

Effect of Leadership Behaviour of Principals on Students' Academic Achievement at Secondary Level: A Comparison of the Leaders and Teachers Perceptions

*₁ Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah, *₂ Muahamad Zafar Iqbal, *₃ Muhammad Amin, *₄ Uzma Quraishi
Email: tatlah@ue.edu.pk

This article reports a study aiming to investigate the affect of leadership behaviour of secondary school leaders on the academic achievement of the 10th grade students from public and private sector schools in Punjab, Pakistan. This study also explored if there was any difference in affect of leadership behaviour of principals as described by them and as described by the observers regarding students' academic achievement. A survey was conducted using Leadership Practices Inventory Self and Observers (LPI- Self & LPI-Observers). These inventories were comprised of 30 items separately. LPI-Self was served over 64 secondary school leaders / principals and LPI-Observer was served over 128 secondary school teachers who were the observers of the prevailing practices. Students' achievement score was taken from the annual examination results declared by the Board of Intermediate & Secondary Education. Regression Analysis was conducted to find out the effect of leadership behaviour and t statistics was applied to find out any difference between both of the perceptions. Moreover, there was effect of leadership behaviour of principals on students' academic achievement but there was a significant difference between the view point of the leaders and observers regarding this affect. A significant contrast between the observations regarding the affect of leadership behaviour on students' achievement as described by the principals themselves and as described by the observers was noted.

Keywords: *leadership behaviour, students' achievement, observers, leaders*

*₁ Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah (*Lecturer, University of Education Township Campus Lahore*)

*₂ Muahamad Zafar Iqbal (*Professor of Education, UMT Lahore*)

*₃ Muhammad Amin (*Assistant Prof , University of Education Township Campus Lahore*)

*₄ Uzma Quraishi (*Professor of Education, Lahore College for Women University*)

Introduction and Theoretical Background of the Study

Prevailing political, social and economic shifts in the environment in which schools are located, as well as significant changes in the education structure itself, such as the way educational institutions are managed; demand that school leaders need to be well developed to meet the challenges of the twenty first century (Northouse, 2010a). Moreover, increased competition, technological advancements, the global demands of a professional workforce and the diverse needs of students are just a few indicators of why school leaders need to be efficient and to continually foster development to enable their schools to be sustained within a challenging environment in an era of globalization (Bono and

Judge,2003; House and Javidan,2004).

There are several central forces within the continually changing educational context in which school leaders operate, such as school demographics, multifarious governance structures, accountability frameworks and the professionalization of teaching, that demand the use of informed leaders to cope with the challenges of the changing environment (Murphy,2002). These educational contexts are now more complex, dynamic and fluid than ever before, suggesting various scenarios that could affect the ways in which leaders perform their roles and deal with problems challenging them. Hanna and Latchem (2001) conclude that an increasingly uncertain, fast-paced and competitive environment is forcing change upon schools, and that leaders need

to focus on their leadership behavior to excel.

Research has consistently acknowledged and emphasized the critical role played by educational leaders in improvements of the performance of institutions, individuals and students (Al-Omari, 2008; Dimmock, 2003; Simkins, 2003). Regarding the significance of leadership in educational institutions, Simkins (2005) argues that “Leadership is one of the major factors or sometimes it seems the only factor that will determine whether an educational organization, be it a school, a college or a university, will succeed or fail”. This generally accepted notion is supported by significant initiatives undertaken for the development of educational leadership (Bush and Middlewood, 2005).

As leadership is considered very significant for improvement for individuals and school performance, it has attracted the attention of researchers, theorists and educational institutions, where programmes in leadership studies have been started, throughout the world (Northouse, 2010b). Some theorists conceptualize leadership as an attribute or behavior, whilst other researchers consider it the relational point of view (Northouse, 2010c).

Similarly, many of the definitions perceive leadership as a process by means of which a leader influences the students’ performance (Davies, 2001; Northouse, 2010d). According to Yukl (2002), the term leadership itself projects images of powerful, dynamic individuals who command victorious armies, build wealthy and influential empires, or alter the course of nations. Stated succinctly, people commonly believe that leaders make a difference and want to understand why. Bass (1990) states that leadership is often regarded as the single most important factor in the success or failure of institutions. Ogawa and Scribner (2002) defined the leadership as a wide, diverse, and a growing set of stakeholders which are known as leaders, and they are largely responsible for school performance.

School leadership is crucial to creating an environment in which teaching and learning can take place, and for the same cause Pakistani public school educators have been facilitating students regarding

their academic achievement. In Pakistan, thousands of education officers and principals are working to implement provisions of Education Sector Reforms for this purpose (Kronstadt, 2004). These reforms place demands on education officers, principals, and teachers to increase achievement of all students. Significant research has been conducted to recognize precise principal behaviours and leadership styles that impact academic achievement of the students.

Leithwood (2003) holds that:

“Educational leaders must guide their schools through the challenges posed by an increasingly complex environment. Curriculum standards, achievement benchmarks, programmatic requirements, and other policy directives from many sources generate complicated and unpredictable requirements for schools. Principals must respond to increasing diversity in student characteristics, including cultural background and immigration status, income disparities, physical and mental disabilities, and variation in learning capacities”.

Principals need strong leadership skills to successfully lead the schools of the twenty-first century and address school improvement pressures. Current educational reform has focused a great on the influence of leadership behavior on school progress (Harris, 2005). Leithwood (2004) argued the affective principal behavior in terms of transformational and transactional leadership styles. They are of the view that, ‘influence of principal on teachers’ teamwork has an effect on the behavior of principals’ and teachers’ regarding school improvement’.

Basically less has been targeted the relationship between principal leadership behavior and academic achievement of students. Moreover, dire need is to explore the perceptions of principals’ about their own leadership behaviour towards its effect on students’ academic achievement. Accordingly the perceptions of teachers’ about their principals’ leadership behaviour and its effect on students’ achievement is necessary to be investigated. In Pakistani scenario the difference between these perceptions of school leaders as stated by them and

as described by the senior school teachers is also required to be compared. Reason behind this belief is that school leaders are supposed to perform various duties instead of the activities regarding school development. Accordingly teachers are also officially involved in many of the functions other than school premises. In lieu of all these reasons this study will contribute towards finding the facts about students' academic achievement in the result of school leaders' behaviour.

Review of the Related Literature

Leadership is a highly complex concept to define, but most definitions focus on the exercise of influence (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1999), as the notion of efficient leadership has shifted from delegation and direction to collaboration and shared responsibilities (Crowther and Olsen, 1997). A recent concept about leadership has moved away from analyses of individual leaders either those in formal leadership roles or charismatic or informal leaders to "distributed leadership" (Gronn, 1999; Spillane, 2004). The term "distributed leadership" implies an advocacy for democratic leadership with a sharing of authority among principals, teachers and other stakeholders (Harris and Muijs, 2005).

According to Leithwood and Riehl (2005), "leaders engage in three kinds of activities that promote achievement. The first is setting direction that includes, but not limited to, establishing a shared vision and fostering the acceptance of group goals. The second is changing the organization by strengthening the culture, modifying organizational processes and changing structures. Finally, leaders can develop people by offering intellectual stimulation and offering individual support". Teacher leaders may engage in any of these activities through adopting any of the leadership styles.

Three machinery of Halpin (1963) classic premise for research on principals' Leadership Behaviour were used by Bridges to classify the body of experiential research on school representatives. The three constituents are the behaviour of the managers; the predecessor variables influence such behaviour, and conclusions, which at least reasonably could be attributable to the principal. In categorizing studies with approbation to outcomes,

Bridges (1982a) made distinction between those studies dealing with the impact which school controller have on school outcomes or students accomplishment.

In the administrators' impact studies, researchers attempted to conclude whether representative made computable dissimilarity in schooling. As observed by Bridges (1982b), researchers are far more likely to focal point on directorial health than executive achievement. In his words when considering the effect of school leaders: Organizational health refers to the extent to which the personnel remain intact as a group, and may be determined in terms of self-confidence, teamwork amongst group members working with one another (Halpin, 1966).

Hallinger and Heck (1996a) terminated that hypothetical and bureaucratic shifts (from positivist, to post-positivist, significant theory, and constructivist) taking place in the last ten years in the educational research arena did not have a larger blow on the studies of leaders establishment on school conclusions. The research on the connection between the two was mostly examined from a positivist suggestion and with a thoughtful dependence on quantitative method.

The concept of educational leadership style progresses with the passage of time through the past ten years, same the research of the blow of the school leader's style on the school. Many of researchers performed experimental studies in an effort to determine, at the time when the design of instructional leadership became established, if the instructional leadership jobs, behaviours, and actions and activities practiced by school leaders may be connected with students' accomplishments. The huge wave of research on instructional leadership happened in 1980s and 1990s as well.

Hallinger and Heck (1996b) used Pitner's (1988) association of representative have special consequences as situation for classifying forty studies on instructional leadership and students understandings published during the phase 1980 to 1995. All studies re-examine were side vision a land non-experimental in panorama, natural history organization that researchers had restrained or no pressure on sovereign variables.

In the area of principal's leadership, paradigm shifts instructional to transformational leadership, and have completed into a widespread decline in the number of studies purposeful on examining the instructional management style of school principals. The mainstream of the observed studies on school efficiency and instructional leadership have been carried out in the framework of the directing loosely attached educational system of domination in the U.S.A. Recent modifications related to the presentation of the standards-based improvement movement stress the instructional management features of school leaders. Amongst few quantitative studies in the post-1995 age, one conducted by Louis et al, controlling for applicable principal and school setting types such as race or customs, socioeconomic rank, and sexual grouping, Louis (1996) originated that affective leaders in high pricking schools worked productively to inspire professional disagreement, conversation and to create the networks of exchange that tied faculty together around common matters of instruction coaching and knowledge.

One of the most vital confronts for educational researchers is to identify assets of schools that make a real disproportion in academic achievement. While different 5 features of school organizational categorically have a strong association with student achievement, former factors within the control of schools emerge to be more important than Coleman and his followers understood. Recent research, using better data and more complicated and complex statistical supports than Coleman(2003) and his companion's accessible proves that numerous school belongings are as significant as school managerial health in clerical for academic victory (Goddard, 1998; Goddard & Woolfolk, 2000) faculty trust in students (Bryk & Schneider, 2003).

Each and every of this category can be overstressed by the deeds of leaders and other school persons in charge, and each one provides an understandable focus for efforts to improve academic realization of students.

Recently, Hoy and colleagues (Hoy, Miskel, Tarter & Woolfolk, 2005) have recommended that these metaphors may characterize the proportions of a solo covert create, which they identify educational

highlighting. Academic achievement is important and academic highlighting is a shared vision in the middle of faculty that the faculty has the ability to help students attain, and that students can be private to cooperate with those in this activity in short, a school wide self-assurance that students will succeed rationally.

Today, where obstacles and annoying times are frequent in education, it is especially important for principals to celebrate the small successes so that teachers will continue working diligently toward goals. Affective leaders are aware of the authority they have over their followers and work to inspire others to do great things. Affective leaders recognize individual happenings of others both publicly and genuinely. Recognition should be based on the values that reflect the goals of the organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2003c). They distinguish the importance of self-motivation. Strong principals are able to reward and distinguish for good work while helping and encouraging improving shortcomings. These principals are continually available to answer questions, show appreciation, and encourage others. Kouzes & Posner (2003d) included seven essential mechanisms in describing "Encourage the spirit": deposit clear principles, anticipate the best, personalize gratitude, pay concentration, tell the story, rejoice together, and set the models. They understand that showing appreciation for assistance and celebrating accomplishments is a strategy that is particularly motivating.

Celebrations and praise by leaders can be very motivating and stimulating for staff and can improve proves the culture of the whole organization. Glickman (2003) felt that school leaders, who connect with the hearts of staff, develop riotous behaviour and traditions that encourage teachers and students. Affective leaders focus on associations with people and maintaining a positive working environment. Goleman (2006) conducted a research and concluded that the indispensable task of a school leader declines to serving people get in to and stay in best situation in which they can work to their best facility.

Affective principals, acknowledging and build a caring and trusting environment by showing

approval for the efforts of teachers and other staff. Strong leaders strive to bring out the best in workers while maintaining high expectations and constantly giving encouragement and feedback.

School leaders have been usually firm on resource distribution and process requirements, in present era, leaders comprise additional tasks related to student achievement and the necessary skills to stimulate and show the way to all those who are authority on student learning and achievements (Kearns, 1995). Thus, the influential behaviors of the school leaders can have an impact on student achievement. Leadership behaviors are the lines or activities of an individual or a group attention to facet towards attaining a goal in a given condition (Hersey & Johnson, 1996).

There are a number of studies from a variety of contexts and settings which investigate the conceptual framework involving leadership behavior and Students' Academic Achievement to examine relationship between them; many of these studies reveal this relationship to be significant (Barth, 2001; Wilmore, 2002; Leithwood, 2003; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Cox, 2005; Covey, 2005; Golman, 2006; Sheppard, 2007; Rowland, 2008; Hoy & Tarter, 1997; Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2005).

The conceptual framework of this study includes the major variables of the study at hand like secondary schools principals' leadership behavior and Students' Academic Achievement. So the design of this framework is based on the major aim of the study i.e. to find out the effect of principals' leadership behavior on Students' Academic Achievement. Accordingly, Students' Academic Achievement is their grades obtained from the Board of Intermediate & Secondary Education. In the same fashion demographics of secondary schools considered for this study are gender of principals, teachers and students, type of schools like public or private, discipline of the students i.e. arts and science group.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study was delimited to only English medium public and private secondary schools.
2. Private schools only affiliated with Boards of

Intermediate & Secondary Education, and having total number of students not less than five hundred were included in the study.

3. Only those principals were selected who have been serving for the last two years in the same school from where teachers and students were selected.
4. Teachers who have been teaching 9th and 10th grades for the last two years were selected.
5. Students enrolled in the 9th grade in the beginning of the session and promoted to 10th grade were selected for this study.
6. Only senior teachers i.e. SSTs – secondary school teachers having graduation with at least B.Ed. were considered.
7. Those secondary schools having both academic disciplines i.e. science and arts groups were selected for the study.

Research Questions of the Study

1. Is there any effect of leadership behavior of principals on students' academic achievement as described by them and as described by observers?
2. Is there any difference in the leadership behaviour of secondary school principals as stated by them and as observed by the observers?

Methodology

The research design was an Ex-Post-Facto i.e. it dealt with the variables; the manifestation of which had already occurred. The variables of the study were not manipulated and were not under the direct control of the researcher. As Ex-post facto research is systematic empirical inquiry in which researchers do not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or they are not manipulated inherently (Silva, 2010a).

In this study, inferences about relationship among variables are made without direct intervention of independent and dependent variables. Basically, this type of research is based on a scientific and analytical examination of dependent and independent variables where independent variables are studied in survey for seeking possible and plausible relations and affects that independent variables produce changes on dependent variables. However, independent variable in this type of

research are not manipulated but have occurred already that sometimes also called attribute variables. Moreover, this is less costly and time consuming because establishing cause-effect relationship is more difficult than in experiments where independent variables are manipulated by the researcher (Silva, 2010b).

Population

All the secondary school principals and secondary school teachers and students of 10th grade in the Punjab province of Pakistan were the target population in this study and sample was selected from this population. Both male and female principals, secondary school teachers and tenth grade students of public and private secondary schools located in the Punjab were the accessible population. All 36 districts of the Punjab province, Pakistan were the population of this study.

Sampling Design

To get the true representative sample out of accessible population, four districts of Punjab province were selected on the basis of convenient sampling technique by dividing the Punjab province in three geographical regions. Selected sample out of these regions was Rajanpur district from Sothern region, Chakwal district from Northern region, whereas Jhang and Lahore districts were from Central region.

Schools in each selected district were divided into two strata i.e. public schools and private schools. Each stratum was further divided into two sub strata i.e. boys schools and girls schools. Eight boys and eight girls' schools were selected randomly from each district. Whereas, one principal, two secondary school teachers (SST). Moreover thirty students from each school were selected randomly.

The total sample was comprised of sixty four principals ($1 \times 64 = 64$), one hundred and twenty eight secondary school teachers ($2 \times 64 = 128$), and nineteen hundred and twenty students ($64 \times 30 = 1920$) from the selected districts.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

Prevalent literature on the Leadership Behaviour and Students' Academic Achievement lead towards

the most common instruments for data collection as given below;

1. Leadership Practices Inventory Self (LPI-S)
2. Leadership Practices Inventory Observed (LPI-O)
3. Students' Academic Achievement Score

1. Leadership Practices Inventory Self (LPI-S)

Leadership Practices Inventory Self developed and used by Kouzes & Posner (2003) was much suitable instrument for the study at hand. Since Martin in 2011 in his study "The relationship between principals' Leadership Behaviour and principal experience" also used this instrument. Its reliability and validity were well documented and proven. It was short and easy to fill out and this was the main cause of its wide usage throughout the world. Permission was sought through an e-mail from the developers to use the Leadership Practices Inventory Self (LPI-S). This was administered on principals of the sample schools.

To measure Leadership Behaviour of the Headteachers Leadership Practices Inventory- Self (LPI-S) developed by Kouzes and Posner in 2003 at 6 point Likert Scale from rarely to very frequently, was used. This Inventory is comprised of the 30 items, and it was pilot tested and Cronbach Alpha Reliability for this in Pakistani context was found 0.92.

2. Leadership Practices Inventory Observer (LPI-O)

To measure Leadership Behaviour of the Headteachers as observed by the Secondary School Teachers (SST), Leadership Practices Inventory Observers developed by Kouzes and Posner (2003) at 6 point Likert Scale from rarely to very frequently, was used. This inventory consists of 30 items measuring leadership behavior.

With reference to pilot testing of the second part of the research tool, Leadership Practices Inventory Observer, Cronbach Alpha Reliability in Pakistani context found was 0.86. Forty Secondary School Teachers (SSTs) randomly selected participated in this pilot survey outside research sample, 20 from public and 20 from private secondary schools. Permission was sought through an e-mail from the

developers to use the Leadership Practices Inventory Observers (LPI-O).

3. Students' Academic Achievement Score at Secondary level;

Students' Academic Achievement at secondary level is mostly defined as the marks obtained by the students in final examination held by the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education i.e. annual based summative assessment for 9th and 10th grade separately. That is why the achievement scores of students were obtained from the annual examination results of the Boards of Intermediate & Secondary Education of Punjab held in year 2013. The respective boards were; Board of Intermediate & Secondary Education, Lahore, Faisalabad, Rawalpindi, and Dera Ghazi Khan.

At secondary level, the process of development of question papers and evaluation, standard procedures are observed by a panel of assessment experts. Four Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education in Punjab allocated different science and arts subjects to subject specialists, head teachers and teachers to develop examination papers. Two days training workshop is conducted to train the paper setters and each paper setter prepares six sets of subject papers consisting of 12 Multiple Choice Questions, 22 Short Answer Test Items and 3 Extended Response Test Items. To ensure the

content validity of the test, chapter wise proportional weightage is conveyed to the paper setters. An expert of the relative subject is also appointed as coordinator who reviews all the test items and papers as a whole and makes changes if necessary. The Multiple Choice Questions are marked while short answers and extended response items are evaluated by already developed rubrics to eliminate biasness in the evaluation process.

Presentation and Description of the Analyzed Data

Collected data were analyzed by using SPSS and the demographics of the participants of the study are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents regarding gender and type of their schools. Five female principals were serving in boys private secondary schools instead of male leaders. Therefore, the number of female principal respondents was 57.81% that was greater than male principals whose percentage was 42.18%. Accordingly, female teacher respondents were also more in number as compared to the male teachers. Whereas, the percentage of female student respondents 48.17% was lower than that of the male student respondents which was 51.82%. Moreover, this table shows that the number of respondents from private and public schools was equal. Accordingly the descriptive statistics for the used data is presented in Table 2 below.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographics		Respondents		
		Principals	Teachers/Observers	Students
Gender	Male	27	54	995
	Female	37	74	925
Total		64	128	1920
Type of schools	Public	32	64	960
	Private	32	64	960
Total		64	128	1920

Table 2: Effect of Leadership Behaviour of Principals according to Observers on students' Academic Achievement

R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	df	F	Sig.
0.461	0.444	2	26.10	0.000

Table 3: Regression Coefficients of Leadership Behaviour of Principals as Described by them and according to Observers and Students' Academic Achievement

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	P
SA	370.36	58.36		6.34	.00
LBP-O	13.22	7.45	.18	1.77	.08
LPI-S	80.83	13.57	.59	5.95	.00

- a. Dependent Variable: Students' Academic Achievement (SA)
 b. Leadership Behavior of Principals as described by teachers (LBP-O)
 c. Leadership Behaviour of Principals as described by themselves (LPI-S)

Ho1 There is no significant effect of Leadership Behaviour of principals on Students' Academic Achievement as described by themselves and as described by teachers.

In order to find out the effect of Leadership Behaviour of principals on Students' Academic Achievement as described by the teachers and Principals themselves, Multiple Linear Regression was applied, and the results yielded are presented in the Tables 3& 4 respectively.

Table 2 describes that, F-test supports the predictive utilities of Leadership Behaviour of secondary school principals self and as observed by teachers on Students' Academic Achievement. Because R-square = 0.461, adjusted R-square = 0.444 and F = 26.10, which is significant at $p < 0.01$ with df = 2.

Table 3 presents the unstandardized coefficients for Students' Academic Achievement and Leadership Behaviour of secondary school principals according to teachers. Leadership Behaviour as described by teachers (LBP-O) $\beta = 13.22$, $t = 1.77$, $p > 0.01$ was not found statistically significant to Students' Academic Achievement. The null hypothesis claiming, no significant effect of Leadership Behaviour of principals on Students' Academic Achievement as described by the teachers, is therefore, accepted.

Moreover, this table also presents the unstandardized coefficients for Students' Academic Achievement and Leadership Behaviour of secondary school principals according to their own opinion. Leadership Behaviour as described by themselves (LBP-S) $\beta = 80.83$, $t = 5.95$, $p < 0.01$ was statistically significant to Students' Academic Achievement. The null hypothesis claiming, no significant effect of Leadership Behaviour of principals on Students' Academic Achievement as described by them, is therefore, rejected. Effect of Leadership Behaviour Self and Observer can be calculated through the following prediction equation;

$$Y = a + BX$$

Where Y = Dependent variable,

a = Intercept (constant),

B = Slope (increase or decrease coefficient of independent variable),

X = Independent variable

Therefore SA = $370.36 + 13.22$ (LBP-O) + 80.83 (LPI-S)

Calculation for both LPI-O and LPI-S are made separately as under;

$$\begin{aligned}
 &1\text{-Effect of Leadership Behaviour on Students' Academic Achievement according to teachers perceptions;} \\
 &SA = 370.36 + 13.22 \times \text{LPI-O Mean Score} \\
 &= 370.36 + 13.22 \times 2.80 \\
 &= 370.36 + 37.01 \\
 &= 407.37
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, according to teachers after the affect of Leadership Behaviour of Principals on Students' Academic Achievement score becomes = 407.37 on average. This score is statistically insignificant as shown in Table 7 that $p > 0.01$.

2- Effect of Leadership Behaviour of principals Leadership Behaviour on Students' Academic Achievement according to their own perceptions;

$$\begin{aligned} SA &= 370.36 + 80.83 \times \text{LPI-S Mean Score} \\ &= 370.36 + 80.83 \times 4.53 \\ &= 370.36 + 366.16 \\ &= 736.51 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, according to the perceptions of secondary school principals after the affect of their Leadership Behaviour on Students' Academic Achievement score becomes = 736.51 on average. This score is statistically significant because $p < 0.01$ as shown in the Table 7.

Ho2 There is no significant difference in Leadership Behaviour of principals as described by themselves and as described by the teachers of their schools.

In order to find out any significant difference between Leadership Behaviour of principals as described by themselves and as described by the teachers, t-statistics was applied to compare the means of both of the types of respondents i.e. principals and teachers. Results gained from this analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 4 describes that mean score for Leadership Behaviour self was 4.53 and for Leadership Behaviour as described by teachers was 2.90, and the highest mean score for this scale was 6. Whereas, SD is 0.69 and 1.22 respectively, and t-value (10.41) with $df = 63$ is significant at $p < 0.01$. Hence there was a significant difference between Leadership Behaviour of secondary school principals as stated by themselves and as described by teachers of their schools. Thus, null hypothesis claiming, no significant difference between Leadership Behaviour of principals as described by principals themselves and as described by the teachers of their schools, is therefore, rejected.

Table 4: Comparison of Principals' Leadership Behaviour of principals as described by them and as described by the Observers

Variables	N	M	SD	Df	t	P
Leadership Behavior of Principals Self (LBP-S)	64	4.53	.69	63	10.41*	.00
Leadership Behavior of Principals as described by Observers (LBP-O)	64	2.90	1.22			

* $p < 0.01$

Conclusion

Results shows that there is effect of leadership behaviour of principals on Students' Academic Achievement as described by them but according to the observers who were senior secondary school teachers there was not any effect of principals leadership behaviour on students' academic achievement. The achievement score of the students' is equal to 736 in the result of effect of leadership behaviour of principals on students; academic achievement. Whereas, the achievement score is 407 in result of the principals' leadership behaviour according to the opinion of the observers who were the senior secondary school teachers. Thus a huge difference in achievement score equal to 329 has been noted and the same is also supported by the significant difference in leadership behaviour according to them and according to the opinion of the observers.

This gap in perceptions seems true based on the scenario of our country regarding the job style and commitments of the public sector school principals. They have to perform different duties like House Census, Polio, Elections, Voter Lists Preparation, UPE Survey, Youth Festivals, Dengue Campaign, Examinations other than schools, and Meetings with high officials and society representatives apart from the academic commitments in official hours. These might be the reasons behind for less focus on the academic activities for the principals at secondary level due to which the observers opined that principals' leadership behaviour has less affect on students' academic achievement.

References

- Al-Omari, A.(2008). The Relationship between leadership styles of Hashmite University Department and job satisfaction as reported by faculty members. *University of Sharjah Journal for Humanities & social Sciences*,5(2), pp.101-124.
- Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make a difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *A Handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bono, J. and Judge,T.(2003). Self-concordance at work: Towards understanding the motivational affect s of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*,46(5),pp554-571.
- Bridges, E. M. (1982a). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-19801. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 12-33.
- Bridges, E. M. (1982b). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-19801. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 12-33.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational leadership*, 60(6), 40-45.
- Bush ,T.and Middlewood, D.(2005). *Leading and managing people in education*. London:Sage.
- Coleman, M.(2003). Gender and the orthodoxies of leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 23, 325-339.
- Covey, S. (2005). *Principal-centered leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Cox, E. (2005). Visioning: The principal's perspective. *connections: Journal of Principal Preparation and Development*, 6. Retrieved from <http://www.mrspagnolocentral.org>.
- Davies, J., Hides, M.T. and Casey, S. (2001).Leadership in Higher Education. *Journal of Total Quality Management& Business Excellence*, 12(7), pp.1025-1030.
- Dimmock , C.(2003). Leadership in learning-centered schools: Cultural context, functions and qualities, in Brundrett,M. et al. *Leadership in Education*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its

meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 479-507.

Glickman, C.D. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goleman, D. (2006). The socially intelligent leader. *Educational Leadership*, 64(1), 76-81.

Hanna, D. and Latchem, C. (2001). *Leadership for 21st century learning: Global Perspectives from Educational Innovators*. London: Kogan Page.

Harris, A. (2005). Distributed leadership. In B. Davies (Ed), *The essentials of school leadership* (pp. 173-190). London: Paul Chapman

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998a). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness, 1880-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998b). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness, 1880-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.

Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago.

Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1966). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (1996). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

House, R.J. and Javidan, M. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, Organization; The GLOBE study of 62*

Societies. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hoy, W.K., Miskel, C.G., Tarter, C.J., & Woolfolk. (2005) *Educational administration: theory, research, and practice* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kearns, K. P. (1995). Affective nonprofit board members as seen by executives and board chairs. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 5(4), 337-358.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003a). *Leadership Practices Inventory: Facilitator's Guide* (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003b). *Leadership practices inventory: Facilitator's Guide* (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003c). *Leadership Practices Inventory: Facilitator's Guide* (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003d). *Leadership practices inventory: Facilitator's guide* (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *Leadership practices inventory: Facilitator's guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kronstadt, K. A. (2004, December). Education Reform in Pakistan. Library of Congress Washington DC Congressional Research Service.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1999). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), p. 112-129.

Leithwood, K., & Reihl, C. (2003). *What do we already know about successful school leadership?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://www.cepa.gse.rutgers.edu/what%20wed%20know%20long_%20003.pdf

Leithwood, K., & Reihl, C. (2004). *What do we already know about successful school leadership?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Leithwood, K., & Reihl, C. (2005). *What do we already know about successful school leadership?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Louis K, PhiDelta Kappa & Marks H. (1996) Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools, *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(4), 757-789.

Murphy, J. (2002). *The Educational Leadership Challenges: Redefining Leadership for the 21st Century*. Chicago: NSSE.

Northouse, P.G. (2010a). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 5th ed. London: Sage.

Northouse, P.G. (2010b). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. 5th ed. London: Sage.

Northouse, P.G. (2010c). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. 5th ed. London: Sage.

Northouse, P.G. (2010d). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. 5th ed. London: Sage.

Ogawa, R.T., and Scribner, S.P. (2002). Leadership: Spanning the Technical and Institutional Dimensions of Organizations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(6), 576-88.

Pitner, N. J. (1988). The study of administrator affect s and effectiveness. *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration*. New York: Longman, 99-122.

Rowland, K. A. (2008). The relationship of principal leadership and teacher morale (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Pro Quest Digital Dissertations database.

Sheppard, L. (2007). The relationship between student performance and leadership practices as perceived by principals and selected sit-based decision making (SBDM) committee members of middle schools in region 5 education service center (ESC), Texas; A cohort study. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Texas A&M University, Texas.

Silva, C. (2010a). Expost facto study. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of research design*. (pp. 466-467). Thousand Osaka, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:10.4135/978142961288.n145

Silva, C. (2010b). Expost facto study. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of research design*. (pp. 466-467). Thousand Osaka, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:10.4135/978142961288.n145

Simkins, T., Sisum, C. and Memon, M. (2003). School leadership in Pakistan: exploring the head teacher's role. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 14(3), pp. 275-292.

Simkins, T. (2005). Leadership in education: what works and what makes sense? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 33(1), pp. 9-26.

Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2005). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership*. 61(7), 48-52.

Yukl, G.A. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.