those countries which gave priority to education and never neglected this constructive factor are the nations that have shown substantial development.

One of the most effective factors in this regard is leadership. Leadership history is as long as human history. It has shown itself inseparable to mankind. Since the inception of society before the dawn of civilization, leadership has been a very important aspect. Leadership can be considered as the lighthouse for a ship. Schools like other organizations need powerful, creative, patient and sympathetic leaders. So, head teachers need to sustain their leadership role.

Society is consistently changing and education’s goal is to prepare students to function within their present environment and be prepared for the future. Thus, education must keep pace with these changes. Schools and school districts that do not improve, will be taken over by others that have an entrepreneurial spirit. Schools need to be engaged in long and short-term
planning to remain viable. They also need to be places of intellectual strength while bringing to fruition the talents and abilities of all students (Marx, 2001).

When a group of people contract together one of them should be chosen as the leader of that group to lead them. Every society which has chosen and defined an objective for itself, first of all needs a powerful leader to obtain that goal and, being powerful depends on how much he is predominant in his job. So, no society can reach its objectives without a leader and this fact is evident to anyone. In modern societies with their special intricacies and need to have basic programming and consider all directions, this is the leader who should star and show his art and, with a foresight of future needs and realistic perception of present situation and based on last experiences, chooses the best way that society could reach its desirable goal.

Leadership of school head teachers has a basic role in school because it determines the success or failure of any school. The study of leadership in schools is closely tied to the analysis of school effectiveness. The importance of leadership is reflected in every aspect of the school specially school effectiveness. Teachers who are supported by head teachers display a better sense of responsibility than those who do not have their head teachers’ support.

The role of today’s school head teachers has become increasingly more complex now (Colgan, 2003; Fullan, 2003; Hopkins, 2000; Johnson, 2002; Norton, 2002; Pavin, 1991; Quinn, 2003; Rooney, 2003; Stronge, 1998). The comment made by one of the head teachers who participated in O’Hanlon and
Clifton’s (2004) study captures the effect of the head teachers’ personality on the school, “I think that I have heard that some schools even smell like the principal because as the principal walks from room to room that fragrance, whatever kind of fragrance that the lady wears, follows her long” (p.3).

School systems also need to adapt to the changes taking place in the society. Knowledge is increasing exponentially because of technology and schools that can construct new ways of thinking will lead the way into the future. Furthermore, schools are trying to keep and attract the best teachers. There is a lack of qualified applicants and districts are competing for these trained teachers (Marx, 2001).

School is the place which elites should prepare the way for considered and defined objectives and notice that the sapling which they grow in school today, would show its fruits in all parts of the society in future. Head teachers can show their arts and skills in schools and it depends on how much they have created a positive and relax atmosphere for their staff and students. In this situation, teachers and students can willingly continue their activities. Each progress needs a suitable situation. Schools should be suitable and a comfortable place for teachers and students, too.

In one word, the root of progress of any society depends mainly upon its standard of Education, and one of the most important factors in this way is skillful head teachers who can have an important role in school effectiveness. In general, we should reconsider the role of education, educational leaders
(head teachers), teachers and schools in making the conditions favorable for progress.

1.2 ON DEFINING LEADERSHIP

Leadership in political, economical, cultural, artistic, social, scientific and educational dimensions has its own characteristics that leader should have necessary abilities based on structural dimension and goals and natural features. Leadership paradigm has changed over the last decades: it has transited from the traditional leadership to the new perspectives. Schermerhorn et al. and Hoy and Miskel (2001) categorize trait, behavioral and situational or contingency theories under traditional leadership perspectives, and charismatic and transformational leadership theories under the new leadership perspectives. The focus of all theories of leadership is to determine organizational effectiveness.

Beginning with the leadership studies of Lewin and Lippitt in 1938, there have been numerous studies of leadership and numerous leadership theories developed. Major theories posited include Trait theory, Situational/Contingency Theory, Power and Influence Theory and Transactional and Transformational leadership.

Important leadership theories beginning from the personality theory, through behaviorist and contingency theories, to the theory of transformational and transactional leadership, most are the works of McGregor, Argyris, Likert, Blake and Mounten, Fiedler, House, Hersy and Blanchard, towards the more
current research of Taffinder, Crosby and Daft have shown that leadership styles influence the efficiency and effectiveness of the organizational on one hand, and performance and satisfaction of the subordinates on the other.

The exploration of the leadership style between leadership styles and performance and work efficiency starts from Likert, who was the first to stress the importance of different leadership styles for performance and work efficiency and who has based on empirical research reached the conclusion that all leadership styles are the cause, and not consequence of work efficiency.

Leadership research has tended to view leadership as an aspect of role differentiation or as an outgrowth of social interaction process. Bass (1990) argues that the meaning of leadership may depend on the kind of institution in which it is found. He points out that leadership can be viewed as:

…a focus of group process, as a matter of personality, as a matter of enduring compliance, as the exercise to influence particular behaviors, as form of persuasion, as power relations, as an instrument to achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role… (p. 11).

Leadership is a concept that does not refer to one specific idea but carries shades of meanings pointing towards two sets of ideas. Gardener as quoted in Fullan (2000) sees leadership as “the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers” (p. 3).
From this description one is able to identify the two ideas emanating from it: First, the idea of interaction between the leader and people, and second the idea of the leader seeing to the accomplishment of objectives. Cawood and Gibbon (1985) make the issue explicit when they say:

…To lead means basically to be out in front, to go ahead with the intention of being followed…the word lead strongly denotes an interpersonal relationship between those who go ahead and those who follow. A leader then, is one who not only leads but who is also followed (p. 3).

Cawood and Gibbon imply the organizational nature of leadership in their definition. The people-relation nature of leadership is made explicit. In an educational field, head teachers are leaders whose work is basically to lead their institutions to attain goals and objectives that have been set up. The act of leadership is, therefore, an activity of relations.

Nabavi (2005) defines leadership as the power of affecting the followers in such a way that based on their feeling and wanting, they try to obtain the objectives of organization in different situations, and the leader is the one who is able to employ followers with this method.

1.3 ROLE OF LEADERSHIP

Nongauza (2004) in a research entitled “The Role of a Principal in an Academically Successful Farm School” argues that according to role of leadership theory each member of society occupies a position in the community as well as in various groups, organizations or institutions. In each position, an individual is expected to play a more or less well-defined role. Leadership is a
role within the scheme of relations and is defined by reciprocal expectations between the leader and other members of the organization. According to Bass (1990) leadership is defined by stabilized expectations that are more exacting and that require greater obligations from the leader than from the other members of the group. He argues that leadership as a differentiated role is required to integrate various roles of the group and to maintain unity of action in the group’s effort to achieve its goals (p.17).

1.4 A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON LEADERSHIP

Scholars and researchers have been interested in leadership for thousands of years (Cantu, 1997). Leadership has been widely discussed, written about, and practiced for thousands of years and still remains an active area of inquiry (Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee, 2002; Kouzes and Posner 2002, Yukl 2002; Kotter, 1999; Bass, 1997; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1989). According to Burns (1978), “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth (p. 2). Leadership is identified by researchers in the manner that fits their perspectives of leadership and contains the factors of interest to the researcher (Yukl, 2002).

Beginning with the leadership studies of Lewin and Lippitt in 1938, there have been numerous studies of leadership and numerous leadership theories have already developed. Major theories posited include Trait theory, Situational/Contingency theory, Power and Influence Theory, and finally Transactional and Transformational theories.
1.4.1 Trait Theory

An approach to leadership developed in the early 1900’s is Trait theory (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2002). This theory is based on the view that leadership abilities are innate, or, simply put, leaders are born so. The theory emerged from the attributes the leaders showed during their term of leadership (Hughes, Wattuhewa, Miller, Ye, and Pederson). According to Hoy and Miskell (1996) trait theory was based on the Aristotelian thinking which maintained, “…from the hour of birth, some are marked for subjection and others for rule” (p. 376). The criticism leveled against trait theory was its inability to explain the environmental and situational factors that had a bearing on the leadership and leadership styles. Smyth (1989) has criticized this theory and has regarded it as forming part of the traditional view of leadership. He described it as “… static, indifferent towards historical forces and ignorant of moral and political dimensions…”(p. 20)

Trait theory uses the physical or psychological characteristics of individual leaders to study and explain leadership style (Hoy and Miskell, 1996). During most of recorded history, the assumption was that leaders are born, not made. It was thought that by isolating and analyzing these physical and psychological traits, leaders could be identified (Bass, 1990; Hoy and Miskel, 1996). During the period from 1904 to 1948, Trait theory was the influential leadership theory with over one hundred trait studies being conducted (Yukl, 2002). Leader traits examined during these numerous studies included physical characteristics of leaders such as self-esteem, dominance,
and emotional stability; and ability traits which included general intelligence, verbal fluency, originality and social insight (Yukl, 2002).

Proponents of trait theory, according to Fullan (2000), strengthened their belief in the theory because they maintained that the presence of leadership traits in an individual would be accepted almost without any regard to the situation in which the leader was functioning (p. 8).

1.4.2 Situational/Contingency Theory

Many theories felt that Trait theory was missing a variable called situation (Bass, 1990; Hoy and Miskell, 1996; Stogdill, 1974; Yukl, 2002). The Situational Theorist’s variables included the structural prosperities of the organization, organization climate or culture, role characteristics such as power, type or difficulty of task, and subordinate characteristics such as education and experience (Hoy and Miskel, 1996). Most prominent amongst these theorists are Fielder’s (1967) Contingency Model, Evans and House’s (1971) Path-Goal Theory, and Vroom Yetton’s (1973) Leadership Model. While each of these focus on different aspects of situational leadership and take it beyond the original boundaries of early theorists, they all have at their roots looking at a leader in conjunction with the situation and people with which a leader is working. If the situation was the major determinant of leadership effectiveness, there are several practical implications.

The foremost amongst them is the following: By better understanding the situational aspects that require control, one can determine and instill
through an analysis of the situation and the proper training the types of behavior necessary to effectively lead.

The Contingency approach to leadership was the first approach to blend leadership behaviors and changing situations (Bass, 1990). In Fiedler’s (1967) Contingency theory, the leader seeks to satisfy both personal needs and organizational needs. Fiedler proposed that the situation influences leader behavior and no particular personality trait or no particular leadership behavior assures good leadership in all situations. Fiedler and Chemers (1974) purported that the situation often influences how the leader will behave. Fiedler’s contingency model components are: leader style is determined by leader motivation; group atmosphere; task; structure and power determine situational control and the leader style; and control of the situation determines group effectiveness (Hoy and Miskel, 1996). The contingency approach to leadership is complex and difficult to test and empirical support for the model is lacking (Yukl, 2002).

On contingency theory Fiedler (1667) points out that the effectiveness of task orientated and relations orientated leader is contingent on the demands imposed by the situation (person situated theory). This focuses on how the person needs to be developed to be able to adapt to the needs of the situation.

Horner (1997) seems to be in support of the view expressed because he explains that contingency theories “…make the assumption that the effect of one variable on leadership are contingent on other
variables” (p. 271). Horner goes on to say that this theory provided a major insight at the time of its popularity because it opened a new understanding which showed that leadership could be different in every situation. It is also here that leadership styles may shift towards a people-centered approach or towards a task-orientated approach.

Fiedler’s contingency studies attempted to find leadership styles that were effective in certain situations (Fiedler 1967). The attempt was to match a leader with a situation that would be most conducive to a particular style of leadership. As can be seen here, contingency theories were seen to bring some kind of balance from trait and behaviour theories discussed earlier. Fullan (2000) felt that the balance brought about by the contingency theories was attempting to explain historical forces. He states that historical forces have created the circumstances in which leaders emerged but he also noted that leaders in turn have had their impact on history (p. 8). The belief then is that the interaction between the leader and the environment is ongoing. Each situation brings its own unique outcomes.

House and Mitchell as quoted in Horner (1997) have within the contingency theories developed a path-goal theory that seeks to understand the leadership style by concentrating on followers. The theory suggests that the leader “… is primarily responsible for helping followers develop behaviors that will enable them to reach their goals or desired outcomes” (p. 271). One cannot fail to see the shift in emphasis and the attempt that is being made to look and understand leadership differently from the previous trait and behavior
theories. Contingency theories were differing in approach and were building from the previous theories, thereby evolving into a complex analysis of the leader and the situation.

Contingency theory had situational leadership as one of its strong points. Fiedler as quoted in Horner (1997) says that situational leadership was a combination of leader-member relations, tasks structure and position power. Through his research he claimed that certain leadership styles were more effective in certain situations. Although this was viewed as simplistic it attempted to match a leader to a situation that would be more conducive to that leadership style. In short, this meant that leadership style, the situation in which the leader is found and the characteristics of the followers will all be evaluated and the outcome would spell out the nature of that leadership within the contingency theory (p. 271).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) also suggest a situational aspect to leadership. The principle thought behind their theory is the selection of one of five decision-making styles (Baker, 1999). First amongst these is the autocratic one style where problems are solved using the information already available. Autocratic two styles requires additional information be obtained from the group leader before a leader then makes his/her decision. The next style, consultative one, leads itself to more group interaction as the leader discusses problems with subordinates individually before making a decision. An extension of this concept is consultative two where problems are discussed as a whole group with the group before making a final decision. Finally, the most
participatory of Vroom and Yetton’s leadership styles is the group where the work group actually decides how to address problems presented to them. In this final style, the leader acts only as a chair. The extent to which a style is used depends on the person’s job maturity and psychological security.

### 1.4.3 Power and Influence Theory

According to Yukl (2002), the power and influence approaches to leadership were developed in the late 1950’s. Power is the ability to influence subordinates, peers, supervisors and people outside the organization (Bensimon, et al., 1989; Cohen, 1990; Gardner, 1990).

The two themes evident in power theory are social power and social exchange (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989). Social power is defined by a leader influencing followers and social exchange emphasizes the relationship between the leader and follower (Ehrl and Bennett, 1988). The five bases of social power identified by Bensimon, Neumann and Birnbaum (1989) are: legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, and referent power. Legitimate, reward, and coercive power are associated with leadership position while expert and referent power are known as personal power (French and Raven, 1959).

Mintzberg (1983) proposed a Power Theory that examines the internal and external power in an organization. Power in organizations is the result of control over technical skills, knowledge or resources and administrators must
learn to tap into organizational power systems of authority, expertise, ideology, and politics.

### 1.4.4 Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory describes a complementary relationship where the leader provides services in exchange for compliant and approving group behavior (Bensimon, Neymann, Birnbaum, 1989). Transformational and transactional leadership emerge from social exchange theory (Yukl, 2002; Lucas, 1994; Bensimon, Neymann, and Birnbaum, 1989). Transactional leadership is based on honest bargaining for valued things. A transactional leader balances the demands of the organization or institution and the requirements of the people within the organization (Gardner, 1990).

Transformational leadership seeks to raise the consciousness of followers by motivation and a new level of morality (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Gardner, 1990). Leaders and followers share a vision. Transformational leaders value justice and equality and values that provide empowerment to followers (Lucas, 1994; Bass 1994).

### 1.5 CURRENT STATUS OF LEADERSHIP

Bryman (1996) wrote that a leader “defines organizational reality through the articulation of a vision which is a reflection of how she or he defines an organization’s mission and the values which will support it” (p.280). The two approaches, Burns (1978), and Bass (1985) are clearly categorized under the
new leadership classification according to Bryman’s (1996) classification approach.

Bass and Avolio (1990) argue that this century will require leadership that is flexible, developmentally-oriented, willing to accept diverse points of view and capitalize on them, and that has the ability to challenge a better educated workforce. The leadership required to address the changes in organizations during the coming century is referred to as transformational leadership.

The importance of transformational leadership to an organization has been written about by several authors (Anderson, Ackerman-Anderson, 2001; Bass, 1997; Bass and Avolio, 1994; Bass, 1985; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Tichy and Devanna, 1986).

1.5.1 Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) identified two types of leadership, transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Burns (1978) acknowledged leadership as “Leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations-the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations-of both leaders and followers” (p. 19). According to Burns (1978), “Transformational leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that the leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20). Northouse (1997) believed that transformational leadership is a “…process whereby an individual engages
with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (p. 131). According to Burns (1978), “transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things”. (p. 19). Northouse (1997) described transactional leadership as the “…focus on the exchanges that occur between leaders and their followers…. Head teachers who offer promotions to employees who surpass their goals are exhibiting transactional leadership” (p. 131).

Carlson (1996) believed that with the complexities of urban education, transformational leadership allows the most amounts of people to positively impact student learning. Transformational leadership uses a theoretical framework of all people working toward a common vision to accomplish high levels of student success. People are empowered to be change agents in the process of transforming low performing schools to high performing schools. Transformational leadership is moving people to a common vision by building trust and empowerment.

He also stated that “Principals who are successful in creating a culture that is collaborative in nature allowing change to be a natural process widely shared across the organization”. Transformational leadership is the “… process to develop and articulate a vision of what is possible and that challenges the status quo” (p. 135).
Bass (1998) stated the following: Transformational leaders do more with colleagues and followers than set up simple exchanges or agreements. They behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the four components of transformational leadership.

He also believed that leadership is charismatic such that the followers seek to identify with the leaders and emulate them. The leadership inspires the followers with challenge and persuasion providing meaning and understanding. The leadership is intellectually stimulating. Finally, the leadership is individually considerate, providing the follower with support, mentoring and coaching. (p. 5)

According to Marks and Printy (2003), “…transformational leaders play a pivotal role in precipitating change, followers and leaders are bound together in the transformational process” (p. 375). Transformational leaders understand the importance of building wholesome relationships in order to successfully move people through the change process.

According to Lezotte and Pepperl (1999), “The principal acts as an instructional leader, effectively and efficiently communicating the mission to the staff, parents and students. The principal understands and applies characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program” (pp. 108-109).
According to Marzano, Watters and McNulty (2005), four I’s are important in the transformational development process. The four I’s developed by Bass and Avolio are described below.

…the school leader must attend to the needs of and provide personal attention to individual staff members, particularly those who seem left out (individual consideration). The effective school administrator must help staff members think of old problems in new ways (intellectual stimulation). Through a powerful and dynamic presence, the effective school administrator must communicate high expectations for teachers and students alike (inspirational motivation). Finally, through personal accomplishments and demonstrated character, the effective principal must provide a model for the behaviors of teachers (idealized influence). (p. 15)

According to Avolio and Bass (2004), “Transformational leadership is associated with motivating associates to do more than they originally thought possible....Associates’ perception of self efficacy or confidence, as well as their developmental potential, are enhanced through the transformational leadership process” (pp. 26-27).

Furthermore, according to Avolio and Bass (2004), “the process of transforming associates does not merely empower them or delegate to them the responsibility for fulfilling a goal; rather, it develops their capability to determine their own course of action, if they lack the ability” (p. 27).

Understanding people is an important trait in transformational leadership. Stakeholders often become stressed when changing an organization from poor to great or even good to great.
Transformational leaders alleviate stress from people. In this connection Bass (1998) stated, “…Inspirational leaders create a positive, optimistic environment for identifying the conflict and an expectation of its resolution” (p. 30).

Transformational leaders understand teams of people and can identify conflicts and act accordingly. Transformational leaders seek input from others. According to Wilmore and Thomas (2001), “It becomes the principal’s responsibility to seek input from all stakeholders, help create the specific of a collaboratively developed school action plan, and achieve a mutually developed mission” (p. 4). Leithwood (1992) stated, “Transformational leadership is a collaborative, shared decision-making approach; an emphasis on teacher professionalism and empowerment; and an understanding of change, including how to encourage change in others” (p. 10).

The relationship between the leader and the followers is the basis for the concept of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978). In school organizations, the transformational leader is mission centered, performance centered, and culture centered.

While focusing on the pursuit of higher purposes by developing a widely shared vision and strengthening collaborative cultures of the school, the transformational leader motivates followers by raising their consciousness about the importance of organizational goals (Marks and Printy, 2003).
Leithwood (1992) defined three fundamental goals of the transformational leader in education. These goals are: helping the staff to develop and maintain a supportive and collaborative school culture, fostering the professional growth and development of teachers, and assisting teachers and staff in learning to solve problems more effectively. Leaders involve all stakeholders in collaborative goal setting, which in turn reduces teacher isolation. Leaders also motivate and stimulate new thinking and ideas within the organization.

Sergiovanni (1991) defined transformational leadership with three concepts: building, bonding, and banking. Building involves empowering others and raising expectations of both the leader and the follower in order to bring about higher levels of commitment and performance. Bonding elevates the organization to a higher moral level through a shared covenant. Banking supports an atmosphere where the transformation becomes routine and part of the daily practices of everyone in the organization.

Avolio and Bass (2004) described transformational leaders as “…inspirational, intellectually stimulating, challenging, visionary, development oriented, and determined to maximize performance. In many cases the term ‘charisma’ was used” (p. 3). Burns (1978) described transformational leadership 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” (p. 20). Transformational leaders allow people to share a common understanding or belief that all people are valued and important.
Transformational leaders have the ability to make everybody in the organization better.

Bass (1985) believed transformational leaders have the ability to raise others around them to a new level of success. Transformational leaders attempt and succeed in raising colleagues, subordinates, followers, clients, or constituencies to a greater awareness about the issues of consequence. Thus, heightening of awareness requires a leader with vision, self confidence, and inner strength to argue successfully for what he sees is right or good, not for what is popular or acceptable according to the established wisdom of the time. (p. 17)

Avolio and Bass (2004) described transformational leadership as: A process of influencing in which leaders change their associates awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. Transformational leaders are proactive: they seek to optimize individual, group and organizational development and innovation, not just achieve performance at expectations. They convince their associates to strive for higher levels of potential as well as moral and ethical standards. (p. 97).

1.5.1.1 Transformational Leadership Behaviors

Transformational leadership is about the development of people. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), “Transformational leaders help followers grow and develop into leaders by responding to individual followers’ needs by
empowering them and by aligning the objectives and goals of the individual followers, the leader, the group, and the larger organization” (p. 3)

1.5.1.1.1 Idealized Influence

Idealized Influence behavior is defined by Avolio and Bass (2004) as “leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Followers identify with and want to emulate their leaders” (p. 97). According to Bass and Avolio (1994), “Amongst the things the leader does to earn this credit is considering the needs of others over his or her own personal needs. The leader shares risks with followers and is consistent rather than arbitrary” (p. 3).

Idealized influence is also known as charisma. According to Northouse (1997), “… leaders who act as strong role models for followers; followers identify with these leaders and want to emulate them. These leaders usually have high standards of moral and ethical conduct and can be counted on to do the right thing” (p. 134).

The leader in which followers react to his/her behavior is defined by the leaders idealized influence score. Idealized influence leaders have high moral and ethical values and are able to provide their followers with a sense of vision and mission. Followers deeply respect the idealized influence leader (Northouse, 2001).
1.5.1.1.2 Inspirational Motivation

Bass and Avolio (1994) described inspirational motivation as: Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work...The leaders creates clearly communicated expectations that followers want to meet and also demonstrates commitment to goals and shared visions (p. 3).

According to Avolio and Bass (2004), inspirational motivation has four key characteristics. “First, talking optimistically about the future. Second, talking enthusiastically about the needs to be accomplished. Third, articulating a compelling vision of the future and fourth expressing confidence that goals will be achieved” (p. 97).

Inspirational motivation is shown in leaders when they inspire and motivate followers to demonstrate commitment to the shared vision of the group or team. The inspirational motivational leader engages in clearly communicating high expectations to followers and increases team spirit and enthusiasm (Northouse, 2001).

1.5.1.1.3 Intellectual Stimulation

Yukl (2006) described intellectual stimulation as “behavior that arouses strong follower emotions and identification with the leader” (p. 262). Avolio and Bass (2004), stated, “These leaders stimulate followers’ effort to be innovative and
creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways. There is no ridicule or public criticism of individuals’ mistakes” (p. 98).

Intellectual stimulation is demonstrated by the transformational leader when they support followers to be creative and innovative, to try new approaches, and challenge their own beliefs and values. This type of leader promotes problem solving to find creative solutions to the task at hand (Northouse, 2001).

1.5.1.1.4 Individual Consideration

Bass and Avolio (1994) describe individual consideration as: Transformational leaders pay special attention to each individual’s needs for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor. Followers and colleagues are developed to successively higher levels of potential....New learning opportunities are created along with a supportive climate. Individual differences in terms of needs and desires are recognized. The leader’s behavior demonstrates acceptance of individual differences (p. 4).

Avolio and Bass (2004) described transformational leaders as utilizing individual consideration through coaching and mentoring, treating others as individuals, considering each individual as having different needs and abilities and helping others to develop their strengths (p. 98).
Individualized consideration is shown by the transformational leader by creating a supportive climate, listening to followers, and acts as a coach and mentor. The leader pays attention to individual differences and treats individual employees in a caring way. Leaders also help individuals achieve goals and grow personally. This type of leader also uses delegation to get followers to grow through personal challenges (Northouse, 2001).

1.5.1.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership has strengths and weaknesses. This type of leadership moves people to a higher level of performance through a relationship of mutual commitment and interdependence. One strength of transformational leadership is the process of guiding subordinates to new levels. This type of leadership is not about the leader but about the people.

The leader takes a back seat and allows others to grow and lead in the process. The key is to provide the support, training and follow-up for each constituent and not allowing them to fail. This leadership style is engaging and allows others to be a part of the leadership initiative.

According to Wilmore and Thomas (2001), transformational leaders care about people and their inventive ideas.

A transformational leader supports innovation. When teachers or groups come up with ideas they want to try, a transformational leader asks questions in a supportive, reflective manner and works as a part of the team to assess and
analyze the new ideas. On the other hand, if an idea is not successful, it is still up to the transformational leader to be supportive and again, ask insightful questions designed to analyze what went wrong and why. The goal is to further innovation, not nip it in the bud due to a bad experience (p. 5).

Collaboration is another strength of transformational leadership. Wilmore and Thomas (2001) described teachers in a professional learning community focusing on student learning:

… A transformational leader makes use of all participants in a learning community to address the learning styles of each student. If individual needs as well as strengths in knowledge, ability to learn, and best ways of learning are not addressed, how can any school realistically expect to maximize learning for every student? (p. 6).

There are very few transformational leaders, partly because a leader must truly care about people and their well-being. A leader must then build a strong relationship with their subordinates through trust and empowerment. This relationship will take time to develop. Most leaders do not or cannot devote this amount of time. Another weakness is not every leader has the ability to convince their subordinates to make every effort to perform at a high level. Transformational leader is challenging and difficult. If it were easy, there would be more leaders of this type.

1.5.2 Transactional Leadership

Shackleton (1995) stated that “transactional leaders clarify the role of the subordinates, show consideration towards them, initiate structure, reward and punish, and attempt to meet the social needs of subordinates” (pp. 113-114).
Transactional leadership is defined by Avolio and Bass (2004) as “…setting up and defining agreements or contracts to achieve specific work objectives, discovering individuals capabilities, and specifying the compensation and rewards that can be expected upon successful completion of the tasks” (p. 3). Furthermore, “… in its corrective form, it focuses on actively setting standards. In its passive form, it involves waiting for mistakes to occur before taking action” (p. 3).

As Avolio and Bass (2004), “Transactional leaders work toward recognizing the roles and tasks required for associates to reach desired outcomes; they also clarify these requirements for associates, thus creating the confidence they need to exert the necessary effort” (p. 21).

Bass additionally identified the associate’s needs. He stated: Transactional leaders also recognize what associates need and desire, clarifying how these needs and desires will be satisfied if the associate expends the effort required by the task. Such motivation to perform will provide a sense of direction and help to energize others (p. 21).

Avolio and Bass (2004) described transactional leaders as:

…behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. The constructive style is labeled contingent reward and the corrective style is labeled management-by-exception. Transactional leadership defines expectations and promotes performance to achieve these levels. Contingent reward and management-by-exception are two core behaviors associated with ‘management’ functions in organizations (p. 98).
According to Shackleton (1995), management-by-exception and contingent reward were described as follows: This is when a leader applies correct actions, such as reprimands, when, and only when, an employee commits as error or fails to deliver on agreed objectives. The leader does not attempt to change methods of work if subordinates are achieving performance goals. Leaders take no action unless a problem arises. Contingent reward or leadership by exchanging promises for results. This is the familiar work-for-reward exchange agreement, where the leader makes clear what tasks must be accomplished in order to obtain desired rewards and provides these rewards only when subordinates perform adequately or put in the necessary effort (p. 115).

Yukl (2006) stated that, “Transformational leadership increases follower motivation and performance more than transactional leadership, but effective leaders use a combination of both types of leadership” (p. 262). According to Bass and Avolio (1994), “Transformational leaders do more with colleagues and followers than set up simple exchange or agreements. They behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the four I’s” (p. 3).

1.5.2.1 Transactional Behaviors

Transactional leadership is associated with the exchange between the leader and the subordinate. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), “Transactional leaders are those who lead through social exchange” (p. 3). For example,
“…transactional business leaders offer financial rewards for productivity or deny rewards for lack of productivity” (p. 3).

1.5.2.1.1 Contingent Reward

Yukl (2006) described contingent reward as “…clarification of the work required obtaining rewards and the use of incentives and contingent rewards to influence behavior” (p. 263).

According to Avolio and Bass, (2004), “Transactional contingent reward leadership clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved. The clarification of goals and objectives and provisions of recognition once goals are achieved should result in individuals and groups achieving expected levels of performance” (p. 98).

Bass and Avolio (1994) state that, “Transactional leadership occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines the follower depending on the adequacy of the follower’s performance. Transactional leadership depends on contingent reinforcement, either positive contingent reward or the more negative active or passive forms of management-by-exception” (p. 4).

Contingent Reward is how the leader and followers exchange specific rewards for outcomes or results. Goals and objectives are agreed upon by both the leader and followers and the achievement is rewarded or punished. The MLQ-5X measures a leader’s degree of possessing Contingent Reward leadership attributes which are demonstrated by leaders that engage in a
constructive path to goal transaction and exchange rewards for performance. These leaders clarify expectations, exchange promises and resources, arrange mutually satisfactory agreements, negotiate for resources, exchange assistance for effort, and provide commendations for successful follower performance (Northouse, 2001).

1.5.2.1.2 Management by Exception

Avolio and Bass (2004) narrated that, “Management-by-exception focuses on leadership as a negative behavior. This leadership behavior is when the leader concentrates on the subordinates deviances, mistakes, and errors and then taking corrective actions as quickly as possible when they occur” (p. 98).

According to Chemers (1997), management-by-exception:

…reflects the extent to which the leader intervenes only when things go wrong. This may involve active monitoring of subordinates performance or just waiting for trouble to indicate the need for contingent punishment. A sample is “takes actions only when a mistake has occurred” (p. 87).

Avolio and Bass (2004) describe management by exception: active as “the leader specifies the standards for compliance, as well as what constitutes ineffective performance and may punish followers for bring out of compliance.” Furthermore, management by exception: passive is reactive. “…does not respond to situations and problems systematically” (p. 98).

According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leadership is an expansion of transactional leadership. Transactional leadership emphasizes the
transaction or exchange that takes place amongst leaders, colleagues, and followers. This exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards these others will receive if they fulfill those requirements (p. 3).

Management-by-Exception (active) is when a leader makes corrective criticisms or uses negative reinforcement. This leadership behavior monitors followers closely so they can point out mistakes and errors. Leaders with Management-by-Exception with “active” behaviors have characteristics of monitoring followers’ performances and taking corrective action if deviations from the set standards occur. These leaders enforce rules to avoid mistakes (Northouse, 2001).

Management-by-Exception (passive) is only intervening when goals have not been met or a problem arises. The Management-by-Exception leader with a “passive” behavior would not intervene until problems become serious. The Management-by-Exception leader (passive) waits to take action until mistakes are brought to his or her attention (Northouse, 2001).

**1.5.2.1.3 Laissez-faire**

These leaders avoid authority and responsibility. They mostly depend upon the group to establish objectives and goals, formulate policies and programs. The group members train and motivate themselves. Contrary to the autocratic style the leader plays minor or negligible roles and depends upon the group. It is,
however, concluded that there is no clear-cut leadership style which is applicable universally and in all circumstances (Subbarao, 2003).

The Laissez-faire leader avoids accepting responsibilities, is absent when needed, fails to follow up on requests for assistance, and resists expressing his or her views on important issues. The Laissez-faire leader gives the majority of control in the decision-making process to the followers. Laissez-faire leadership assumes that followers are intrinsically motivated and should be left alone to accomplish tasks and goals. The Laissez-faire leader does not provide direction or guidance (Northouse, 2001). Laissez-faire behaviors are ones that delay decisions and give up responsibility. Laissez-faire leaders offer no feedback or support to the follower. Laissez-faire leadership is a “hands-off” approach to leadership (Northouse, 2001).

1.5.2.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership allows leaders to set clear guidelines for their subordinates through personal satisfaction and the use of rewards and punishment. One strength transactional leaders offer is exchanges for efforts. This benefits both the leader and the subordinates.

Leaders here express happiness when others meet or exceed expectations. Most of the attention is reactive instead of proactive. Attention is focused on mistakes of the subordinates. Time is another strength. Transactional leaders do not spend a lot of time making their subordinates better, instead they wait until the constituent either fails or succeeds. Therefore,
this could be perceived as a strength for the leader but also a weakness for the organization.

According to Avolio and Bass (2004), “Transactional leaders...recognize what associates need and desire, clarifying how those needs and desires will be satisfied if the associate expends the effort required by the task” (p. 21).

Furthermore, “Such motivation to perform will provide a sense of direction and help energize others. This approach, currently stressed in most popular leadership training programs, is helpful but limited to first order exchanges” (p. 21).

A weakness of transactional leadership is the leader keeps track of mistakes by others. This is not a productive means of leadership. Leadership is not about tallying mistakes set by subordinates, but the ability to lead people in a positive and healthy manner. Transactional leaders wait until problems arise and then work to solve the problem. Transactional leaders do not try to make people better; rather they wait until they make a mistake and then take action. This type of leadership is reactive.

1.6 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TRANSFORMATIONAL AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Burns, 1978 states that, “Transformational leadership differs from Transactional leadership. In transactional leadership, relationships between leaders and followers are based on a series of exchanges or bargains.
... Transactional leadership can be immobilizing and manipulative, and often seeks to control subordinates rather than foster an atmosphere of mutual respect. Transformational leadership goes beyond exchanging rewards for performance by inspiring followers to transcend their own self-interests for a higher, collective purpose.

Transactional leaders manage outcomes and aim for compliance of the members of the organization. Transformational leaders encourage open-ended intellectual stimulation and a commitment to treating people fairly (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1998).

Bass (1985) believed that transactional leadership is about personal satisfaction. The transformational leader may be less willing to be satisfied with partial solutions, or accept the status quo, or to carry on as before. He is more likely to be seeking new ways, change for its own sake, taking maximum advantage of opportunities despite the higher risks. (p. 105)

Furthermore, Bass (1985) discussed more specifically the differences between transformational and transactional leadership. “…transformational leaders are more likely to be proactive than reactive in their thinking; more creative, novel, and innovative in their ideas” (p. 105).

“Transactional leaders may be more equally bright but their focus is on how to best keep the system running for which they are responsible-reacting to problems generated by observed deviances, looking to modify conditions as needed” (p. 105).

According to Schlechty (2001), “Transformational leaders are different from transactional leaders in the sense that they foster change in the
organizational system and its cultural norms. The interactions of principals with teachers and students are influenced by external agencies (state legislatures and community perceptions), which demand new kinds of educational products and new ways of school management. Transformational leadership calls for leaders and the led to embrace new and revolutionary assumptions about organizational outcomes and possibilities. Transactional leadership requires that the leader only improve operational effectiveness of the organization based upon commonly accepted assumptions” (p. 164).

According to Kouzes and Posner (1985), “In transactional leadership, the leader and the led exchange needs and services in order to accomplish independent objectives. The wants and the needs of the followers are traded against the wants and needs of the leader. Positive reinforcement is exchanged for good work, promotion for increased persistence, a feeling of belonging for cooperation. In contrast transformational leadership, leaders and followers are united in the pursuit of higher level goals common to both. Both want to become the best. Their purposes, which may have started out as separate but related as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused (p. 133).

1.7 SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS DEBATE

Literature on school effectiveness can be traced from the time of Coleman’s Report (1966) supported to a great extent by Jencks, Smith, Acland, Bane, Cohen, Gintis, Heyns and Michelson (1972). Based on Hayden and Thompson, (2000), at that stage the home environment was argued to be the biggest factor
in influencing children’s progress in schools. The schools therefore were regarded as not very useful to the future of children’s education if they were unable to accommodate the conditions of lower, poor or working class children. It was for that reason that a radical call was made by such authors as Ivan Illich for a de-schooling policy because schools were regarded by the de-schoolers as ineffective (p. 157).

Nongauza (2004) argues that good schools are normally those that are well managed, able to link with the communities in which they are found and capable of producing good results. To understand school effectiveness researcher looks at what makes a school good.

No conducting teachers, parents and students’ opinion about school effectiveness is an important factor which enough attention has not been paid to it. In this research, the researcher tried to take the opinion of these three groups by taking their opinion through questionnaire.

Although parents are not seen inside the educational system, they can have a very important role in school effectiveness.

In confirming the above subject Matthew (2006) states:

… A school is only as good as the parents consider it to be. In other words, pupils’ trust in and esteem for a school is largely influenced by their parents’ assessment of the school. If the parents think highly of the school and its teachers, and have trust in them, the same will get reflected in their children’s attitude as well. On the contrary, if the parents constantly complain about the school, its teachers, and its decisions, children too will lose trust in the school and all what it stands for. An effective school must win the trust and esteem of its parents and as a natural corollary those of its pupils too.
1.8 CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD SCHOOL

Blumberg and Greenfield in Sergiovanni (2001) have found in their studies of successful schools that head teachers in these schools are proactive and:

… direct behaviors at building and articulating a vision of what the school is and can become. … Nearly all these studies … identify the concept of ethos (shared goals and expectations and associated modes of behavior) or strong school culture as being an important characteristic. Important to this culture are norms and values that provide for cohesion and identity and that create a unifying moral order or ideology from which teachers and students derive direction meaning and significance.

As has been indicated, the position of Sergiovanni here does stress the principal’s involvement in the school’s ultimate good performance. Doyle and Wells (1997) realize that, as factors tabled in Sergiovanni call for serious consideration, they are finally looking at relationships between school and its environment as well as the interpersonal relationships within the school (p. 147).

There are some important points raised by various authors about a good school and these are not at variance with school effectiveness studies.

1.9 EFFECTIVE SCHOOL STUDIES

The late Ronald Edmonds’s work laid the foundation for effective schools. He conducted a national research project that identified school populations that had 16% to 99% poor as a portion of their school building. He wanted to know what was there about them that made them effective. The late Ronald Edmonds (1986) discovered the following five institutional characteristics:
• Safe and orderly atmosphere.
• Climate of high expectations.
• Strong instructional leadership.
• Frequent monitoring of pupil progress.
• Opportunity to learn.

Noted scholars such as Lawrence Lezotte have popularized correlates originally created by the late Ronald Edmonds. Lezotte (1991), like Edmonds, believes that school culture, a safe and orderly environment, home school relations, instructional leadership, a clear and focused mission, high expectations, frequent monitoring, opportunity to learn, and time on task are correlates of effective schools. Many scholars agree with Edmonds and Lezotte.

Smith and Andrews (1989) emphasized the crucial role that head teachers play when they interact daily with teachers. Grandmont (1997) stated that parent involvement is more indicative of a child’s success in school than any other factor. This head teacher in Connecticut conducted an action research study on his campus. The purpose of his study was to entice parents to become involved in their children’s school. Grandmont was successful in having approximately 400 parents attend their schools’ planned social events. He suggests when planning parent involvement activities, the focus should be on planning events that are fun for teachers, parents, and students.
Schaps, Lewis, and Watson (1996) recognized how a strong sense of classroom community contributes to many positive student outcomes. The purpose of their study was to measure students’ sense of classroom community in six elementary schools in a suburban district near San Francisco, California. They discovered students with a heightened sense of community showed significantly greater academic motivation and performance, namely, positive attitudes toward school. Also, strong sense of classroom community contributed to many positive student outcomes like academic motivation, conflict resolution skills, and an overall satisfaction with their school environment.

Levine and Lezotte (1995) identified six characteristics of schools with unusually high achievement. They derived their findings from a compilation of work from noted scholars. The identified characteristics were:

1. High faculty cohesion and collaboration.
2. An orderly environment.
3. Head teachers providing abundant support for their teachers.
4. Involvement of parents.
5. Engaged active learning and academic success.
6. Respect for differences in cultures and environments.

Levine and Lezotte (1995) explained that to contribute to school effectiveness, the characteristics listed above must be exhibited on a campus level. Characteristics associated with effective schools should be viewed as prerequisites for attaining effective schools. Families and educators seek out charter schools for primarily educational reasons: high academic standards,
small class size, a focus on teaching innovative approaches to curriculum, and
instruction are all reasons shared by teachers, parents, and students who have
embraced the charter school movement (Weil, 2000).

Recently, Johnson, Livingston, Schwartz and Slate (2000), identified
seven correlates of effective schools from studying rural Vermont teachers.
They were: (a) strong leadership (b) safe and orderly environment (c) clearly
defined curriculum (d) parental involvement (e) high expectations
(f) monitoring student progress, and (g) professional staff development. It
appears that most educators and stakeholders continue to view effective schools
in similar ways.

1.10 LEADERSHIP AND THE NOTION OF SCHOOL
EFFECTIVENESS

Nongauza (2004) as cited from Sergiovanni (2001) argues that he found school
effectiveness to have a common meaning and a technical meaning. He
describes school effectiveness from a common understanding as “… ability to
produce desired effect.” On the technical level he points out that school
effectiveness refers to a school “… whose students achieve well in basic skills
or basic competency standards as measured by achievement tests” (p. 163).
Barnard in Beare, Caldwell, and Millikan (1989) sum up school effectiveness
by stating that “…an action is effective if it accomplishes its specific objective
aim.” The same authors put effectiveness in a school differently and they say:
“… you are effective if you set yourself a target and then hit it” (p. 11).
Andrews and Soder (1987) related that student achievement gains were significantly greater in schools with strong head teacher leadership. Brookover, et al., (1978) stated that in effective schools the head teacher was seen as the instructional leader. Edmonds (1978) perhaps best summarized the effective schools literature in regard to the role of the head teacher in effective schools when he said, “they have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can be neither brought together nor kept together” (p. 36).

Rutter in Beare et al. (1989) conducted studies on school effectiveness and helped identify one of the important elements of school effectiveness, viz. parental choice. He noted that it did matter which school the child attended as this was a parental decision.

He went on to note that good results provided a strong indication of what the worthwhile activities of the school were and how good organizational structures were used to help the school to succeed. Parents would be inclined to choose such schools, particularly if they observe that such schools are performing very well. They would do so because they see the chances of their children doing well in such a school increasing. There is a strong suggestion here of school effectiveness having been brought about by a certain leadership style or styles. School effectiveness implies good leadership, good organizational capability, good understanding and maintenance of effective relationships.
Literature on school effectiveness states that strong leadership is one of the major requirements for a successful school. Purkey and Smith (1983) confirm this when they say that school site management and instructional leadership are amongst the necessary characteristics for school effectiveness.

Gunter (2001) on the other hand is cautious about a simplistic understanding of leadership in an effective environment. She raises questions, asking “… who is staking the claim for a particular version of a performing school, what those claims are, who is listened to and who receives claims and validation…” (p. 18). This cautions those who investigate school effectiveness that they need to be aware of sometimes, simplistic approaches. She argues that good results proving that a school is effective may be contested. Doyle and Wells (1997), for example, argue that one of the main problems facing researchers of effective schools is inadequate consideration of the “…systems perspective of how organizations are influenced by external social factors (p. 145).

1.11 PROBLEM OF THE STUDY

The present investigation has been designed to explore and investigate the school head teachers’ leadership style in relation to school effectiveness at the secondary stage in Mysore City, India and Shiraz City, Iran. The following variables have therefore been incorporated in the execution of the research.
1.12 VARIABLES OF THE STUDY

(a) Independent Variable

(i) Head Teachers’ Leadership Style

(b) Dependent Variable

(i) School Effectiveness

(c) Moderator Variables

Head teachers’ background variables such as

(i) Gender (Male/Female)
(ii) Age (Below 40/Above 40)
(iii) Educational Qualification (Bachelor/master)
(iv) Academic Stream (Arts/Science)
(v) Experience (below 10 years/Above 10 years)

1.13 NEED AND SIGNIFICANT OF THE STUDY

Review of literature on school effectiveness indicated that head teachers’ strong leadership is one of the major requirements for a successful school. Purkey and Smith (1983) confirm this, when they say that school site management and instructional leadership are amongst the necessary characteristics for school effectiveness.
School head teachers’ leadership style in relation to school effectiveness has drawn the attention of researchers to probe various aspects of this innovation in some countries. A careful scrutiny of the meager research available in the filed of head teachers’ leadership style and its relation to school effectiveness leads one to believe that it is a growing field with vast research potential. Surveys of research in education in India and Iran vouch for it. Dearth of the researches in this area particularly at the secondary stage on the one hand and inadequacy of existing research evidence to predict the satisfaction and success of head teachers’ leadership style in relation to school effectiveness on the other hand have served as motivating factors for undertaking the present piece of research so as to fill in the important research gap.

The researcher has looked at head teachers’ leadership style and school effectiveness because various authors like Purkey and Smith (1983); Gunter (2000); Edmonds (1979); and Doyle and Wells (1997) viewed good leadership as a key component for good results in a school. Smith and Andrews (1989) emphasized the crucial role that head teachers play when they interact daily with teachers.

In order to improve the effectiveness of school quality, teachers play a crucial role. Teachers need to be empowered and motivated to do their task. Further, the leadership and guidance that they receive from the instructional head is of paramount importance.
As such no studies were available looking into the secondary school head teacher’s leadership styles on school effectiveness in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran), the researcher decided to investigate this area and also fill the existing research gap.

1.14 TITLE OF THE STUDY

The problems selected for the present research may be precisely stated as under:

“A study of the leadership styles of head teachers in relation to school effectiveness at the secondary stage in India and Iran”.

1.15 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE KEY TERM USED

Leadership Styles: This refers to the behavioral pattern/model of the head teacher in a given school situation leading teachers and students’ activities. The study focuses on the two major leadership styles such as (i) Transformational leadership: A form of leadership in which a leader motivates followers to higher-order needs and results in performance and development beyond expectations. (ii) Transactional leadership: A form of leadership in which a leader uses a cost-benefit or economic exchange to meet each follower’s material and psychological needs in return for services provided by the follower (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

Secondary School: Secondary level education consists of classes 9-10 in India and 9-11 in Iran which serves as a bridge between elementary and senior
secondary education and prepares young persons between the age group of 14-16/17 for entry into further education.

**Head Teacher:** It refers to the head of a school. In India head teacher is known as headmaster/headmistress and in Iran, head of school is known as manager.

**School Effectiveness:** It refers to the performance of the school. In this research the performance of the school is measured through the opinions of teachers, parents, and students and the consolidated opinions regarding instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, safe and orderly environment, positive school climate, high expectations, frequent assessment/monitoring of student achievement, emphasis on basic skills, maximum opportunities for learning, parent/community involvement, strong professional development and teacher involvement in decision-making.

**1.16 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The following are the major objectives of the study:

(i) To identify the leadership styles of school head teachers at the secondary stage in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

(ii) To study the differences in the leadership styles of secondary school head teachers with reference to their background characteristics in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

(iii) To investigate the school effectiveness at the secondary stage in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).
(iv) To find out the relationship between head teachers leadership styles and school effectiveness at the secondary stage in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

(v) To study the relative contribution of leadership styles of head teachers to school effectiveness at the secondary stage in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

1.17 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Hypotheses serve as beacon light in fulfilling the objectives of the study. They form an essential and indispensable part of any study designed to make use of the procedures of inferential statistics for the analysis of its data. The formulation of hypotheses depends partly upon the findings of previous researches and partly on researcher’s intuitive understanding and insight. For the present study, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

(i) The leadership styles of school head teachers at the secondary stage differ in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

(ii) There is a significant difference in leadership styles of secondary school head teachers with reference to their background characteristics in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

(iii) There is a significant difference in school effectiveness at the secondary stage in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).
(iv) There is a positive relationship between the leadership styles of head teachers and school effectiveness at the secondary stage in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

(v) There is a significant contribution of leadership styles of head teachers to school effectiveness at the secondary stage in Mysore City (India) and Shiraz City (Iran).

1.18 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study has been delimited with respect to its area, method, sampling, tools, variables and techniques proposed for the study. However, some of the delimitations are listed below:

- The data was collected from head teachers, teachers, parents and students in a limited geographical area, i.e. Mysore City of India and Shiraz City of Iran. Therefore, the results may not be generalized to other Districts/States or to the countries in general.

- The data was collected using Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) and School Effectiveness Questionnaire (SEQ), to collaborate the information.

- The details of the study also may be interpreted in terms of the number and kinds of schools which are selected as the sample of the study.

Review of Related Studies is dealt-with in the following chapter.