

Leadership and School Culture of Mainstream and Special Primary Schools

A. S. Antoniou¹ & Maria Gioumouki²

¹Assistant Professor of Psychology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

²Primary Teacher, MSc Special Education, MSc School Leadership, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i5/4113>

DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i5/4113

Published Date: 06 April 2018

Abstract

Different leadership models as well as leadership skills are of interest to both the research area and the school environment. More specifically, in recent years, school leadership and school culture have been studied as two interrelated parameters of school units. The purpose of the study reported here was to investigate the relationship between the leadership of mainstream and special primary schools in terms of Extra Effort, Effectiveness and Satisfaction and their correlation with the dimension of School Culture. Another goal of the study was to examine the influence of specific demographic variables on the key factors of Leadership and School Culture. The sample consisted of 526 primary school teachers working in primary schools (PS) across Greece: 120 Headteachers/Assistant Headteachers of mainstream PS, 106 Headteachers /Assistant Headteachers of Special PS, 150 teachers of mainstream PS and 150 teachers of Special PS. The participants completed the Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004) and the Questionnaire for School Culture (SCEQ) (Cavanagh & Dellar, 1997). Results showed that there were statistically significant differences in the sub-scales of Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Effectiveness, and Joint Planning with regard to gender and type of school. In addition, Transformational Leadership is significantly related to Transactional Leadership and Leadership Outcomes, and Transformational Leadership is related to the subscales of School Culture. The findings of this research will be discussed in the context of formulating proposals for the key role of school leadership in the school environment of the future.

Keywords: School Leadership, Characteristics of Headteachers, Forms of School Leadership, School Culture, Transformational Leadership.

Introduction

School leadership has been found to represent one of the main components to the overall success of the school (Greenberg & Baron, 2013). The aim of investigations is finding an effective form of leadership, which will lead to the effectiveness of the school unit (Armstrong, 2017; Pashiardis & Johansson, 2016). The key person is the head teacher, who is

characterized by specific abilities-skills, making him/her special in the school environment, often a model to be followed.

At the same time, the issue of school culture has interested the scientific community, which seeks to examine the factors that contribute to its existence. In addition, the school has shown that culture promotes a positive school climate, which amplifies the effectiveness of both the teaching staff and the students. An important role in shaping the culture is that of the head teacher, who can provide examples of teaching excellence and can motivate staff towards training, shaping a future vision, contributing to successful staff collaboration, making the right decisions and who has the ability to solve the crises that may arise in the school environment (Cavanagh & Dellar, 1997; Godfrey, 2016).

All of the above contribute to shaping the school, the effectiveness of which is composed as follows: implementing leadership, permanence of personnel, structure and organization of the curriculum, staff development, maximizing teaching time, recognition of school success, parent involvement and support, joint planning and collegial relations, sense of community, clear targets and common expectations (Ghamrawi, 2011).

Theoretical Background

Transformational Leadership

It has been noted that transformational leadership is considered a participatory type of leadership (Rehman & Waheed, 2012). Thus, the transformational leadership is applied from the leader and subordinates. Therefore, the leadership is not applied by one person. (Bass, 1985).

Utilising the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Bass and Avolio (1997) developed a complete model of leadership and proceeded to identify five factors that represent the key components of transformational leadership style, namely:

Idealized Influence (as a feature) in the team member's recognition that the leader has a mission and a possible vision and can identify with him/her.

Idealized Influence (as behavior) refers to the behavior of the leader who leads to the above recognition and identification.

Inspirational Motivation refers to the behavior of the leader who motivates and inspires the team members providing meaning and challenges in their work.

Mental Stimulation is demonstrated when the leader encourages team members to take initiatives to be innovative and creative, to challenge the mainstream, to redefine problems and approach situations in new ways.

Individualized Care occurs when the leader communicates at an interpersonal level with the team members in order to highlight their individual goals and develop their skills.

Transactional Leadership

According to the model of Bass and his associates, Transactional Leadership refers to the two way relationship between the leader and the subordinates (Avolio, Bass, & Yung, 1999; Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990). The negotiating process can metaphorically be considered as the form that utilises the benefits of leadership. The aim is an agreement. Finally, positive reinforcement rewards good work and the improved performance of exchange between the leader and the subordinates (Hulpia & Devos, 2010; Sergiovanni, 1991).

Specifically, Bass and Avolio (1997) identified three factors that constitute the core components of this leadership behavior.

Contingent Reward refers to an exchange of rewards between leaders and followers in which effort is rewarded by providing rewards for good performance or threats and disciplines for poor performance.

Active Management concerns cases where the leaders are characterised as monitors who detect mistakes.

Passive Management pertains to cases wherein the leader intervenes only when major problems or errors arise (Barnett, McCormick, & Conners, 2000; Burns, 1978).

School Culture

The culture of school unit is defined by various aspects. It is argued that the culture of a school unit represents the image of the members themselves. Also, it refers to topics that are accepted by all members of a school (Headteacher, teachers, students) and which deepen their ties as they become simultaneously a distinct identity from the members of other schools. Overall, the school culture reflects the broader climate of the school and affects its effectiveness (Cheng, 2000; Lountzis & Antoniou, 2013; Maslowski, 2001).

The “culture” of the school becomes obvious from the first visit via: the condition of the school building, learning achievements, satisfaction of students and teachers and communication between the school and society (Hargreaves, 1995; Peterson & Deal, 1998; Turan & Bektas, 2013).

Finally, school culture consists of the attitudes, opinions, values and behaviors that represent the people who study or work at the school and the successful combination of specific external and internal parameters. Cavanagh and Dellar (1997) developed a model of culture that presents relations between six cultures and their contribution to the overall culture of the school. These elements are as follows:

Professional Values: relate to the value attributed to the social institution of education and the application of pedagogical principles at work.

Emphasis on Learning: revolves around the learning program of each school and the extent to which the school is a learning community.

Partnership: includes proposals and intentions for interpersonal relationships between teachers and their need to be strengthened.

Cooperation: involves interaction among teachers, focusing on a more formal relationship that refers to the operation of the school.

Joint Planning: is a mental figure that assumes that teachers have a mutual understanding of the goals and objectives of their school, and participate in the planning of programs and evaluation taking into consideration common goals and purposes.

Transformational Leadership: refers to the role of the leadership of the school in terms of support for teachers and school programs.

Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of the current research was to investigate the relationship between the leadership styles of Headteachers in mainstream and special primary schools and teachers perceptions of mainstream and special schools for Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction as well as the correlation of parameters of the School Culture among them. An individual research objective was to investigate the possible impact of specific demographic variables on the key factors of leadership and school Culture.

Sample

The sample consisted of 526 primary school teachers working in primary schools throughout Greece. Of these, 120 were Headteachers/Assistant Headteachers of mainstream primary schools, 106 were Headteachers /Assistant Headteachers of special schools, 150 were Teachers at mainstream primary schools and 150 were Teachers at special schools.

Research Instruments

To address the research objectives of the study the following research tools were utilised:

a) M.L.Q. (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) (Form-5x) (Bass and Avolio,2004). The questionnaire includes 45 five-grade scale Likert type questions.

b) The SCEQ (Culture Elements School Questionnaire)-(Cavanagh and Dellar,1997). The questionnaire includes 42 five-grade scale Likert type questions.

Results

Demographic data of Headteachers/Assistant Headteachers of mainstream and special schools

Table 1 presents the demographic data and information regarding the profession. Most participants were men (63.7%, n = 144) whilst women represented 31.4% (n = 82) of the sample. Of the participants, 68.6% (n = 155) were Headteachers and 31.4% (N = 71) were Assistant Headteachers. 75.7% (N = 171) of Headteachers/Assistant Headteachers were married, 14.6% (n = 33) were unmarried and 9.7% (n = 22) indicated other marital status. Most participants (53.1%) (n = 120) were headteachers of mainstream schools, and the remaining 46.9% (n = 106) were from special schools. 56% (N=112) hold a master's degree, 42.5% have a university degree (n = 85) while just 1.5% (n = 3) has a doctoral degree. 15.2% (n = 15) of the sample indicated that they intend to leave the profession. Finally, 41.4% (n = 41) of participants indicated that they discuss work problems with their partner, 55.6% (n = 55) discussed problems with colleagues, 16.2% (n = 16) discussed problems with their relatives, 28.3% (n = 28) discussed problems with friends and 16.2% (n = 16) discussed problems with other persons.

Table 1:

Demographic data for Headteachers/Assistant Headteacher

Category	Description	N	%
Gender	Male	144	63.7
	Female	82	36.3
Work Status	Headteacher	155	68.6
	Assistant Headteacher	71	31.4
Marital Status	Married	171	75.7
	Single	33	14.6
	Other	22	9.7
Higher Level of Studies	BSc	85	42.5
	Msc	112	56
	PhD	3	1.5
Type of education	Mainstream	120	53.1
	Single	106	46.9
Thoughts about leaving the profession over the last 5 years	Yes	15	15.2
	No	84	84.8
Problems with:			
Partner	Yes	41	41.4
	No	58	58.6
Colleague	Yes	55	55.6
	No	44	44.4
Relatives	Yes	16	16.2
	No	83	83.8

Demographic data of teachers of mainstream and special schools

As shown in Table 2, most participants were men (60.6%, n = 182) while women represented 39.4% (n = 118) of the sample. 68.3% (n = 205) of participants hold a permanent teaching position, 18.3% (n = 55) are employed in deputy education and 13.4% (n = 40) hold an hourly paid position. In terms of marital status, 78.3% (n = 235) were married, 11.7% (n = 35) were single and 10% (n = 30) indicated other marital status. Half of the participating teachers were employed in mainstream schools and half were employed in special education schools. 33.3% (n = 100) of participants hold a master's degree and 62.5% have a university degree (n = 195) while just 4.2% (n = 5) has a doctoral degree. 18.3% (n = 55) of participants indicated that they intend to leave the profession. 42.5% (n = 85) of participants indicated that they discuss professional problems with their partner, 56.2% (n = 95) with their colleagues, 25% (n = 50) with their relatives and 25% (n = 20) with a friend. 25% (n = 20) of participants indicated that they discuss their problems with someone else, including the headteacher.

Table 2:

Demographic data for Teachers

Category	Description	N	%
Gender	Male	182	60.6
	Female	118	39.4
Work Status	Permanent	205	68.3
	Dependent	55	18.3
	Hourly	40	13.4
Marital Status	Married	235	78.3
	Single	35	11.7
	Other	30	10
Higher Level of Studies	BSc	195	62.5
	MSc	100	33.3
	PhD	5	4.2
Type of Education	Mainstream	150	50
	Special	150	50
Thoughts about leaving the profession over the last 5 years	Yes	55	18.3
	No	245	81.7
Problems with:			
Partner	Yes	85	42.5
	No	115	57.5
Colleague	Yes	95	56.2
	No	75	43.8
Relatives	Yes	50	25
	No	150	75
Friends	Yes	50	33.3
	No	100	66.7
Other	Yes	20	25
	No	60	75

Differences in Average Scores

The Mann-Whitney test was applied to look for differences in average scores for the factors of each scale with regard to gender, position held, desire to leave the profession and school type (mainstream or special school). Differences with regard to gender were identified for the subscale of "Transformational Leadership" ($Z = -2.083$, $p\text{-value} = .037 < 5\%$), "Transactional leadership" ($Z = -3.212$, $p\text{-value} = .001 < 5\%$) and "Effectiveness" ($Z = -2.192$, $p\text{-value} = .028 < 5\%$). Women demonstrated significantly higher scores for "Transformational leadership" ($M = 3.21$ vs. $M = 3.36$), "Transactional Leadership" ($M = 2.12$ vs. $M = 2.37$) and "Effectiveness" ($M = 3.37$ vs. $M = 3.54$).

As to the location of the participants, differences were observed for the subscale of "Transformational Leadership" ($z = -2.766$, $p\text{-value} = .006 < 5\%$) and "Extra Effort" ($z = -2.357$, $p\text{-value} = .018 < 5\%$). The headteachers showed the highest scores rated by teachers in

relation to “Transformational leadership” ($M = 2.79$ vs $M = 3.08$) while teachers showed the highest scores rated by headteachers for “Extra Effort” ($M = 2.80$ vs $M = 3.20$).

As to the desire to leave their profession, differences were observed for the School culture subscales: “Partnership and Cooperation” ($Z = -2.843$, $p\text{-value} = .004 < 5\%$), “Joint Planning” ($Z = -2.293$, $p\text{-value} = .022 < 5\%$), “Support for the Implementation of Vision” ($Z = -2.741$, $p\text{-value} = .006 < 5\%$) and “Emphasis on Learning” ($Z = -3.438$, $p\text{-value} = .001 < 5\%$). Teachers who do not wish to leave their professional position exhibited a higher score for “Partnership and Cooperation” ($M = 3.30$ vs. $M = 3.50$), “Joint Planning” ($M = 2.90$ vs. $M = 3.25$), “Support for Implementation of Vision” ($M = 2.82$ vs. $M = 3.11$) and “Emphasis on Learning” ($M = 2.90$ vs. $M = 3.31$).

Regarding type of school, differences were observed for “Passive” Leadership ($Z = -2.227$, $p\text{-value} = .026 < 5\%$) with teachers at schools of general education demonstrating higher scores ($M = .72$ vs. $M = .53$). Differences were observed for “Joint Planning” ($Z = -1.775$, $p\text{-value} = .076 < 5\%$) with special education teachers obtaining a higher score ($M = 3.17$ vs. $M = 3.37$).

To determine whether there were statistical differences for the MLQ subscales and school Culture in terms of educational attainment and marital status the use of Kruskal-Wallis identified the following:

There were differences in terms of marital status, for the subscale of “Transformational Leadership” ($Z = 13.842$, $p\text{-value} = .001 < 5\%$), “Ability” ($Z = 7.404$, $p\text{-value} = .025 < 5\%$) and “Partnership and Cooperation” ($Z = 16.202$, $p\text{-value} = .000 < 5\%$). Married participants scored higher for “Transformational Leadership” ($M = 3.34$ vs. $M = 3.06$, $M = 3.01$), “Ability” ($M = 3.40$ vs. $M = 3.17$, $M = 3.055$) and “Partnership and Cooperation” ($M = 3.48$ vs. $M = 3.39$, $M = 3.26$).

Differences in level of education were also identified for the subscales of “Transformational Leadership” ($Z = -2.766$, $p\text{-value} = .006 < 5\%$) and “Extra Effort” ($Z = -2.357$, $p\text{-value} = .018 < 5\%$) with those holding a master's degree obtaining higher scores than university graduates and Doctorate holders with regard to “Transformational leadership” ($M = 3.38$ vs. $M = 3.29$, $M = 3.21$) and “Extra Effort” ($M = 3.44$ vs. $M = 3.32$, $M = 3.00$).

Table 3:

Differences in MLQ and School Culture scores with regard to gender, work status, desire to leave the profession and type of school

	Gender		Desire to abandon		Work Status		Type of school	
	Z	p-value	Z	p-value	Z	p-value	Z	p-value
Transformational Leadership	-2.083	.037	-1.422	.155	-2.766	.006	-.319	.749
Transactional Leadership	-3.212	.001	-.103	.918	-.248	.804	-.732	.464
Passive Leadership	-1.542	.123	-.341	.733	-.835	.404	-2.227	.026
Extra Effort	-1.370	.171	-1.436	.151	-2.357	.018	-1.090	.276
Effectiveness	-2.192	.028	-1.537	.124	-.227	.820	-.458	.647
Ability	-.186	.852	-.751	.453	-1.175	.240	-1.052	.293
Partnership and Cooperation	-.737	.882	-2.843	.004	-.123	.902	-.658	.510
Joint Planning	-.334	.738	-2.293	.022	-1.625	.104	-1.775	.076
Transformational Leadership	-.320	.749	-1.008	.313	-1.541	.123	-1.591	.112
Support for the Implementation of Vision	-.050	.960	-2.741	.006	-.019	.985	-.847	.397
Emphasis on Learning	1.289	.592	-3.438	.001	-1.122	0.262	-.790	.430

Correlations between the Questionnaires

Pearson coefficient was used to exam correlations between the questionnaires.. The results demonstrated statistically significant correlations between the variables. Specifically, "Transformational leadership" was positively correlated with "Transactional Leadership" ($r = .343$) and there was a strong positive correlation with "Extra Effort" ($r = .612$), "Effectiveness" ($r = .592$), and "Ability" ($r = .742$) and a weak negative correlation with "Passive Leadership" ($r = -.326$). "Transactional Leadership" showed a weak positive correlation with "Extra Effort" ($r = .215$), "Passive Leadership" ($r = .281$), "Effectiveness" ($r = .072$) and "Ability" ($r = .040$). "Passive Leadership" showed a weak negative correlation with "Effectiveness" ($r = -.289$) and a weak negative correlation with "Ability" ($r = .316$) and "Extra Effort" ($r = -.160$). Finally, "Effectiveness" had a strong positive correlation with "Ability" ($r = .653$) and a moderate positive correlation with "Extra effort" ($r = .522$) whilst for "Ability" a moderate positive correlation with "Extra Effort" was also observed ($r = .514$).

Table 4:

Correlations between MLQ's subscales

	Transformational Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Passive Leadership	Extra Effort	Effectiveness	Ability
Transformational Leadership	1.000	.343**	-.326**	.612*	.592**	.742**
Transactional Leadership	.343**	1.000	.281**	.215*	.072	.040
Passive Leadership	-.326**	.281**	1.000	-.160	-.289**	.316**
Extra Effort	.612**	.215*	-.160	1.000	.522**	.514**
Effectiveness	.592**	.072	-.289**	.522*	1.000	.653**
Ability	.742**	.040	-.316**	.514*	.653**	1.000

Furthermore, in terms of the School Culture variables the results demonstrated that "Partnership and Cooperation" correlated with "Joint Planning" ($r = .501$) with a strong positive correlation, and with "Transformational Leadership" ($r = .254$) with a moderate positive correlation, with "Support for Implementation of Vision" ($r = .589$) with a strong positive correlation with "Emphasis on Learning" ($r = .460$) with a moderate correlation. "Joint Planning" was largely positively associated with "Support to the Implementation of Vision" ($r = .665$) and "Emphasis on Learning" ($r = .562$) and moderately positively associated with "Transformational Leadership" ($R = .145$). "Transformational Leadership" was positively correlated at a low level with both "Support for Implementation of Vision" ($r = .211$) and "Emphasis on Learning" ($r = .068$). Finally, "Support for the Implementation of Vision" was positively correlated at a high level with "Emphasis on Learning" ($r = .524$).

Table 5:

Correlations between the School Culture's subscales

	Partnership and Cooperation	Joint Planning	Transformational Leadership	Support for the Implementation of Vision	Emphasis on Learning
Partnership and Cooperation	1.000	.501**	.254**	.589**	.460*
Joint Planning	.501**	1.000	.145	.665**	.562*
Transformational Leadership	.254**	.145	1.000	.211*	.068
Support for the Implementation of Vision	.589**	.665**	.211*	1.000	.524*
Emphasis on Learning	.460**	.562**	.068	.524**	1.000

Finally, correlations were identified between the forms of leadership and the subscales of School Culture. The results showed a moderate positive correlation of "Transformational Leadership" and the "Partnership and Cooperation" ($r = .375$), a moderate positive correlation with "Joint Planning" ($r = .483$), a strong positive correlation with the eponymous variable ($r = .814$) and a moderate positive correlation with "Support for Implementation of Vision" ($r = .353$) and "Emphasis on learning" ($r = .327$). In parallel, the "Transactional Leadership" related positively and weakly with "Partnership and cooperation" ($r = .181$) and moderately positive with "Joint Planning" ($r = .223$), "Transformational leadership" ($r = .238$), "Support for Implementation of Vision" ($r = .277$) and "Emphasis on learning" ($r = .323$). "Passive Leadership" showed a weak negative association with "Partnership and cooperation" ($r = -.186$) and "Emphasis on learning" ($r = -.092$) and a moderate negative association with "Joint Planning" ($r = -.214$), "Transformational Leadership" ($r = -.402$) and "Support for the Implementation of Vision" ($r = -.359$).

Table 6:

Correlations between School Culture's subscales and forms of Leadership

	Partnership and Cooperation	Joint Planni ng	Transformatio nal Leadership	Support for Implementation Vision	Emph asis of on Learni ng
Transformati onal Leadership	.375**	.483**	.814**	.353**	.327* *
Transactiona l Leadership	.181**	.223**	.238**	.277**	.323* *
Passive Leadership	-.186**	- .214**	-.402**	-.359**	- .092* *

Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusion

In addressing the research questions, we identified statistically significant differences in sex for the scale of "Transformational Leadership" (p-value = .037 <5%), "Transactional Leadership" (p-value = .001 <5%) and "Effectiveness" (p-value = .028% <5%). Women scored higher on three subscales of leadership. It seems that women behave more transformational and transactional and emphasize effectiveness. However, statistically significant differences were observed in the subscales of school culture. The above findings contradict Stogdill surveys (1974), Jacobson and Effertz (1974) and Deaux (1979), who had expressed the opinion that women are not effective in leadership. However, our findings are in line with the views of Bass (1999) Carless of Hackman and Furniss (1997) and Kark (2012), who believe that the woman is a transformational figure, while Eagly and Carli (2003) consider the woman as effective in applying transformational or transactional leadership.

Regarding the position of participants in the school (Headteacher/Assistant Headteacher) a statistically significant difference was observed for the subscale of "Transformational Leadership" (p-value = .006 <5%) and "Extra effort" (p-value = .018 <5%). Specifically, the headteachers showed higher scores than teachers for the "Transformational leadership", while teachers showed higher scores for the subscale of the "Extra Effort". It is observed that headteachers apply the transformational leadership style, while teachers emphasize further and continuous efforts as a result of the leadership style applied.

As to the type of school (mainstream or special school), statistically significant differences were observed for the subscale of "Passive Leadership" (p-value = .026% <5%) and for "Joint Planning" (p-value = .076% <5%), which is a subscale of school culture. More specifically, the general school teachers demonstrated higher scores for "Passive", while teachers of special schools exhibit higher scores for "Joint Planning". Thus, it is concluded that teachers of mainstream schools tend towards the absence of leadership behaviour while teachers of special schools seem to have developed the sense of partnership and cooperation for the mutual understanding of the goals of the school and jointly designing programs that promote their achievement.

The above findings agree with the results of the survey of Rayner and Ribbins (1999), which expressed the view that teachers of special schools place emphasis and value on

relationships, personal development, effective management and positive attitudes towards education. Meanwhile, Leithwood et al. (2006) felt that leadership in special schools tends to be transformative. Concerning other demographics, statistically significant differences in terms of desire to leave the profession were observed for the subscales of school culture "Partnership and Cooperation" (p-value = .004 <5%), "Joint Planning" (p-value = .022 <5%), "Support for Implementation of Vision" (p-value = .006 <5%) and "Emphasis on learning" (p-value = .001 <5%). Specifically, teachers who do not wish to leave their profession showed higher scores on the above subscales. The result depicts a logical consequence, as teachers who work in a collaborative environment, with support and positive interactions, will show less desire to desert their profession.

In terms of marital status, statistically significant differences were identified for the subscale of "Transformational Leadership" (p-value = .001 <5%), "Ability" (p-value = .025 <5%) and "Partnership and Cooperation" (p-value = .000 <5%). In particular, married participants obtained higher scores for all three subscales. Thus, it seems that the existence of the family promotes collaborative behavior as well as the capacity to apply a transformational leadership style.

In terms of education level, statistically significant differences were observed for the subscale of "Transformational Leadership" (p-value = .006 <5%) and "Extra Effort" (p-value = .018% <5%). Holders of master's degrees displayed higher scores on the two subscales above. It seems that the further training of teachers brings positive results with regard to applying transformational behavior. Regarding the last three demographic variables, the research questions were confirmed in respect of the subscales of "Transformational Leadership", "Ability", "Partnership and Cooperation", "Extra Effort", "Joint Planning", "Support for Implementation of Vision" and "Emphasis on learning".

Subsequently, "Transformational Leadership" related positively with the "Transactional Leadership" and strongly positively with the "Extra Effort", "Effectiveness" and "Ability". "Transactional Leadership" was weakly positively correlated with "Extra Effort", "Effectiveness" and "Ability". "Passive" was weakly negatively correlated with "Effectiveness", "Ability" and "Extra effort". "Effectiveness" has a strong positive correlation with "Ability" and a moderate positive correlation with "Extra Effort". These findings are in line with the investigations of Sergiovanni (2001) and Leithwood et al. (2006). Sergiovanni (2001) expressed the opinion that transactional leadership is an essential element of transformational leadership. Leithwood et al. (2006) argued that transformational leadership style is a type of participatory leadership, which encourages and supports staff to engage in further effort and effectiveness.

With regard to the school's culture subscales, a strong correlation was identified between "Partnership and Cooperation" "Joint Planning" and "Support for the Implementation of Vision", while a moderate positive correlation was identified for "Transformational leadership" and "Emphasis on Learning". "Joint Planning" has a strong positive association with "Support for Implementation of Vision" and "Emphasis on learning", while it has a weak positive correlation with "Transformational leadership". "Transformational leadership" relates weakly positively with "Support for the Implementation of Vision" and "Emphasis on learning". On the contrary, "Support for the Implementation of Vision" related strongly positively with "Emphasis on learning". The above findings are consistent with the findings of the investigations of Minckler (2013), who argued that school culture factors relate to each other. Specifically, "Joint Planning" related with the

“Emphasis on learning”. These results are confirmed by Everard and Morris (1999) and Hoyle, English and Steffy (1998).

Finally, there was a correlation between the three leadership styles and subscales of school culture. According to the results, it was found that “Transformational leadership” as a leading style had a positive association with “Transformational leadership” as a subscale of school culture. This is a measure of concurrent validity of the scale. In addition, there were moderately positive associations with the remaining subscales of school culture. “Transactional Leadership” relates moderately and positively with the subscales of school culture, and moderately negatively with “Passive”. This implies that the lack of leadership skills in a school unit is a basic aspect that can lead to absence of school culture. The same conclusion was reached by Mlekanis (2005), who argued that the transformational leadership style is directly related to the establishment of relations among the teachers, school vision and emphasis on learning and student progress.

The current study may form the basis for further research. As the sample is limited (n = 527), future studies could involve a larger sample to ensure that the results are credible and more representative. In addition, the conduction of research on personnel working in special education and diagnostical structures will bring to light more interesting findings. As far as the authors are aware, such research has not been conducted previously and an integrated opinion about school leadership and school culture will be configured.

References

- Armstrong, P. (2017). Successful school leadership: international perspectives. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 65(2), 263-264.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
- Barnett, K., McCormick, J., & Conners, R. (2000). Transformational leadership in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(1), 24-46.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), 26-40.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: theory, policy and practice. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 391-406.
- Bush, T. (2008). From management to leadership. Semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 36(2), 271-288.
- Bush, T. (2010). The national professional qualification for headship: The key to effective school leadership?. *School Leadership & Management*, 18(3), 321-333.
- Carless, S. A. (1998). Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Roles*, 39, 887-902.
- Carpenter, D. (2014). School culture and leadership of professional learning communities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29(5), 682-694.

- Cavanagh, R. F., & Dellar, G. B. (1997, March). *Towards a model of school culture*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Chao, K. J., Lin, C. Y., Ma, C. M., Lai, J. C., Ku, C. Y., Kuo, H. W., & Chao, C. I. (2011). Relationship among sexual desire, sexual satisfaction, and quality of life in middle- aged and older adults. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 37*(5), 386-403.
- Cheng, Y. C. (2000). Cultural factors in educational effectiveness: A framework for comparative research. *School Leadership & Management, 20*(2), 207-225.
- Danielson, Ch. (2007). The many faces of leadership. *Educational Leadership, 65*(1), 14-19.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 807-834.
- Everard, B., & Morris, G. (1999). *Effective education administration* (D. Kikizas, trns.). Patra: Greek Open University.
- Ghamrawi, N. (2011). Trust me: Your school can be better- A message from teachers to principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 39*(3), 333-348.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (2013). *Behavior in organizations*. London: Pearson.
- Godfrey, D. (2016). Leadership of schools as research-led organisations in the English educational environment: Cultivating a research-engaged school culture. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 44*(2), 301-321.
- Hackman, M. Z., Furniss, A. H., & Peterson, T. J. (1992). Perceptions of gender role characteristics and transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 75*(1), 311-319.
- Hallinger, P. (2010). Developing instructional leadership. *Studies in Educational Leadership, 11*, 61-76.
- Hargreaves, D. (1995). School culture, school effectiveness and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 6*(1), 23-46.
- Harris, A. (2010). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts. *School Leadership & Management, 22*(1), 15-26.
- Hoy, K. W., & Miskel, G. C. (2005). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. N.Y.: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
- Hoyle, J., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1998). *Skills for successful 21st Century school leaders. Standars for peak performers*. Arlington. VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Hulpia, H., & Devos, G. (2010). How distributed leadership can make a difference in teachers' organizational commitment? A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 565-575.
- Jacobson, B. M., & Effertz, J. (1974). Sex roles and leadership: Perceptions of the leaders and the led. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12*(3), 383-396.
- Jensen, R. (2016). School leadership development: What we know and how we know it. *Acta Didactica Norge, 10*(4), 48- 68.
- Kark, R. (2012). Does valuing androgyny and femininity lead to a female advantage? The relationship between gender role, transformational leadership and identification. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*, 620-640.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful school leadership. What it is and how it influences pupil learning*. Nottingham: NCSL.

- Maslowski, R. (2001). *School culture and school performance: An explorative study into the organizational culture of secondary schools and their effects*. Amsterdam: Twente University Press.
- Minckler, H. (2013). School leadership that builds teacher social capital. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(5), 657-679.
- Nesis- Isik, A., & Gursel, M. (2013). Organizational culture in a successful primary school: An ethnographic case study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(1), 221-228.
- Pashiardis, P., & Johansson, O. (2016). *Successful school leadership: International perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Peterson, K., & Deal, T. (1998). How leaders influence culture of schools. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 28-30.
- Rayner, S., & Ribbins, P. (1999). *Headteachers and leadership in special education*. Herfordshire: Harmer Green Lane.
- Rehman, R. R., & Waheed, A. (2012). Transformational leadership style as predictor of decision making styles: Moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Commercial Society Science*, 6(2), 257-268.
- Sergiovanni, Th. (2001). *Leadership. What's in it for schools?* London: Routledge & Falmer.
- Starrat, R. J. (2001). Democratic leadership theory in late modernity: an oxymoron or ironic possibility. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(4), 333-352.
- Stedman, L. C. (1987). It's time we changed the effective school formula. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(3), 215-227.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Turan, S., & Bektas, F. (2013). The relationship between school culture and leadership practices. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 52, 155-168.
- Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent reward behaviour the augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 15(4), 381-394.