Teachers' Perceptions on Transformational Leadership Based on Demographic Differences

[1]Baharak Talebloo, [2]Ramli Bin Basri, [3]Soaib Bin Asmiran, [4]Aminuddin Hassan

[1]Ph.D. Candidate, Education Faculty, University Putra Malaysia
[2,3,4]Education Faculty, University Putra Malaysia

Abstract: Transformational leadership emphasizes emotions and values sharing and aims at fundamental reform of individuals and the whole organization capacity. It has contributed to development in terms of motivation and commitment in problem solving as well as implementation of reform initiative.The purpose of this study was to determine the level of transformational leadership in primary schools in Malaysia based on demographic differences. 144 primary school teachers from 24 schools in six district of Selangor were selected based on stratified random sampling. Data were collected based on survey method and were analysed using descriptive and independent t-sample test and one way-ANOVA. According to the findings the level of transformational leadership was high based on teachers' perceptions. Furthermore, result of analysis indicated that there among transformational leadership dimensions there was significant difference between national, chines and Tamil teachers' perception in individualized support and collaborative in decision making. The findings based on differences in transformation leadership by location showed that teacher perceptions in urban area higher in modelling behaviour and straight school culture than the rural teacher's perceptions. The findings of this study have implications for how close or far the schools move towards 2010 Malaysia vision and which transformational leadership factors need to be focused on more.

Key words: Transformational Leadership · Primary Schools · School Locations · Type of School · Malaysia

INTROUDUCTION

Educational organizations have changed dramatically during the last decade in an effort to increase effectiveness. Therefore, School effectiveness and educational reform need to discussed new leadership toward adopted with school challenges and administrators who can manage the daily process of school and who are able to articulate a vision for success, inspire others to embrace the vision and have the ability to make the necessary changes. Bass [1, 2] indicated that there was much attention on the development of leaders at the upper hierarchical levels of the organization. Lunenburg Stated that new organizational paradigms that include the sharing of information, decentralization of decision-making authority. Therefore, as a result of reform there is need leader who are capable of driving the process system to be effective and sustainable, empowering others to take responsibility. This is called transformational leadership [2]. According to Leithwood

[3-10] transformational leadership concept is including building school vision, establishing school goal, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, organization values, emphasizes followers' needs, demonstrating high performance expectations, creating a productive school culture and developing structures for encourage follower to participate in school decisions. These are necessary conditions for a school strong in academic optimism. Based on the results of the research regarding to transformational Leadership in Malaysia and other countries, schools can be autonomous and effective so that it has a significant effect on improving students' outcomes. According to Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025) for the transformation of the Malaysian education there is need high performance school leader in improving quality of education and transforming school visions and goals. The main problem according to transformational leadership is that, numerous studies carried out in Malaysia and other countries, focused on the relation

Corresponding Author: Baharak Talebloo, Ph.D. Candidate, Education Faculty, University Putra Malaysia.

between transformational leadership and student achievement. However, few works has been done on determined level of transformational leadership based on the demographic Furthermore, Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025) emphasises on demographic features such as gender and type of schools gap by 2020.

Furthermore, Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025) emphasises on demographic features such school location (urban and rural) and type of schools gap by 2020.These factors are important as well when it comes to school effectiveness and improvement. According to Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025) the ministry aspires to halve the current Urban-Rural gap by 2020 [9].

Transformational Leadership in School Setting: Transformational leadership defined by Burns (1978) as a process in which "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation, the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations" [38]. Bass (1985) added to the initial concepts of Burns (1978) to help explain how transformational leadership could be measured, as well as how it impacts follower motivation and performance. The leader transforms and motivates followers through his or her idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration. Based on Bass and Avolio (1995) theory, followers can be motivated and encouraged by leaders in order to obtain unexpected goals and achievement. As a result of transformational leadership, followers feel confident and strong enough to overcome challenges and difficulties.Ttransformational leadership has four components; idealized influence (vision that the leader conveys), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation (focuses on creativity and innovation) and individual consideration.

Leithwood and his colleagues have researched on the effects of transformational leadership on schools (Leithwood. Leithwood's model of transformational leadership provides a different perspective from the transformational leadership model by Burns, (1979) and Bass (1985). Leithwood's in this model attention to building productive community relationships, which is not addressed in earlier models. The Leithwood model includes eight dimensions: vision, group goals, high performance expectations, intellectual stimulation, individual support, modelling, school culture, Building collaborative structure. According to this model, in a successful transformational leadership in schools, all the aspects have to be considered.

Transformational leadership model by Leithwood (1994) include 8 dimensionsthat are categorized in 3 groups as follows: 1: Setting direction: focuses on a clear school vision, school goals and high performance expectations, 2: Developing people: motivating teachers through individual support, intellectual stimulation and modeling important values and practices, 3: Redesigning the organization: establishing a productive school culture and fostering collaborative decision making. According to this model, in a successful transformational leadership in schools, all the aspects have to be considered.

- *Building school vision:* behaviour on the part of the principal aimed at identifying new opportunities for his or her school staff members and developing, articulating and inspiring others with his or her vision of the future.
- *Establishing school goals:* behaviour on the part of the principal aimed at promoting cooperation among school staff members and assisting them to work together toward common goal.
- *Holding high performance expectations:* Behaviour that demonstrates the principal's expectations for excellence, quality and high performance on the part of the school staff.
- *Providing an appropriate role model:* behaviour on the part of the principal that sets an example for the school staff members to follow consistent with the values the principal espouses. Modelling is the best practices and important organizational values
- *Providing individualized support:* Behaviour on the part of the principal that indicates respect for school staff members and concern about their personal feelings and needs.
- *Providing intellectual stimulation:* Behaviour on the part of the principal that challenges school staff members to re-examine some of the assumptions about their work and rethink how it can be performed.
- *Productive school culture:* Leithwood *et al.,* (1999) acknowledge that there is much evidence to suggest that the culture of a school plays a big role in the success of the school. The culture of a school is the shared "norms, beliefs, values and assumptions" of the members of the school.
- *Fostering participative decision making:* The formal and informal opportunities for school staff to give their professional input for the purpose of making decisions). When teachers feel engaged in making

significant decisions they develop new beliefs in their capacity to not only make a difference in the classroom, but across the whole school as well.

Importance of the Transformational Leadership in School Setting: As result of transformational leadership in schools, leaders and follower can share values, schools teachers become more responsible and committed to changes in school and can identify factors that are more effective in school changes. Teachers become more committed to the mission of learning for all. Transformational leadership strategies helped improve teacher collaboration in schools if teachers feel appreciated by their principals. Furthermore, schools need administrators who can manage the daily process of school and who are able to lead teachers through the current school change and reform efforts. In such a complex and changing environment, a school administrator must be able to articulate a vision for success, inspire others to embrace the vision and have the ability to make the necessary changes happen. Moreover, transformational leadership studies has shown that, it has positive effects on several variables such as job behaviours, leadership behaviours and positive cultural ratings, positive perception of organizational, school culture, organizational commitment, organizational performance, effectiveness, job satisfaction, changed teacher practices, planning and strategies for change, pedagogical or instructional quality, organizational learning and collective teacher efficacy. Therefore, the occurrence and implementation of transformational leadership in school should contribute to organizational performance and effectiveness.

In addition, the results of study on transformational leadership could be significant to educators and researchers moving toward Malaysia 2025 vision. The ministry of higher education has an important role to improve school management, organizational effectiveness and national development toward achievement of vision 2020. Its contribution occurs through: 1: creating a productive school culture 2: Creating a structure of school decision-making, 3: Results in academic optimism, 4: Results in group processes, 5: Results in the conditions across the organization. As a result of this, the findings will illustrate how close or far the schools move towards 2010 Malaysia vision and which factors need to be focused on more. Transformational leadership in this research is defined as a form of principal leadership that moves individuals toward a level of commitment to achieve school goals by setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization and managing the instructional program. In order to examine the teacher's perceptions on transformational leadership based on demographic variable such as gender, academic and type of schools. This research aims to investigate:

- What is the level of transformational leadership dimensions in Malaysia primary schools based on teachers' perception?
- Are there differences in teachers' perception toward transformational leadership dimensions based on school location (urban or rural)?
- Are there differences in teachers' perception toward transformational leadership dimensions based on type of school?

MATERIALS AND MATHODS

Participants and Sampling: The target population of this study was teachersin primary schools in 6 destrict (Gombak, Hulu Langat, Hulu Selangor, Kelang, Kuala Langat and Kuala Selangor) in Selangor, Malaysia. The schools include National, Chinese and Tamil schools each consisting of urban and rural schools. According to Cochran formula, the sample size 375 teachers are enough for the data analysis. However, 30% for the percentage dropout in other to increases the sample size was done in this study. First, 488 schools divided to 6 strata and each strata divided to 2 subgroups of urban and rural. 2 schools were selected for each type of school in each district. Therefore, the total number of schools that were chosen as sample was 72 in 6 districts of Selangor. In next step, number of teachers was selected through stratified random sampling. According to the result, 7 teachers were chosen in each school. So the total number of teachers was 504. Finally, 410 questionnaires returned for this study.

Instrumentation: The research instrument was a questionnaire developed by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006). The questionnaire was divided into two sections; Demographic data and TLQ. This questionnaire consists of contained 50 items measuring the eight dimensions of principals' transformational leadership (1) Vision Identification, (2) Modelling, (3) Goal Acceptance, (4) Individualized Support, (5) Intellectual Simulation and (6) High Performance Expectations. A 5-point Likert scale

was be used with the responses ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.892, composite reliability was. 827 and convergent validity was 519. Thus, this showed that the questionnaire has a high reliability and valid.

Data Analysis and Findings: To analyse data, both descriptive analysis (mean, standard deviation and levels) and inferential analysis (independent t-test and One-Way ANOVA) were employed to answer research questions one and two. For first research question, in order to categorize data based on three levels of low, moderate and high, the following process has been utilized. Based on five point liker scale of the questionnaire, the lowest possible mean score is one and the highest possible mean score is five, so the subtraction is four. To calculate the range, four is divided by three (low, moderate and high) the result is 1.33. Therefore, the lowest is one while the highest for low level is 2.33. The moderate level is 2.34 to 3.66 and the high level is 3.67 to 5.

Demographic of Respondents: Thedemographic data shows that out of 410 participants in this study, the majority of respondents, 311 (75.9%) were female. Thedemographic data shows that the majority of respondents were from 35 and above years (n = 198, 48.3%) %). In terms of educational level the result showed that majority of respondents had bachelor degree (n=272, 66.3%). Majority of teachers in this study (n=198, 48.3%) had experiences of teaching below 5 years. Thedemographic data shows that the majority of respondents were from chines schools (n = 168, 41%) and rural schools (n=231, 56.3%).

Research Question 1: What Is the Level of Transformational Leadership Dimensions in Malaysia Primary Schools Based on Teachers' Perception?

Results in table 1 indicates that the teacher' perception on TL dimensions. TL is comprised of eight dimensions: (building school vision, establishing school goals, Holding high performance expectations, offering individualized support, modelling best practices and important organizational values, providing intellectual stimulation, creating a productive school culture and build collaborating structure). According to teachers' perceptions all of the dimensions rated at high level. The result indicated that the TL's dimension which obtains the highest score is item 3, "Holding high

performance expectations" (M=4.287, SD=.630)". This is followed by item 4 modelling behaviour (M=4.208, SD=.627). Finding indicated that item 1 "building school vision" (M=4.169, SD=.610) is third dimension with highest rank. Item 2, "establishing school goals" (M=4.012, SD=.576) was the fourth highest TL's dimension. Moreover, the result revealed that teachers' perceptions about item 7 "creating a productive school culture" was the fifth high dimension with (M=4.047, SD=.558). Followed by item 6 "providing intellectual stimulation" with rank of six (M=3.982 and SD=.657). The next highest dimension is item 8 build collaborating structure (M=3.975, SD=.551). The last dimension with high score is item 5" offering individualized support" (M=3.922, SD=.694). Overall, the level of TL is high (M=4.089, SD=.464). This data show that teachers perceive overall TL in their school at high level [11-39].

Research Question 2: Are there differences in teachers' perception on transformational leadership (TL) dimensions based on location (Urban-Rural)?

According to Table (2) the significant value for levenes' test (test of homogeneity of variance) for individual support and school culture are less than <.05. Thus for this score the homogeneity of variance assumption was not meet. Refer to the Table (2) there is no significant differences between teachers' perceptions in rural and urban schools about level of transformational leadership's dimensions (develop a shared vision, building goal consensus, holding high performance expectations, providing intellectual stimulation and participation in decision making) and overall transformational leadership. (P>.05).According to the result there is significant difference only in Strengthening school culture (t-test for equal variance not assumed (408) = -2.387, p =.017<.05) and modelling behaviour (t (408) = -2.08, p = .038<.05). Thus, the level of strengthening school culture, in urban schools (M=4.119) is higher than rural school (M=3.99) according to their mean score. Moreover, the level of "modelling behaviour", in urban schools (M=4.28) is higher than rural school (M=4.15). It can be concluded that school's location had no significant effects on the level of transformational leadership's dimensions except strengthening school culture and modelling behaviour.

Research Question 3: Are there differences in teachers' perception on overall transformational leadership based on type of school?

Table 1: Level of Transformational Leadershipbased on Teachers' Perception

No	Items	Mean	SD	Level	Rank
3	Holding high performance expectations	4.287	.630	High	1
1	building school vision	4.169	.610	High	3
6	providing intellectual stimulation	3.982	.657	High	6
7	creating a productive school culture	4.047	.558	High	5
4	modelling behaviour	4.208	.627	High	2
8	build collaborating structure	3.975	.551	High	7
2	establishing school goals	4.012	.576	High	4
5	offering individualized support	3.922	.694	High	8
	Overall	4.089	.464	High	

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N=410

Table 2: Independent sample t- test for differences in teachers' perception on transformational leadership (TL) dimensions based on location

		N	M	SD	Source	df	Mean difference	t	sig
Develop a shared vision	Rural	231	4.1714	.62028	Equal variances assumed	408	.0049	.081	.935
	urban	179	4.1665	.59943	Equal variances not assumed	388.783	.0049	.082	.935
Building goal consensus.	Rural	231	4.1223	.59292	Equal variances assumed	408	.0007	.014	.989
	urban	179	4.1215	.55735	Equal variances not assumed	393.113	.0007	.014	.989
Holding high performance expectations.	Rural	231	4.2673	.64245	Equal variances assumed	408	-.046	-.74	.456
	urban	179	4.3142	.61585	Equal variances not assumed	390.097	-.046	-.75	.453
Modelling behaviour	Rural	231	4.1521	.66448	Equal variances assumed	408	-.129	-2.0	.038
	urban	179	4.2817	.56951	Equal variances not assumed	403.834	-.129	-2.1	.034
Providing Individualized support	Rural	231	3.8647	.76566	Equal variances assumed	408	-.131	-1.9	.058
	urban	179	3.9958	.58268	Equal variances not assumed	407.879	-.131	-1.9	.050
Providing intellectual stimulation	Rural	231	4.0000	.65695	Equal variances assumed	408	.0399	.609	.543
	urban	179	3.9601	.65885	Equal variances not assumed	382.310	.0399	.609	.543
Strengthening school culture	Rural	231	3.9913	.60603	Equal variances assumed	408	-.128	-2.3	.021
	urban	179	4.1197	.48295	Equal variances not assumed	407.669	-.128	-2.3	.017
participation in school decisions	Rural	231	3.9491	.58315	Equal variances assumed	408	-.059	-1.0	.281
	urban	179	4.0084	.50621	Equal variances not assumed	402.728	-.059	-1.0	.272
Overall	Rural	231	4.0648	.49454	Equal variances assumed	408	-.056	-1.2	.225
	urban	179	4.1210	.42110	Equal variances not assumed	404.351	-.065	-1.2	.215

To answer this question, One-Way ANOVA method was conducted to shows whether there were significant differences among teachers in transformational leadership by type of school. ANOVA test Table (2) indicated no significant differences in means score among National type, Chines type and Tamil type schools on their perception towards transformational leadership except in level of Providing Individualized supportand participation in school decisions.Tukey test as a follow up-test was used to examine pairwise differences among mean scores of National, Chines and Tamil teachers in participation in school decisions. Becauseof the homogeneity of variance assumption was not met for individual support, there for Games-Howellwas used..

Based on teachers' perceptions, the level of "participation in school decisions" and individualized supportare significantly higher in the National Chinese type schools (M=4.05) compare to National Tamil type schools (M=3.86). Similarly, the level of individualized support are significantly higher in the National Chinese type (M=3.99) schools compare to National Tamil type schools (M=3.76). Overall, It concluded that, according to teachers' perceptions about the level of TL's dimensions (shared vision, holding high performance expectations, modelling behaviour, providing intellectual stimulation, Strengthening school culture) and overall TL were not significantly different based on type of schools (National, Chines and Tamil) in primary schools in

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA test for Transformational Leadership by Type of School

		N	M	SD	F	sig
Develop a shared vision	National	122	4.2590	.55844	2.188	.113
	Chinese	168	4.1548	.59928		
	Tamil	120	4.0983	.66812		
	Total	410	4.1693	.61053		
Building goal consensus.	National	122	4.1557	.52650	.585	.558
	Chines	168	4.1295	.57321		
	Tamil	120	4.0771	.63079		
	Total	410	4.1220	.57697		
Holding high performance expectations.	National	122	4.2910	.65977	.005	.995
	Chinese	168	4.2842	.56397		
	Tamil	120	4.2896	.69133		
	Total	410	4.2878	.63064		
Modelling behaviour	National	122	4.2073	.60890	1.115	.329
	Chines	168	4.2560	.59487		
	Tamil	120	4.1440	.68687		
	Total	410	4.2087	.62737		
Providing Individualized support	National	122	3.9836	.69587	4.684	.010
	Chines	168	3.9926	.56958		
	Tamil	120	3.7604	.81889		
	Total	410	3.9220	.69402		
Providing intellectual stimulation	National	122	3.9766	.69607	.559	.572
	Chines	168	4.0196	.61010		
	Tamil	120	3.9369	.68243		
	Total	410	3.9826	.65727		
Strengthening school culture	National	122	4.1276	.49310	2.816	.061
	Chines	168	4.0527	.54551		
	Tamil	120	3.9583	.62706		
	Total	410	4.0474	.55866		
Participation in school decisions-making	National	122	3.9795	.60779	4.054	.018
	Chines	168	4.0506	.48831		
	Tamil	120	3.8646	.55939		
	Total	410	3.9750	.55102		

Table 3: Tukey HSD test of Transformational Leadership by Type of School

Dependent Variable	Post-Hoc	(I) Type of school	(J) Type of school	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Providing Individualized support	Games- Howell	National	Chines	-.00895	.993
			Tamil	.22319*	.060
		Chines	National	.00895	.993
			Tamil	.23214*	.022
		Tamil	National	-.22319*	.060
			Chines	-.23214*	.022
Participation in school decisions	Tukey HSD	National	Chines	-.07109	.519
			Tamil	.11492	.232
		Chinese	National	.07109	.519
			Tamil	.18601	.013
		Tamil	National	-.11492	.232
			Chines	-.18601	.013

Malaysia. This means that type of school does not influence teachers' perceptions on the level of mentioned dimensions. Whereas, type of school does influence teachers' perceptions on the level of "participation in school decisions" and "individualized support". This means that teachers in three types of schools had same view regarding transformational leadership in their schools (Table 3).

CONCLUSION

The result of the study illustrated that all primary school teachers in six district in Selangor had a high level of transformational leadership perception in their schools. This could mean that the school had a positive attitude toward the importance of transformational leadership dimensions. According to the results, the dimensions of holding high performance expectations was higher than other dimensions. Moreover, individual support was the lower compare to other dimensions. The current research findings have consistent with research by Salleh and Saidova in Malaysia. Similarity, Selamat *et al*., illustrated that holding high performance had high level in Kelang area. Moreover, the result of this study supported by Geijsel et al.,and Leithwood and Jantzi and Leitwood and Sun in Netherlands and Canada. The findings of this study were supported by Yu, Leithwood and Jantzi (2002) which indicated the level of providing individualized support was lower compared to the other dimensions of transformational leadership as perceive by teachers.

Result of analysis on the level of TL based on the location of the schools, indicated that there was a significant difference between rural teachers and urban teachers' perception in just two dimensions of transformational leadership, "modelling behaviour and school culture.". According to the finding by Saidova et al., there is a difference between schools location in Urban and Rural in Malaysia.

Furthermore, result of analysis on the level of TL based on the type of the schools, indicated that there was no significant difference between national, chines and Tamil teachers' perception in overall transformational leadershipexcept on collaborative and individuals support. These findings were in line with Saidova et al.,findings. They assumed that there are no significant differences between ratings of teachers on overall qualities of teachers on the basis of nationalities of teachers.

Finding of this research show that there is significant different between chines and Tamil school based on individualized support and participation in school decision making. It is suggested that manager at Tamil school attention to participation with teachers in order to collaborating with their teachers decision making in their school. In addition, according to the result there was no significant difference between urban and rural.Malaysian Ministry of Education (2011) has been sending pre-promoted principals to principal courses trained in Institute AminuddinBaki (IAB). In response to these education changes and challenges, many schools have joined the quality movement and implemented various school quality improvement initiatives as a means to enhance competitiveness. It can conclude that this training was effective and principal leadership promote. Moreover it is suggested that to be consider in training regardsbuilding school culture and models behaviour to halve differences between urban and rural and teachers in this school follow consistent with the values the principal espouses for crating modelling best practices in their schools. In summary, for future research, it is suggested that the perceptions of other stakeholders such as parents and students should be considered. Moreover, other district should be considering for purpose of compare this result and other demographic variables such as teacher's years of experience and field of specialty can be examined.

REFERENCES

1. Bass, B.M. and B.J. Avolio, 1990. Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. [Electronic version], Journal of European Industrial Training, 14(5): 21-37.
2. Bass, B.M. and B.J. Avolio, 1995. MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire sampler set: Technical report, leader form and scoring key for MLQ Form 5x-Short. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
3. Lunenburg. F.C. and C. Allan, 2012. Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices, 6th Edition.
4. Leithwood, K., 1994. Leadership for school restructuring, Educational Administration
5. Leithwood, K., 2011. Leadership and student learning: What works and how. Leadership and learning, pp: 41-55.
6. Leithwood, K., 2012. Turning Around Underperforming School Systems: Guidelines for District Leaders.

7. Leithwood, K. and D. Jantzi, 1999. Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10(4): 451-479.

8. Leithwood, K. and D. Jantzi, 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.

9. Leithwood, K. and J. Sun, 2012. The Nature and Effects of Transformational School Leadership A Meta-Analytic Review of Unpublished Research. Educational Administration Quarterly, 48(3): 387-423.

10. Leithwood, K., D. Jantzi and A. Fernandez, 1994. Transformational leadership and teachers.

11. MacKenzie, S.B., P.M. Podsakoff and N.P. Podsakoff, 2011. Challenges oriented organizational citizenship behaviours and organizational efectiveness: Do challenges behaviours really have an impact on the organizations bottom line? Personnel Psychology, 64(3): 559-592.

12. Nguni, S., P. Sleegers and E. Denessen, 2006. Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. School effectiveness and school improvement, 17(2): 145-177.

13. Oguz, E., 2010. The relationship between the leadership styles of the school administrators and the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9: 1188-1193.

14. Organ, D.W., 1988. Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

15. Podsokoff, P., S. MacKenzie, R. Moorman and R. Fetter, 1990. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. The Leadership Quarterly, 1(2): 107-142 Quarterly, 30(4): 498-518.

16. RUTLEDGE II, R.D., 2010. The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Academic Optimism within Elementary Schools (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama TUSCALOOSA).

17. Salleh Mohamad Johdi and P. Saidova, 2013. Best Practice of Transformational Leadership among Multi-Ethnic Head teachers of Primary Schools, Malaysia. IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279 0845.www.Iosrjournals.Org, 3(9): 01-09.

18. Selamat, N., N. Nordin and A.A. Adnan, 2013. Rekindle Teacher's Organizational Commitment: The Effect of Transformational Leadership Behavior, Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 90: 566-574.

19. Smith, B., 2011. Who shall lead us? How cultural values and ethical ideologies guide young marketers' evaluations of the transformational manager–leader, Journal of business ethics, 100(4): 633-645.

20. Valentine, G., S. Holloway, C. Knell and M. Jayne, 2008. Drinking places: Young people and cultures of alcohol consumption in rural environments, Journal of Rural Studies, 24(1): 28-40.

21. Branson, R.K., 1987. Whay the schools can't improve: the upper-limit hypothesis. Journal of Instructional Development, 10(4): 5-26.

22. Brookover, W.B. and L.W. Lezotte, 1979. Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement, East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University.

23. Bush, T., 2011. Theories of educational leadership and management. Fourth Edition the University of Nottingham, UK. SAGE Publications Ltd.

24. T. and D. Glover, 2003. School Leadership: Concepts and Evidence: Full Report. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership.

25. Commitment to change. In J. Murphy and K. Louis (Eds), reshaping the principalship, Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc., pp: 77-98.

26. Di Paola, M. and W.K. Hoy, 2008. Principals improving instruction: Supervision, evaluation and professional development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

27. Education, M.O., 2012. Periliminary Report Malaysia Education Bluprint 2013-2025. Putra jaya: retrived from http//www.moe.gov.my/userfiles/file/PPP/Periliminary-Bluprint-Eng.pdf

28. Freeman, T.M. and L.H. Anderman, 2005. Changes in mastery goals in urban.

29. Geijsel, F., P. Sleegers and Berg, R. van den, 1999. Transformational leadership and the implementation of large-scale innovation programs, Journal of Educational Administration, 37(4): 309-328.

30. Getzels, J.W. and E.G. Guba, 1957. Social behavior and the administrative process. The School Review, 65(4): 423-441.

31. Ghani, M.F.A., S. Siraj, N.M. Radzi and F. Elham, 2011. School effectiveness and improvement practices in excellent schools in Malaysia and Brunei. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15: 1705-1712.

32. Harris, M. and D. Hopkins, 1997. Understanding the School's Capacity for Development: Growth Stages and Strategies, School Leadership and Management, 17(3): 401-11.

33. Hebert, E.B., 2011. The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership and Effectiveness in School Principals.

34. Hoy, W.K. and M. Di Paola, 2007. Essential ideas for the reform of American schools. Greenwich, CT: Information.

35. Hoy, W.K. and C.G. Miskel, 2008. Educational administration: Theory, research and practice, 8th edition. NewYork: McGraw-Hill.

36. Hoy, W.K. and C.G. Miskel, 2013. Educational administration: Theory, research and practice, 9th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

37. Hoy, W.K. and C.J. Tarter, 2004. Administrators solving the problems of practice: Decision-making cases, concepts and consequence, 2nd edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

38. Hoy, W.K. and C.J. Tarter, 2008. Administrators solving the problems of practice: Decision-making cases, concepts and consequence, 3rd edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

39. Lowe, K., K. Kroeck and N. Sivasubramanian, 1996. Effectiveness Correlates of Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of the MLQ Literature, the Leadership Quarterly, 7: 385-425.