

The Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Overall School Effectiveness in Primary Schools, Selangor, Malaysia Based on Teachers Perception

Baharak Talebloo, Ramli Basri, Aminuddin Hassan and Soaib Asimiran

Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i14/3694>

Published Date: 25 December 2017

Abstract

The current study is an attempt to explore the relationship between transformational leadership and overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia based on teachers' perception. This study utilized stratified random sampling method by choosing 72 primary schools and 490 teachers with the response rate of (n=410) in 6 districts of Selangor state (Gombak, Hulu Langat, Hulu Selangor, Klang, Kuala Langat and Kuala Selangor) and from three types of National, National type Chinese and National type Tamil school based on their urban and rural locations. Data analysis conducted by using descriptive statistic and Pearson product moment correlation. The results indicate that there were positive, significant, and small to moderate relationships were found between five organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions and overall school effectiveness. This study proposed several recommendations to the Ministry of Education, headmasters, teachers, and school administrators, to improve the level of school effectiveness by practicing transformational leadership dimensions especially "building shared vision" and "models behaviour" dimension. Moreover, they can develop, maintain, and elevate the level of school effectiveness by exhibiting civic virtue, altruism, and conscientiousness behaviours as the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour in primary schools in Selangor, Malaysia.

Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, School Effectiveness, Primary Schools.

Introduction

The study of effective school is one of the main educational reform initiatives taking place in many countries to identify the influential factors of effective schools in recent years (Botha, 2010; Petty & Green, 2007; Sun et al., 2007). Several empirical and theoretical researches in Malaysia, as well as in many other countries on school effectiveness have defined the effective school based on academic outcomes and achievement, while, school effectiveness

is not only achieved by academic output (Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Botha, 2010; Ghani et al., 2008; Gray, 2004; Lezotte, 1991; Edmond, 1982). Thus, identifying other factors and correlates related to school effectiveness claimed to be required to identify, categorize and solve the challenges that schools face (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001; Kyriakides & Creemers, 2008, Botha, 2010). The seven correlates of effective school model provided by Lezotte & Snyder (2011) characterized the school effectiveness and the tasks that educators can do to make sure that their schools practicing these correlates.

According to Malaysia's education vision (2013), it is required to transform school system to the world-class education system with international standards and high level of education to all students regardless of family background. Ghani (2012; 2014) and Kamaruddin (2011) indicated that a number of studies on school effectiveness in Malaysia are still low and there is a need to refine and elaborate the practices and theoretical models of school effectiveness based on its effective factors and correlates. Moreover, in order to implement the correlates of effective school, respected leaders needed who are capable of driving the process system to be effective and sustainable, empowering others to take responsibility, transform school visions (Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Hallinger, 2007; Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2014; Ibrahim & Wahab, 2012; Marzuki, 1997; Abgoli & Sabti, 2013). Principals' leadership is key factor in creating effective schools (Leithwood, 2012; Marzano, 2003; Harris et al., 2003; Sammons et al., 1997), because it determines the success or failure of school (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2014; Ibrahim & Wahab, 2012; Marzuki, 1997; Abgoli & Sabeti, 2013).

Transformational leadership practiced by headmasters can motivate teachers to change their attitude and values by being committed towards the mission and vision of education. The practice of transformational leadership is said to be able to move the organization led to a clear vision, mission and goals of the organization (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

According to the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025 (MoE, 2013), there is need to ensure high performing school leaders in every school which have ability to shared leadership, increased staff support, new leadership models and structures and commitment to the education sector as the top priority for national transformation and development. The result of a study by Yaakub & Ayob (1993) showed insufficient leadership practicing by Malaysian primary school headmaster in implementing their roles and responsibilities. Although, empirical researches showed that transformational leadership has a significant effect on organizational effectiveness, more investigation needs to be done on the dimensionality of transformational leadership in order to determine the role of each dimensions of transformational leadership in school effectiveness (Moolenaar et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 1999; Shao et al., 2012; Ngang, 2011; Bush, 2011; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Moreover, there is need to determine the role of each dimensions of transformational leadership in school effectiveness (Dickinson, 2010; Leithwood, 2012; Bush, 2003). Similarly, in the context of Malaysia there is less evidence on practicing transformational leadership's dimensions effectively (Salleh & Saidova, 2013) and more researches need to be conducted on their relationship with school effectiveness (Ghani et al., 2011; Ghavifekr et al., 2014; Iyer, 2008).

Furthermore, most of the researches on school effectiveness in Malaysia have been conducted on secondary schools, mostly in Kuala Lumpur state and mainly focused on urban schools (Iyer, 2008; Kamaruddin, 2011; Ghani et al., 2011). Among the educational setting,

the effectiveness of primary schools plays a crucial role in academic achievement and it is highly essential to initiate the educational vision and goals from the very basic grade in educational settings (Ponnusamy, 2010; Othman & Muijs, 2013). According to Southworth (2008), there have been some changes in the role and responsibilities of primary schools leadership regarding to changes in the primary school evaluation system beyond the student achievement. Education at primary level forms the core of the national education system and needs to be on way so that the goals for national development can be achieved (Hamida et al., 2013). The Ministry of Education Malaysia has a number of objectives for primary education such as to facilitate the personal development of pupils, secondary school preparation, social skills and cultural understanding, religious and moral, and contribution to the society and country (MOE, 2012). Schools attempt to develop their efforts for excellence to ensure that their actions correspond with the requirements of a constantly changing environment. An effective school is able to serve as basic guidelines for a school to achieve success because the focus study is comprehensive and not only to focus on teaching and learning process (Ghani, 2014). Therefore, these objectives of primary education are possible with the transform education system by high performing school leaders in every school and efforts and involvement from teachers (Hamida et al., 2013). Few researches have been conducted, to identify the relationship between transformational leadership and overall school effectiveness in Malaysia primary schools. Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine the relationship between transformational leadership and overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia based on teachers' perception.

Literature Review

Transformational Leadership Definition and Concept

Transformational leadership is a new concept in the educational leadership filed. And must respond to the innovative challenges of schools, producing high quality teachers and effectives of school (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Gkolia et al. 2014)

Burns (1978) defined the transformational leadership as the process of engaging with others to create a connection that increases motivation and morality in both the leader and the followers. Burns (1978) discussed leadership as transformation in which the leaders and the followers are often transformed or changed in performance. Other definitions of transformational leadership proposed by Avolio et al. (1999) who defined transformational leaders as being charismatic and influential in their abilities to make employees do more than what was expected from them at work. Similarly, Seltzer & Bass (1990); Bass and Riggio (2006) asserted that transformational leaders commanded by mentoring, inspiring and encouraging their subordinates to use novel methods for problem solving. Transformational leaders consider the leadership as a process that stimulates and inspires their followers and enhances their leadership capacities as well. Moreover, transformational leaders increase the followers' level of awareness about the value of the output and upgrading their success (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leadership provides a flexible approach to change, which allows a leader's personal style and the context to vary and help the organization solve problems (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Marks & Printy, 2003). Transformational leadership creates commitment, motivation and empowerment in individuals (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Bass, 1996; Burns, 1978; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Zhang & Bartol, 2010) and inspires followers to go beyond their own self-interest to achieve high levels of performance and organizational goals (George & Jones,

2012; Hetland et al., 2011; Schermerhorn et al., 2010). Transformational Leadership in educational setting moves individuals towards a level of commitment to achieve school goals by identifying and articulating a school vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, providing an appropriate model and having high performance expectations (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996).

Relationship between Transformational Leadership with School Effectiveness

Skillful school leadership is a key factor in explanation of school effectiveness (Hallinger, 2011; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Hallinger & Heck, 1998). School effectiveness as the school ability to accomplish their goals is highly dependent on leader's effectiveness (Hallinger, 2011; Marzano et al., 2005; Hallinger & Heck, 1998). Therefore, a key element of an effective school is an effective principal, which must be a visible and interactive part of the school environment (Whitaker, 1997). According to McFarlin & Sweeney (1998), the most successful leaders should be transformational leaders, which interact with subordinates to accomplish organizational goals (Yukl, 1999) and foster strong community support for the change by creating a vision for the organization and stimulating them at school (Bass, 1985; 1997). Furthermore, the success of school effectiveness efforts is dependent on principals' transformational leadership ability. These transformational leaders enabled and empowered constituents, provided resources and encouraging their employees by developing the vision of the effective school (Alexson, 2008).

According to review of literature, some researchers have empirically investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and school effectiveness. According to empirical studies, practicing transformational leadership by leaders in schools increases the level of school effectiveness by focusing their effort to long-term goals, building a shared vision, inspiring the teachers to follow their vision, and creating high performance expectations (Hallinger, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Harris, 2008; Jackson, 2000; Leithwood, et al., 2004). Thus, by practicing transformational leadership, the follower feels loyalty, trust, and respect toward the leader and they will be motivated to do more than they are expected which increases the level of school effectiveness (Leithwood, et al., 2004). Leithwood and colleagues between 1990 to 2006 examined the effect of transformational leadership on the outcomes of organizational conditions and student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Leithwood, et al., 2004; Leithwood et al., 2002, Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990). The findings of their studies indicated that transformational leadership dimensions have significant positive effects on teachers' work settings, student achievement and organizational conditions, which contribute to the school effectiveness. Leithwood (1994) found that, practicing transformational leadership behaviours such as setting direction through visions, goals, and high expectations; developing people through individualized support, intellectual stimulations, and modeling practices; redesigning the organization through culture, structure, and policies will enhance overall level of academic optimism and will provide a structure of effective school leadership (Leithwood et al., 2006). Furthermore, Leithwood & Sun (2012) indicated that transformational leadership dimensions had large effects on schools' working environment. Among all transformational leadership dimensions, strengthening school culture and building collaborative structures, have small but significant influences on teachers and school conditions. One possible explanation for increasing the level of school effectiveness by practicing transformational leadership is that when staff

ensures they have adequate involvement in decision making related to programs and instruction their activities toward school goals will be increased.

Cheng (1997) indicted that, in order to solve the deal with challenges of changing education environment and educational reforms, school principals must have a new set of leadership beliefs that can transform the traditional constraints, facilitate educational changes, develop appropriate school environment for school stakeholders to work and pursue long-term effectiveness in schools.

Marzano et al. (2005) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of research covering effective school leadership. According to Marzano et al. (2005) in effective schools, leaders are responsible to provide a clear vision, sharing values, beliefs, and feelings of a community, recognizing individual's needs and inspiring the organization to grow is all about professional development. Moreover, they indicated that the school leader is responsible for decreasing the amount of interruptions that impact instructional time, monitoring, and evaluating the teachers' activities and provide the specific feedback for them toward school achievement. School leaders ensures that teachers collaboration frequently interrelate to address common issues concerning the achievement of all students.

Methodology

Research Design

The framework of this study is based on a quantitative survey measure. The transformational leadership in the model is based on the conceptualization of Leithwood (1994) which was supported by Bass & Avilo (1999) transformational leadership theory. The model of transformational leadership is operationalized by transformational leadership questionnaire (TLQ) which is developed by Jantzi & Leithwood (1994). TLQ has eight constructs including developing shared vision, building goal consensus, holding high performance expectations, models behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, strengthening school culture, and building collaborative structures. These constructs serve as independent variables.

Location of the Study

This study was carried out in primary schools in Selangor, one state of Malaysia. Selangor state was selected because that is one of the most populated states (teacher populated) in the Malaysia (Department of Statistics, 2010). Moreover, according to the data provided by the Educational and Planning Research Division (EPRD) and Ministry of Education (MoE) , distribution of three Multi-ethnic schools based on their numbers and their urban and rural locations in Selangor is more than the other states of Malaysia (Department of Statistics, 2010; Shahadan, 2014).

Population and Sampling

The population in this study is collected from all primary schools" teachers in Selangor. The population in this study is the 20469 teachers in 488 primary schools in 6 districts of Selangor state, Malaysia (MoE, January 2013). The respondents of the study are the teachers from each of the 488 schools. According to the Cochran"s formula, the calculated sample size is 377. Therefore, the minimum sample size of this study is 377 primary schools" teachers. This number is supported and endorsed by the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) as for population size

of 20000 the sample size is 377. Thus, the sample size 377 found to be enough for the data analysis according to Cochran's formula. The researcher intended to use 30% for the percentage dropout in order to increase the sample size and to replace some of the questionnaire that might not to be retrieved back (Israel, 2009).

30% of the sample size is: $30/100 \times 377 = 113.1 + 377 = 490$ Respondents

Selection of teachers was done based on stratified random sampling, which is a type of probability sampling. In this research, 488 schools in 6 districts of Selangor, Malaysia were selected. As the first step of sampling, 488 schools divided into 6 strata and each strata divided to 2 subgroups of urban and rural. The total number of schools is 488 in 6 districts included 205 urban schools (149 National Type schools, 36 national Type Chinese schools and 20 National Type Tamil schools) and 283 rural schools (128 National schools, 43 National Type Chinese schools, and 112 National Type Tamil schools). In the second step, two schools were selected equally in each type of school from each district in urban and rural area. Next step is choosing the total number of each type of school in 6 districts. As far as mentioned, two schools were selected for each type of school in each district, total number of each type of school in 6 districts was 12 (6×2) that is an equal number in all 6 districts. As a result, 36 schools in urban and 36 schools in rural areas were selected. Therefore, 72 primary schools in six districts were chosen randomly from a list of primary schools in Selangor. In the next step, number of teachers was selected through stratified random sampling in equal size. According to Cochran's formula, the needed sample size was 490 teachers. In order to find the number of teachers in each school, the number of sample teachers was divided by total number of schools. As a result, 7 ($490/72$) teachers were chosen in each school and 14 teachers (2×7) in 6 districts of Selangor. The number of teachers in each type of school was 84 (12×7) teachers in 6 districts. The total number of teachers in urban location was 252 and in rural location was 252 as well. Therefore, by dividing number of teachers by number of schools in each location and type of schools the total number of teachers will be obtained 504, which is more than the number of sample population 490.

Data Collection

Data gathering process initiated by asking permission via a letter written to the "Malaysian Ministry of Education" in Putrajaya and "Federal Territory of Selangor" in Shah Alam to carry out the research in National type, National type (Tamil), and National type (Chinese) primary schools in Selangor. After receiving the permission and approval form "Malaysian Ministry of Education" and "Federal Territory of Selangor", a package containing the permissions, reference letter from Faculty of Education of, researcher's briefing letter, and 7 questionnaires (for seven teachers) distributed to each school of target population via Post (Pos laju Malaysia). For the popups of this research 72 Schools (2 schools for each type in each district in Selangor state) were randomly selected based on list of primary schools in Selangor, provided by Malaysian Ministry of Education (MoE), (2013) which categorized based on school types (Chinese, Tamil, National) and school locations (Urban, Rural). All respondents (7 teachers from each schools) were selected based on stratified random sampling (Ary et al., 2013). Researcher asked headmaster officially through researcher is briefing letter to distribute the questionnaires among teachers randomly from list of teachers' name. After one week, researcher called all the schools to notify the importance of the research work and kindly asked them to cooperate with completion of the questionnaires by respondents. After one-month researcher called to some schools that did not respond as reminder. Finally, after

following up, 410 questionnaires out of 509 (total distributed) gathered after two months (from 19, May 2014 to 20, July 2014).

Instrumentation

In this study, three types of questionnaires with 5-point Likert scale was used to collect information from respondents (Primary schools' teachers). The questionnaire is a useful and very common tool for quantitative data collection that provides statistical description, relationships and analysis (Johnson & Christensen, 2002).

All questions in three questionnaires, which were used in this study, are multiple choice questionnaire formats with a 5-point Likert scale. The Likert scale was developed by the American educator and organizational psychologist Rensis Likert in 1932 to improve the level of measurement in social research (Inforsurv, 2007).

Part A in the questionnaire included six items to measure demographic information of the respondents. Part B included 47 items to measure school effectiveness dimensions, which is designed based on the Lezotte & Snyder (2011) and Ghani (2014) questionnaire. Part C included 49 items to measure transformational leadership's dimensions by Jantzi & Leithwood (1994; 2006).

Instrument Translation

The questionnaires of school effectiveness (SEQ) and transformational leadership (TLQ) were originally developed in English language. The participants of this study were Malaysian primary schools' teachers. Hence, the questionnaires were translated into Malay language, for the convenience of responding. It was necessary to translate the three instruments from English to Malay language. The translation technique that used in the current study followed the forward-then-back translation approach (Chen et al. 2005). The process of translation of the three questionnaires was undertaken carefully to provide the most accurate Malay version of the questionnaires. The translation process was carefully carried out with the assistance of a bilingual instructor of English language, first, forward translation conducted from English to Malay language. Second, back translation from Malay to English language was done. Third, comparison between back translated version and original English version carried out to ensure that the Malay translation of questionnaire is conceptually equivalent to both English and Malay versions. During the process of forward-back translation the language and culture, concepts were taken into account when establishing conceptual equivalence between the original and back-translated versions (Chen et al., 2005). The result indicates a satisfactory level of questionnaire translation. After reconciling the differences and resolving problematic items, an independent, qualified and experienced PhD faculty member from Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) carefully monitored all the above processes and edited the last version of Malay translation. In order to apply the Malay version of three questionnaires formally, after the final revision, a pilot test conducted to check the validity and reliability of them.

Pilot Test

To achieve the reliability of instruments in this study two pilot tests were conducted. First, 20 primary school teachers selected from target population by random convenience sampling (Ary et al., 2013). The teachers were asked to complete and comment on any problems that

they had during answering the items of three questionnaires (SEQ, TLQ and OCBQ). Some teachers claimed and commented that some items were a little unclear and had some typing errors. After considering the comments, which were gained by teachers, it revealed that those problems were mainly related to the word order rather than selection of words. Therefore, the word orders of the items that were needed with maintaining the main idea and corrected typing errors were changed. Second, the instruments revised based on the panel ideas, a pilot test was conducted to further ensure the reliability of three questionnaires. Pilot-test allows the researcher to determine whether respondents have any difficulty with understanding of the questions, also identify the length of time needed to answer the questions (Zikmund, 2003).

According to Bradburn & Sudman (1979) a pilot-test of 20-50 cases are usually enough. Moreover, Malhorta (2007) stated that the size around 15 to 30 respondents is enough. Therefore, thirty teachers were selected randomly and thirty questionnaires were distributed personally. After they completed the questionnaires, some discussions took place to ensure that the questionnaires were appropriate, free from errors and teachers without problems understood all items. Finally, data analysis for Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the Pilot-test result was conducted by using SPSS version 20. The result of the reliability test on school effectiveness showed that Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the pre-test was (0.817) for the seven school effectiveness dimensions and 0.914) for the eight transformational leadership dimensions.

Data Analysis

After data gathering process, the data analysis conducted by the statistical tool SPSS version 20.0 (Statistical Package for Social Science). Data entered directly into the SPSS by using data entry interface. Descriptive and inferential statistics (Pearson product moment correlation) was performed.

Results

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Out of 410 teachers, 311 (75.9%) were female and 99 (24.1%) were male. In terms of educational level the results showed that 20 (4.9%) of respondents had certificate, 97 (23.7%) had diploma, 272 (66.3%) of respondents had bachelor degree, and 20 (4.9%) of respondents had master degree. In this study, only one (2%) respondents had PhD. A total of 132 (32.2%) of the respondents were teachers at National schools, 148 (36.1%) of the respondents were from National type Chinese schools, and 130 (31.7%) of them were teachers of National type Tamil schools. Out of 410 respondents, 230 (56.1%) of them were from rural schools and 180 (43.9%) of them were teachers of urban schools. The findings indicated that 96 (23.4%) of the respondents were between 25-30 and 103 (25.1%) were between 30 – 35 years old. The findings also showed that 13 (3.2%) of respondents were less than 25 years old and 198 (48.3%) were more than 35 years old. A total of 100 (24.4%) of the teachers had teaching experience between 5-10 years, 71 (17.3%) of them had teaching experience between 10-15 years, 74 (18%) of respondents had teaching experience between 15-20 years. The result also indicated that 105 (25.6%) of respondents had teaching experience less than 5 years and 60 (14.6%) of respondents had teaching experience above 20 years.

The Relationship

The results of Person Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) as shown in Table 1 indicated that the strongest significant relationship was found between models behaviour and overall school effectiveness ($r=.565$, $p<.001$). Developing a shared vision dimension was the second significant, positive and high correlation coefficient ($r=.519$, $p<.001$) in relationship with overall school effectiveness. According to the correlation coefficient, there was a significant, positive and moderate relationship between the level of holding high performance expectations and overall school effectiveness ($r=.456$, $p<.001$). The second significant, positive and moderate relationship was found between building collaborative structures and overall school effectiveness ($r=.442$, $p<.001$). This is followed by building goal consensus with correlation coefficient (r) of 0.441 which was significant at the 0.01 level ($r=.441$, $p<.001$). The fourth and fifth significant, positive and moderate relationships were found between providing intellectual stimulation ($r=.433$, $p<.001$) and providing individualized support ($r=.382$, $p<.001$) and overall school effectiveness respectively. The last significant, positive and moderate relationship was reported between strengthening school culture dimension and overall school effectiveness ($r=.305$, $p<.001$) (Cohen, 1988). It can be concluded that the level of transformational leadership's dimensions and level of overall school effectiveness have parallel relationship which means that an increase in the level of transformational leadership's dimensions will be resulted in an increase in the level of school effectiveness. Overall, the result revealed that there was a significant, positive and moderate relationship was found to exist between overall transformational leadership and overall school effectiveness with correlation coefficient (r) of 0.586 which was significant at the 0.01 level ($r=.586$, $p<.00$).

Table 1:

The relationship between variables

Variables	r	P	Level
Developing a shared vision	.519**	.000	High
Building goal consensus	.441**	.000	Medium
Holding high performance expectations	.456**	.000	Medium
Models behaviour	.565**	.000	High
Providing individualized support	.382**	.000	Medium
Providing intellectual stimulation	.433**	.000	Medium
Strengthening school culture	.305**	.000	Medium
Building collaborative structures	.442**	.000	Medium
Overall	.586	.000	High

Discussion

The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between transformational leadership dimensions (independent variable) and overall school effectiveness (dependent variable). Pearson correlation was employed to measure the relationships between transformational leadership's dimensions (Develop a shared vision, building goal consensus, high expectation for success, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, models behaviour, strengthening school culture and building collaborative structure) and overall school effectiveness. The results indicated that Models behaviour ($r=.565$; $p<.001$) and developing a shared vision ($r=.519$; $p<.001$) have a significant positive high correlation with overall school effectiveness respectively. It implies that if the mean

score for models behaviour and developing a shared vision increases, mean score for the overall school effectiveness will be highly increased. It means that headmasters by establishing organization values, articulating the school vision, serving as models of appropriate behaviour and making trust and respect between the followers will increase the level of school effectiveness. Whereas, building goal consensus, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, holding high performance expectation, building collaborative structure and strengthening school culture have a significant positive moderate relationship with overall school effectiveness as well. This means that if the mean scores of these dimensions increase, the level of school effectiveness will be moderately increased. These findings suggested that in Malaysia, headmasters should increase the practice of the transformational leadership dimensions in schools in order to enhance the level of school effectiveness.

These results are in line with Leithwood & Sun (2012) finding which indicated that, leaders influence school conditions through their achievements of a shared vision and goals for the schools, their high expectations and support of school members, practices that strengthen school culture and foster collaboration within the organizations.

Wayman et al., (2009) specified that the deployment of a developing shared vision dimension throughout the school might increase the level of school effectiveness. Therefore, the principal of an effective school has a clear vision and communicate that vision to the teachers and the other school members. Leithwood & Jantzi (2006) reported that transformational leaders learn to adapt their leadership style overtime with the goal of inspiring and empowering colleagues to achieve a common vision. Therefore, it is essential that the leaders involve all members of the learning community in the process of building the vision and articulating goals (Leithwood, 1994).

Several research findings by Giles"s et al., (2007) among school principals in New York, Belchetz & Leithwood (2007) among primary schools in Ontario, Wong (2007) in China schools and Mulford (2007) in Tasmania schools indicated that in successful school principals practicing the models behaviour and manage to set and maintain a sense of purpose and direction for their schools as well.

The result of study by Zembat et al., (2010) about school effectiveness in elementary school indicated that there is a positive and significant relationship between intellectual stimulation and individualized support with school effectiveness, which is in line with the findings of this study. Their results also indicated that leaders influence teachers mainly through people-developing practices, providing individualized support and intellectual stimulation. In another research, Leithwood & Sun (2012) stated that holding high expectations has significant relationship with teachers and school conditions.

According to MacNeil et al., (2009), principals" leadership impacts the culture of high expectations towards student performance. According to Leithwood & Jantzi (1997) usual communication of headmasters" high expectations for teachers will enhance the quality and effectiveness of the school. In another study, Leithwood & Sun (2012) specified that strengthening school culture and building collaborative structures, have small but significant influences on teachers and school conditions.

Overall, this study found that transformational leadership have significant positive relationship with school effectiveness ($r=0.586$, $p=.000$). According to Marzano (2003), the principal's professional leadership is needed by the effective schools because they are able to change the schools, teachers and students towards the positive. These results are in line with Hebert (2010) findings, which implied that, there is a positive relationship between school effectiveness and transformational leadership as perceived by teachers of 30 elementary schools in the United States. Likewise, Hoy (2013) reported that, there was a significant positive correlation between transformational leadership dimensions and school effectiveness. In addition, Abgoli & Sabeti (2013) findings among secondary schools in Shiraz city, Iran indicated that there was a positive relationship between managers' transformational leadership and school effectiveness. It showed, the higher the scores in managers' transformational leadership, the higher the scores were in school effectiveness.

Based on the meta-analytic review of 72 unpublished researches by Leithwood & Sun (2012) transformational leadership dimensions had large effects on schools' working environment and improved schools' instructions. In addition, Robinson et al., (2008) indicated that effectively practice of transformational leadership leads to enhancement in establishing goals, promoting teacher learning and development, high expectations, evaluating teaching and the curriculum, providing orderly and supportive environment. Similarly, the research conducted by Ghani et al., (2011) in excellent schools in Malaysia showed the strong correlation exist between principals' transformational leadership and successful practices of school effectiveness. Likewise, Pihie et al. (2001) reported that there is a moderately high and significant relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and school effectiveness as perceived by 89 aspiring secondary school principals in Malaysia. Therefore, it can be concluded that the level of transformational leadership dimensions and level of overall school effectiveness have parallel relationship which means that an increase in the level of transformational leadership dimensions will be resulted in an increase in the level of overall school effectiveness.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, several general recommendations and suggestions proposed for Ministry of Education, policy makers, schools' headmasters and teachers in educational sectors particularly as follows:

It is suggested that headmasters keep the level of their leadership practices towards improving the level of school effectiveness through building collaborative cultures and promoting collaboration by distributing leadership to teachers and other staff in order to motivate them for accomplishment of the school goals. This can be done by clarifying school goals and vision, providing opportunities for teachers to collaborate in school decision making and encouraging willingness for cooperation among them. Moreover, it is also recommended that headmasters encourage teachers to be creative in problem solving and cooperate with each other's on instructional improvement.

It is suggested that, to enhance the level of school effectiveness, headmasters create a climate of trust in their schools by respecting the school members' ideas and listening to them and clarify their positions and articulating a direction for school members. These practices by headmasters lead to establishment of a climate of trust in which the teachers and school staff

are motivated to go beyond their job descriptions and their own self-interest for sake of school goals.

It is suggested that educational policy makers and headmasters consider the school as a system in which the correlates of effective school are as a set of interdependent components that work together to accomplish the aim of effective school learning for all. It is also suggested that headmasters consider these correlates individually for the purpose of practicing, monitoring and planning for change in their schools. Moreover, it is recommended that headmasters embrace the correlates of effective schools and adopting practical process to implement them by considering the role of professional teachers to achieve the school goals.

It is suggested that Ministry of Education keep and improve the level of school effectiveness through maintaining the physical facilities in a safe, healthy and attractive condition. Additionally, they provide the opportunities to implement and monitor the use of appropriate discipline practices within their schools and provide opportunities for parents to be more involved in school activities by encouraging teachers and staff to engage them in the school events and programs more often. Besides, headmasters develop a guideline to manage the amount of time that teachers allocate on instructional and extracurricular activities. As well, headmasters assist the school members to relate their school improvement efforts and school goals in order to strengthen commitment to achieve them. Moreover, in order to achieve the school goals, it is recommended that headmasters establish an agreement with staff on school's goals and priorities and a willingness to help accomplish them.

It is suggested that Ministry of Education concentrates on transformational leadership dimensions, in their leadership training programs provided for headmasters in order to improve the school effectiveness. This can be achieved through holding up workshops, seminars and practical courses to teach the implementation of each transformational leadership dimensions and their impacts on school effectiveness. Moreover, it is recommended that headmasters act as transformational leader in their schools by considering the follower's needs, values and morals. Additionally, it is suggested that headmasters practice the models behaviour in their schools by playing as a role model for their followers and exhibit greater individual consideration. Furthermore, headmasters create a shared vision for instruction, provide professional development and other forms of support for teachers, and distribute leadership by giving them more roles.

Recommendations for Future Studies

According to the findings and conclusions of this study, several suggestions can be proposed for further study in general and particularly in primary schools as follows:

1. More researches could be conducted to compare the level of school effectiveness dimensions in primary schools and its level in secondary schools in Malaysia
2. The results of this study are limited only to six districts of Selangor state in Malaysia, thus the outcomes this study cannot be generalized to the whole population of primary schools in Malaysia; further studies could be conducted among schools in other states to confirm the results of this study.

3. This study conducted based on teachers' perception, it is strongly recommended to determine the relationship between transformational leadership with school effectiveness perceived by the other stakeholders particularly headmasters in schools.
4. More researches can be conducted to search for the other types of leadership for implementation of the effective schools.
5. Applying some factors, as moderators and mediators would provide in depth understanding about the relationship between transformational leadership's and overall school effectiveness, so further research is recommended to do with factors as mediator or moderator.
6. It is recommended that the relationship between transformational leadership with school effectiveness to be conducted in other Asian contexts to compare the attained effective factor in schools.
7. Use of self-report questionnaire may lead to an overestimation of some of the findings due to variance, therefore conducting qualitative research, using in depth interviews and case studies are recommended for comparative purpose.
8. This study has explored the differences between the level of transformational leadership and school effectiveness based on type of schools and location, so, further study recommended to examine the other demographic factors such as gender and teaching experience.

Conclusion

The major findings of this study revealed that there were a positive and significant relationships between transformational leadership dimensions and overall school effectiveness. The most remarkable relationships was found between Models behaviour ($r=.564$; $p<.001$) and developing a shared vision ($r=.516$; $p<.001$) with overall school effectiveness respectively. Headmasters by establishing an overall sense of vision in their schools, demonstrating the importance of continuous learning through visible engagement in their own professional learning and establishing a climate of trust and respect among the staff could enhance the level of school effectiveness. Therefore, it can be concluded that practicing these dimensions in the school by headmasters could enhance the level of school effectiveness considerably. Whereas, building goal consensus, offering individualized support, intellectual stimulation, models behaviour, holding high expectation, participation in school decisions and strengthening school culture have a significant positive moderate relationship with overall school effectiveness. This shows that headmasters should try to giving staff an overall sense of purpose for their work, stimulating and encouraging staff creativity, attending to individual opinions and needs, expecting high level of professionalism from staff, holding high expectations for success in school, distributing leadership broadly among staff collaboration for planning, establishing working conditions that facilitate staff collaboration for professional growth and encouraging collaboration for program implementation among staff.

References

- Abgoli, A. R., & Sabeti, Z. (2013). The study of the relationship between managers' transformational and transactional leadership styles and school effectiveness in secondary schools in iran. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 209-218. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1679254643?accountid=27932>.

- Albert-Green, D. F. (2005). Teachers', parents', and students' perceptions of effective school characteristics of two Texas urban exemplary open enrollment charter schools, PhD, Texas A & M University, Texas.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2013). *Introduction to research in education*. United States: Cengage Learning.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1996). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(4), 463-478.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. UK: Psychology Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, Research & Managerial Applications (3rd Ed.)*, New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Bradburn, N. M., & Sudman, S. (1979). *Improving interview method and questionnaire design*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Belchetz, D., & Leithwood, K. (2007). Successful leadership: Does context matter and if so, how? In *Successful Principal Leadership in Times of Change* (pp. 117-138). Netherlands: Springer.
- Botha, R. J. (2010). School effectiveness: conceptualizing divergent assessment approaches. *South African Journal of Education*, 30(4), 605-620.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management*. London: Sage Publication.
- Bush, T. (2011). Succession planning in England: new leaders and new forms of leadership. *School leadership & management*, 31(3), 181-198.
- Chen, H. C., Holton III, E. F., & Bates, R. (2005). Development and validation of the learning transfer system inventory in Taiwan. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(1), 55-84.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1997). *The Transformational Leadership for School Effectiveness and Development in the New Century*. Paper presented at the International Symposium of Quality Training of Primary and Secondary Principals toward the 21st Century. Nanjing, China.
- Dickinson, W. P. (2010). Leadership for change: a vital area for faculty development, continuing education and resident education. *Fam Med*, 42(9), 659-60.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. Paper presented at the National Invitational Conference, "Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice" Warrenton, VA.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behaviour*, 6th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall

- Ghani, M. F. A. (2008). The development of school effectiveness and improvement model. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Malaya, Malaysia.
- Ghani, M. F. A. (2014). Development of Effective School Model for Malaysian School. Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 19(10), 1334-1346.
- Ghani, M. F. A., Siraj, S., Radzi, N. M., & Elham, F. (2011). School effectiveness and improvement practices in excellent schools in Malaysia and Brunei. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 15(9), 1705-1712.
- Ghavifekr, S., Hoon, A. L. S., Ling, H. F., & Ching, T. M. (2014). Heads of Departments as Transformational Leaders in Schools: Issues and Challenges. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 2(3), 1625.
- Giles, C., Jacobson, S. L., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Against the odds: Successful principals in challenging US schools. In *Successful principal leadership in times of change* (pp. 155-169). Netherlands: Springer.
- Gkolia, A., Belias, D., & Koustelios. (2014). The effect of principals' Transformational leadership on Teachers' satisfaction: Evidence from Greece. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 69-80.
- Gray, J. (2004). School effectiveness and the „other outcomes“ of secondary schooling: A reassessment of three decades of British research. *Improving Schools*, 7(2), 185-198.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of education*, 33(3), 329-352.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the Principal's Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.
- Hamida, S. F., Nordin, N., Adnan, A. A., & Sirun, N. (2013). A Study on Primary School Teachers' Organizational Commitment and Psychological Empowerment in the District of Klang. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 90, 782-787.
- Harris, A., Day, C., & Hadfield, M. (2003). Teachers' perspectives on effective school leadership. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 9(1), 67-77.
- Hebert, E. B. (2011). The relationship between emotional intelligence, transformational leadership, and effectiveness in school principals. PhD, Georgia State University, Georgia.
- Hetland, H., Hetland, J., Schou Andreassen, C., Pallesen, S., & Notelaers, G. (2011). Leadership and fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs at work. *Career Development International*, 16(5), 507-523.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Iyer, M. G. (2008). Current Views of the Characteristics of School Effectiveness in the Context of National Secondary Schools from the Perceptions of Principals, Heads of Department and Teachers in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, PhD, University of Leicester, England.
- Jackson, D. S. (2000). The school improvement journey: Perspectives on leadership. *School*

- Leadership & Management, 20(1), 61-78.
- Jantzi, D., & Leithwood, K. (1996). Toward an explanation of variation in teachers' perceptions of transformational school leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(4), 512-538.
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. B. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kamaruddin, K. (2011). *Management of Effective Schools in Malaysia: Issues and Challenges*. Malaysia: Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.
- Kyriakides, L., & Creemers, B. P. (2008). Using a multidimensional approach to measure the impact of classroom-level factors upon student achievement: A study testing the validity of the dynamic model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 19(2), 183-205.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational administration quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Leithwood, K. (2012). *The Ontario Leadership Framework: with a Discussion of the Research Foundations*. Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Leithwood, K., Aitken, R., & Jantzi, D. (2006). *Making schools smarter: Leading with evidence*. Australia: Corwin Press.
- Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. *Handbook of research on educational administration*, 2(5), 45-72.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1997). Explaining variation in teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership: A replication. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(4), 312-331.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Oxford: McGraw-Hill International.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112-129.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. In *The essentials of school leadership* (pp. 31-43), UK: Sage Publication.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 17(2), 201-227.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 94-119.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: a meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387-423.
- Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1990). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of*

- research and practice. Madison, WI: National Centre for Effective Schools Research and Development.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1991). *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- Lezotte, L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- Lezotte, L. W., & Snyder, K. M. (2011). *What effective schools do: Re-envisioning the correlates*. Bloomington: Solution Tree Press.
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzuki, C. (1997). *Effective school studies in Malaysia: Model 5 factors* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Ministry of Education Malaysia, Education Data Sector, Educational Planning and Research Division. (2013). *Quick Facts 2013: Malaysia Educational Statistics*(ISSN:1985-6407). Retrieved from http://emisportal.moe.gov.my/emis/emis2/emisportal2/doc/fckeditor/File/Quickfacts_2013/quickfacts2013.pdf?PHPSESSID=ff0a607fc2c9dad2427f4b5147295970
- Ministry of Education Malaysia, Education Data Sector, Educational Planning and Research Division. (2013). *Quick Facts 2013: Malaysia*
- Moolenaar, N. M., Daly, A. J., & Slegers, P. J. (2010). Occupying the principal position: Examining relationships between transformational leadership, social network position, and schools' innovative climate. *Educational administration quarterly*, 46(5), 623-670.
- Mulford, B. (2007). Successful school principalship in Tasmania. In *Successful Principal Leadership in Times of Change* (pp. 17-38). Netherlands: Springer.
- Ngang, T. K. (2011). The Effect of Transformational Leadership on School Culture in Male Primary Schools Maldives. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 30(12), 2575-2580.
- Othman, M., & Muijs, D. (2013). Educational quality differences in a middle-income country: the urban-rural gap in Malaysian primary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 24(1), 1-18.
- Petty, N. W., & Green, T. (2007). Measuring educational opportunity as perceived by students: A process indicator. *School Effectiveness and school improvement*, 18(1), 67-91.
- Pihie, L., Akmaliah, Z., & Elias, H. (2001). Perceptions of Aspiring Malaysian Principals on Transactional, Transformational and Instructional Leadership Behaviours. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 10(1), 63-71.
- Ponnusamy, P. (2010). The relationship of instructional leadership, teachers' organisational

- commitment and students' achievement in small schools. Master Thesis, University Science Malaysia.
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational administration quarterly*, 44(5), 635-740.
- Salleh, M. J., & Saidova, P. (2013). Best practice of transformational leadership among multi-ethnic headteachers of primary schools, Malaysia. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 9(3), 1-9.
- Sammons, P., Thomas, S., & Mortimore, P. (1997). *Forging links: Effective schools and effective departments*. London: Sage Publication.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., Osborn, R. N., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2010). *Organizational Behaviour* (11th Edition), New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of management*, 16(4), 693-703.
- Shao, Z., Feng, Y., & Liu, L. (2012). The mediating effect of organizational culture and knowledge sharing on transformational leadership and Enterprise Resource Planning systems success: An empirical study in China. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 28(6), 2400-2413.
- Southworth, G. (2008). Primary school leadership today and tomorrow. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(5), 413-434.
- Sun, H., Creemers, B. P., & De Jong, R. (2007). Contextual factors and effective school improvement. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 18 (1), 93-122.
- Wayman, J. C., Brewer, C., & Stringfield, S. (2009). Leadership for effective data use. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Wong, K. C. (2007). Successful principalship in Shanghai: A case study. In *Successful principal leadership in times of change* (pp. 139-153). Netherlands: Springer.
- Yaakub, N. F., & Ayob, A. M. (1993). Principals' Leadership Style and School Performance: Case of Selangor Secondary Schools. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 1(1), 19-25.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The leadership quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.
- Zembat, R., Koçyiğit, S., Tuğluk, M. N., & Doğan, H. (2010). The relationship between the effectiveness of preschools and leadership styles of school managers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 2(2), 2269-2276.
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), 107-128.
- Zikmund, W.G. (2003) *Business Research Methods* (7th ed.). Ohio: South-Western.