EFFECTS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' LEADERSHIP STYLES ON LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

Mustafa ÖZGENEL
Department of Educational Sciences, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul, Turkey

*İsmail KARSANTIK
Department of Educational Sciences, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Rize, Turkey
*ismailkarsantik@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Leadership practices play a crucial role on teacher performance and hence the school effectiveness. Therefore, the principal focal point of the present research was to investigate the predictive level of the leadership styles of school principals for leadership practices according to teacher perceptions. In research, relational survey model was preferred from quantitative research models. The research population consisted of 7644 teachers and the research sample consisted of 404 teachers, all working at public schools in Istanbul. Data were collected using the "Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire" and "Leadership Practices Inventory." Data were analyzed by correlation and regression analysis techniques. According to the findings, a significant correlation was found between the leadership styles and leadership practices and its sub-dimensions. As perceived by teachers, the transformational leadership style affects the leadership practices positively while the laissez-faire style affects the leadership practices negatively. Although the transactional leadership style as perceived by teachers is significantly predictive of the leadership practices, the significance level was found not to be notable.

Keywords: *Leadership Styles; Leadership Practices; School Principals; Teachers*

INTRODUCTION

Rapid changes in science and technology cause individuals, societies, organizations and nations to experience changes in many fields such as social, economic and cultural. It seems impossible to avoid this change. Therefore, individuals, societies, organizations and states should adapt to this change. In fact, it is necessary to increase the competitiveness by leading change and innovation. Effective managers are needed more in order to survive and adapt to and manage changes successfully. Although leadership, as a domain that goes beyond a concept of social change (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 3) and is one of the oldest concerns of the world (Bass, 2000, p. 24) it has been a point of interest since the ancient times, scientific studies started in the early 20th century (Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh, & Al-Omari, 2008, p. 267). There are different views and the classifications for leadership theories (Bateman & Snell, 2009; Yukl, 2010). In the present research, the leadership theories were dealt with in three main groups including trait, behavioral and situational theories. The trait theory that differs leaders from others and is also known as the Great Man Theory (Robbins, Decenzo, & Coulter, 2012) sought to describe leadership according to personal traits of a leader (Bateman & Snell, 2009; Hodgetts, 1990). However, the trait theory was found not to suffice alone to define leaders since it disregards the interaction between a leader and group members and the situational factors (Robbins et al., 2012). Therefore, behavioral theories were developed which argue that behaviors exhibited by

a leader and individuals can be trained to become leaders (Bateman & Snell, 2009; Lunenberg & Ornstein, 1991; Robbins et al., 2012).

Although personal traits and behaviors are important to define effective leaders (Robbins & Judge, 2012, p. 381), it fails to define the leadership qualities. Therefore, researchers began to investigate the situational factors that affect the leadership process (McShane & Glinow, 2000; Robbins et al., 2012). Situational approach argues that the leadership process is affected by the characteristics of followers, nature of work, type of organization and external environment (Hodgetts, 1990; Yukl, 2010). Most of today's leadership research focused on the influence of leader on their followers. The research recommends several leadership models or leadership styles. However, the present research deals with a situational leadership theory suggested by Burns (1978) for the first time and developed by Bass (1985), "Full Range of Leadership Model" (Yukl, 2010), transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership styles.

Transformational leadership is the improved version of transactional leadership (Bass, 1996; Bass & Riggio, 2006). The transactional leadership stresses the interaction and exchange between the leader and their followers (Bass, 1996, p. 4). This change is a leadership style where the leader enters into transactions and interaction with their followers, which describes the rewards if their followers fulfill the requirements, or the punishments if they don't (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2002; Bass, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006; McKenna, 2000) and supports their followers conditionally (Bass, 1999, p. 9). In short, "transactional leaders prefer influencing employees using rewards and punishments" (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000, p. 225). The transactional leadership consists of three dimensions including conditional reward, management with active expectation and management with passive expectations (Avolio & Bass, 2002, p. 4):

(1) *Conditional reward* (constructive actions); refers to leader's behaviors that make the role and task requirements clear, and the material and psychological rewards for the followers' effort to fulfill a work. In other words, the leader explains on what conditions the follower will be rewarded.
(2) *Management with active expectation* (active corrective actions); the leader monitors their follower's performance for the satisfaction of goals and standards and may take an active corrective action in case of the follower's failure to satisfy the standards. In other words, the leader has a very tight control over their followers.
(3) *Management with passive expectation* (passive corrective actions); the leader takes measures only after the non-compliance arises, waiting for the problems to arise or when the mistakes arise

Besides improving followers' motivation (Avolio & Bass, 2002) and ethics (Bass, 1999, p. 9), transformational leaders are proactive, as they improve the followers' awareness and help them to achieve extraordinary goals (Antonakis et al., 2012, p. 265). In the Multi-Factor Leadership Model developed by Bass (1985), transformational leadership is comprised of four dimensions (Antonakis et al., 2003; Bass, 1999):

(1) *Idealized influence (attributed and behavior);* attributed refers to the leader's socialized charisma where the leader is perceived as self-confident and powerful and the leader focuses on high-order ideals and ethics. Leadership idealizes when leaders identify with and are followed by their followers. Behavior refers to charismatic actions of leaders focusing on values, beliefs and a sense of duty.
(2) *Inspiring motivation* refers to manners of leaders of motivating the energy of their followers by looking at the future with optimism, stressing ambitious goals, representing an idealized vision and communicating followers that the vision can be achieved. A leader provides courage to challenge and inspiration that give their followers a meaning and understanding.
(3) *Intellectual stimulation* refers to leadership actions that appeal to the reasoning and analysis of their followers by compelling them to think creatively and solve difficult problems and expanding their use of skills.

(4) *Individualized consideration/importance* supports by paying attention to followers' individual needs and by counseling, coaching and guidance. Thus, it refers to a leader behavior that enables follower satisfaction by allowing them to improve and realize themselves.

Transformational leaders seek to achieve superior results using one or more of the above components (Avolio & Bass, 2002). Another leadership style of the multi-factor leadership model, on the other hand, is the one that provides freedom (Laissez-faire). It means "let them be" in French. When applied to leadership, it describes leaders that let people work alone. Leaders that give freedom avoids taking decisions, denies responsibility and do not use their authority. This leadership style is considered the most passive and least effective leadership style (Amanchukwu, Stanley, & Ololube, 2015; Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio & Bass, 1998). Kouzes and Posner (2003) noted that for a leader to be effective, they must fulfill the leadership practices referred to as role modeling, creating a shared vision, risk taking, recognition and commendation and focusing on teamwork. These practices are explained briefly as follows (Kouzes & Posner, 2003): Leaders walk the talk and lead their followers by example (*role modeling*). They foresee the future, care about their followers' values and invite their followers to a common vision *(creating a shared vision)*. They seek innovation, growth and improvement opportunities *(risk taking).* They encourage cooperation and empower and thus motivate their followers *(focusing on teamwork).* They use care to advance their followers, and aware of their contribution and encourage them *(recognizing and commending)*. As a result, leadership practices of school principals reflect on teacher performance to become part of the school culture and turn into a distinctive characteristic of effective school in time.

A principal may have more than one leadership style and prefer to use different leadership styles for different situations. Leadership styles are not a phenomenon that "fits every size and everyone" and must be selected and adapted in such manner as they fit organizations, circumstances, groups and individuals (Amanchukwu et al., 2015). Since leadership effectiveness is determined by several criteria, it is hard to evaluate. In effectiveness of a leader, teams and organization's objective results, their followers' attitude toward the leader and how successful the leader's career may be suggested as an indication. One of the indications of the effectiveness of a leader is the contribution of the leader to the group as perceived by their followers as well (Yukl, 2010, p. 9). Researches showed that leadership styles are very important for the organizations and employees. For example, there are several studies that deal with the relationship between leadership and *school climate* (McColumn, 2010), *motivation*, *job satisfaction* (Asghar & Oino, 2018), *organizational health*, *delegation of authority*, *organizational effectiveness*, *competitive power* (Bateman & Snell, 2009). The best way to assess the effectiveness of leadership is to add different criteria to leadership research and determine the influence of the leader over this criterion (Yukl, 2010).

School principals are decision makers in school's management processes and all activities are carried out at the school. In other words, they play important role in the effective management and success of schools. Those who are affected most by school principals' leadership styles and practices are teachers (followers) who work as their closest colleague. Findings to be obtained from teachers may guide school principals on leadership styles and leadership practices, how they should guide and act at their school. However, the results of this research may form a basis for evaluating strengths and weaknesses of leadership styles and leadership practices and offer a hint about how to become more effective leaders. Determining the effect of school principals' leadership styles on their leadership practices may contribute to the practitioners and researchers in the field of educational management. In this context, the aim of the present research was to determine whether school principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers are predictive of their leadership practices. In this context, answers to the following questions were sought:

*   Is there a significant relationship between the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles and leadership practices and sub-dimensions?
*   Are transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles predictive of leadership practices and sub-dimensions?

METHODS

Research Design

Based on quantitative research model, a correlational survey model was used in the present research, to determine the effects of leadership styles on leadership practices. In survey model of research, while a researcher strives to draw a "picture" of a phenomenon in a certain period (Robson, 1993, p. 276), correlational survey model aims to determine the change between at least two variables (Creswell, 2002, p. 433). The variables in the current study were leadership styles and leadership practices perceived by teachers.

Population and Sample

The research population consisted of 7644 teachers working at public schools in Istanbul. While calculating the sample size, the reliability level was accepted as 95%, error rate as 5%, and the sample size was calculated as 366 (Israel, 1992). 404 teachers selected by the simple ransom sampling method were determined to represent the population. Of the teachers who volunteered to participate in the research, 60.9% (246) were female and 39.1% (158) were male; 21.0% (85) were age 20-30, 50.0% (202) were age 31-40, 23.3% (94) were age 41-50, 5.7% (23) were age 51 or older; 20.0% (81) have 1-5 years of professional service, 20.5% (83) have 6-10 years of professional service, 23.8% (96) have 11-15 years of professional service, 21.0% (85) have 16-20 years of professional service, and 14.6% (59) have 21 years or more of professional service. Of the teachers, 87.1% (352) have an undergraduate degree, 12.9% (52) have a graduate degree; 39.6% (160) work at a primary school, 31.4% (127) work at a middle school, 29.0% (117) at a secondary school; 33.2% (134) work as primary school teacher, 55.2% (223) work as a culture class teacher and 11.6% (47) as a vocational teacher.

Data Collection Instrument

In the research, "Multi-Factor Leadership Styles Questionnaire" and "Leadership Practices Inventory" were used.

Multi-Factor Leadership Styles: The questionnaire was developed by Bass and Avolio (1990) under the Situational Leadership Theory to determine the leadership styles of people and adapted by Akdogan (2002) into Turkish. The questionnaire consists of 36 items, 3 components (Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Laissez Faire Leadership) and seven sub-dimensions of these three components. The questionnaire is 5-point Likert type where the rating includes (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often and (5) Always. The subdimensions of the Transformational Leadership were named as inspiring motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration; the subdimensions of the Transactional Leadership are named as conditional reward, management with expectation (active), management with expectation (passive) and Laissez-faire Leadership. In the present study, the questionnaire's internal consistency Cronbach Alpha value was calculated as 0.841.

Leadership Practices Inventory: The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) developed by Kouzes and Posner (2003) and adapted by Yavuz (2010) into Turkish consists of 30 items and 5 sub-dimensions. Sub-dimensions are named as Role Modeling, creating a Shared Vision, Risk Taking, Recognition and Commendation, and Focusing on Teamwork. While the original form of the inventory is a 10-point Likert type, the Turkish form is a 5-point Likert type scale where the rating is (5) Always, (4) Mostly, (3) Sometimes, (2) Rarely, (1) Never. The inventory provides information on the leadership behaviors. The lowest and highest attainable score in the inventory is respectively 30 and 150. As the score increases, it means that leadership practices are used more frequently (Yavuz, 2010). In the present research, the scale's internal consistency Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated as 0.980. Reliability coefficients, means and standard deviations for leadership styles and leadership practices are seen in Table 1.

Table 1

Reliability coefficients, means and standard deviations of multi-factor leadership inventory and leadership practice inventory

	N	$\overline{x}$	Ss	Skewness	Kurtosis
Transformational Leadership	404	3.66	.757	.849	.665
Transactional Leadership	404	3.10	.473	.113	.765
Laissez-faire Leadership	404	2.12	.816	.872	.471
Role Modeling	404	3.67	.904	.900	.610
Creating a Shared Vision	404	3.63	.865	.950	.795
Risk Taking	404	3.41	.944	.603	.039
Recognition and Commendation	404	3.83	.912	.891	.536
Focusing on Teamwork	404	3.69	.904	.793	.341
Leadership Practices Inventory	404	3.66	.842	.950	.851

According to Table 1, as perceived by teachers, school principals preferred transformational leadership ($\overline{x}$ =3.67), transactional leadership ($\overline{x}$ =3.10) and laissez-faire leadership ($\overline{x}$ =2.12), respectively. Again, according to the teacher perceptions, school principals display recognition and commendation ($\overline{x}$ =3.83), focusing on teamwork ($\overline{x}$ =3.69), role modeling ($\overline{x}$ =3.67), creating a shared vision ($\overline{x}$ =3.63) and risk taking ($\overline{x}$ =3.41), respectively. When the skewness and kurtosis of the assessment instruments are examined, the values were seen to range between -1 and +1 and the data was decided to show a normal distribution.

Data Analysis

The effects of school principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers on their leadership practices were investigated on two stages. On the first stage, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Analysis was performed to determine the relationship between the leadership styles and leadership practices of school principals as perceived by teachers.

On the second stage, Simple and Multiple Regression Analyses were performed to determine the effects of leadership styles on their leadership practices as perceived by teachers. In the regression analysis, leadership styles were defined as the independent variable and leadership practices were defined as the dependent variable. SPSS program was used in the correlation and regression analyses.

RESULTS

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Analysis performed to determine the relationship between the leadership styles and leadership practices of school principals as perceived by teachers are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Pearson's product-moment correlation between leadership styles and leadership practices of school principals

Variables		Role Modelling	Creating a Shared Vision	Risk Taking	Recognition and Commendation	Focusing on Teamwork	Leadership Practices total score
Transformational Leadership	r	.680**	.721**	.660**	.720**	.682**	.751**
Transactional Leadership	r	.116*	.186**	.165**	.102*	.105*	.149**
Laissez-faire Leadership	r	-.460**	-.473**	-.426**	-.497**	-.455**	-.501**

n:404, *p<.01, **p<.05

According to Table 2, there was a medium, positive and significant relationship between school principals' transformational leadership style and leadership practices (r=.75) and their sub-dimensions including role modelling (r=.68), creating a shared vision (r=.72), risk taking (r=.66), recognition and commendation (r=.72), focusing on teamwork (r=.68) as perceived by teachers. There was a positive and significant relationship between school principals' transactional leadership style and leadership practices (r=.14) and their sub-dimensions including role modeling (r=.11), creating a shared vision (r=.18), risk taking (r=.16), recognition and commendation (r=.10), focusing on teamwork (r=.10) as perceived by teachers. According to Table 2, there is positive and significant relationship between school principals' laissez-faire leadership style and leadership practices (r=.50) and their sub-dimensions including role modeling (r=.46), creating a shared vision (r=.47), risk taking (r=.42), recognition and commendation (r=.49), focusing on teamwork (r=.45) as perceived by teachers.

The simple linear regression analysis was performed to determine the effects of school principals' transformational leadership style on their leadership practices and their sub-dimensions as perceived by teachers. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
The results of simple linear regression analysis between school principals' transformational leadership style and leadership practices

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	Std. Error	(β)	t	p	R	R²	F	p
Constant	Role modeling	.705	.163		4.317	.000				
Transformational Leadership		.809	.044	.680	18.565	.000	.680	.462	344.65	.000
Constant	Creating a Shared Vision	.611	.148		4.132	.000				
Transformational Leadership		.823	.039	.721	20.864	.000	.721	.521	435.29	.000
Constant	Risk Taking	.399	.175		2.282	.023				
Transformational Leadership		.822	.047	.660	17.614	.000	.660	.436	310.25	.000
Constant	Recognition and Commendation	.652	.156		4.172	.000				
Transformational Leadership		.867	.042	.720	20.790	.000	.720	.519	432.22	.000
Constant	Focusing on Teamwork	.616	.168		3.657	.000				
Transformation		.838	.045	.682	18.654	.000	.682	.465	347.96	.000

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	Std. Error	(β)	t	p	R	R²	F	p
nal Leadership										
Constant Transformatio nal Leadership	Leadership Practices Total	.595 .835	.137 .037	.751	4.341 22.803	.000 .000	.751	.565	519.97	.000

According to Table 3, school principals' transformational leadership style is significantly predictive of role modeling (R=.68, R^2=.46, F=344.65, p<.01), creating a shared vision (R=.72, R^2=.52, F=435.29, p<.01), risk taking (R=.66, R^2=.43, F=310.25, p<.01), recognition and commendation (R=.72, R^2=.51, F=432.22, p<.01), focusing on teamwork (R=.68, R^2=.46, F=347.96, p<.01) sub-dimensions and leadership practices in total (R=.75, R^2=.56, F=519.97, p<.01) as perceived by teachers. In other words, as perceived by teachers, school principals' transformational leadership style affected their overall leadership practices and sub-dimensions positively. School principals' transformational leadership style as perceived by teachers explains 56% of the total variance in their leadership practices, and for its sub-dimensions, 46% of role modeling, 52% of creating a shared vision, 43% of risk taking, 51% of recognition and commendation and 46% of focusing on teamwork.

The simple linear regression analysis was performed to determine the effects of school principals' transactional leadership style on their leadership practices and sub-dimensions as perceived by teachers. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
The results of simple linear regression analysis between school principals' transactional leadership style and leadership practices

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	Std. Error	(β)	t	p	R	R²	F	p
Constant Transactional Leadership	Role modeling	2.993 .221	.297 .094	.116	10.095 2.340	.000 .020	.116	.013	5.476	.020
Constant Transactional Leadership	Creating a Shared Vision	2.581 .339	.281 .089	.186	9.192 3.791	.000 .000	.186	.035	14.374	.000
Constant Transactional Leadership	Risk Taking	2,398 .329	.307 .098	.165	7.799 3.354	.000 .001	.165	.027	11.250	.001
Constant Transformatio nal Leadership	Recognition and Commendati on	3.228 .196	.300 .095	.102	10.774 2.051	.000 .041	.102	.010	4.205	.041
Constant Transactional Leadership	Focusing on Teamwork	3.051 .207	.306 .098	.105	9.970 2.122	.000 .034	.105	.011	4.501	.034
Constant Transactional Leadership	Leadership Practices total	2.837 .266	.275 .088	.149	10.312 3.031	.000 .003	.149	.022	9.189	.003

According to Table 4, school principals' transactional leadership style is significantly predictive of role modeling (R=.11, R^2=.01, F=5.476, p<.05), creating a shared vision (R=.18, R^2=.03, F=14.374, p<.01), risk taking (R=.16, R^2=.02, F=11.250, p<.01), recognition and commendation (R=.10, R^2=.01, F=4.205, p<.05), focusing on teamwork (R=.10, R^2=.01, F=4.501, p<.01) sub-dimensions and the leadership practices in total (R=.14, R^2=.02, F=9.189, p<.05) as perceived by teachers. However, the independent variable (transactional leadership) did not appear to contribute significantly to the explanation of the dependent variable (leadership practices and sub-dimensions). Therefore, it

can be suggested that the effects of transactional leadership style on leadership practices and sub-dimensions were not significant.

The simple linear regression analysis was performed to determine the effects of school principals' laissez-faire leadership style on their leadership practices and sub-dimensions as perceived by teachers. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
The results of simple linear regression analysis between school principals' laissez-faire leadership style and leadership practices

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	Std. Error	(β)	t	p	R	R²	F	p
Constant Laissez-faire Lead.	Role modeling	4.764 .510	.112 .049	.460	42.601 -10.390	.000 .000	.460	.212	107.962	.000
Constant Laissez-faire Lead.	Creating a Shared Vision	4.703 .502	.106 .047	.473	44.264 -10.770	.000 .000	.473	.224	115.998	.000
Constant Laissez-faire Lead.	Risk Taking	4,466 .492	.119 .052	.426	37.522 -9.433	.000 .000	.426	.181	88.989	.000
Constant Laissez-faire Lead.	Recognition and Commendation	5.019 .556	.110 .048	.497	45.522 -11.493	.000 .000	.497	.247	132.097	.000
Constant Laissez-faire Lead.	Focusing on Teamwork	4.800 .520	.116 .051	.455	41.512 -10.248	.000 .000	.455	.207	105.031	.000
Constant Laissez-faire Lead.	Leadership Practices total	4.762 .517	.102 .045	.501	46.876 -11.607	.000 .000	.501	.251	134.725	.000

According to Table 5, school principals' laissez-faire leadership style is significantly predictive of role modeling (R=.46, R^2=.21, F=107.962, p<.01), creating a shared vision (R=.47, R^2=.22, F=115.998, p<.01), risk taking (R=.42, R^2=.18, F=88.989, p<.01), recognition and commendation (R=.49, R^2=.24, F=132.097, p<.01), focusing on teamwork (R=.45, R^2=.20, F=105.031, p<.01) sub-dimensions and leadership practices in total (R=.50, R^2=.25, F=134.725, p<.01) as perceived by teachers. In other words, school principals' laissez-faire leadership style affected their leadership practices and sub-dimensions negatively. School principals' laissez-faire leadership style as perceived by teachers explains 25% of the total variance in their leadership practices, and for its sub-dimensions, 21% of role modeling, 22% of creating a shared vision, 18% of risk taking, 24% of recognition and commendation and 20% of focusing on teamwork.

The multi-variate linear regression analysis was performed to determine school principals' three leadership styles as perceived by teachers on their leadership practices together. For multi-variate regression analysis, the total score was calculated and analyzed as leadership practices total score. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 6.

Table 6
The results of multivariate linear regression analysis between school principals' leadership styles and leadership practices

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	Std. Error	(β)	t	p	R	R²	F	p
Constant		1.399	.233		6.002	.000				
Transformational	Leadership Practices	.789	.047	.710	16.610	.000	.764	.583	186.124	.000
Transactional		.120	.065	.068	-1.865	.063				
Laissez-faire		.122	.042	.119	-2.915	.004				

According to Table 6, while school principals' leadership styles including transformational leadership style and laissez-faire leadership style as perceived by teachers are significantly predictive of their leadership practices (R=.76; R^2=.58; F=186.124; p<.05), their transactional leadership style is not predictive of their leadership practices (p>.05). In other words, although school principals' three leadership styles as perceived by teachers are predictive of 58% of the change in their leadership practices together, variables that are predictive of the leadership practices appear to be transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles. The transactional leadership style does not appear to contribute significantly to the explanation of the leadership practices. Therefore, the transactional leadership style was removed from the regression equation and the analysis was repeated to determine the effects of the transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles on their leadership practices. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7
The results of multivariate linear regression analysis between school principals' transformational and laissez-faire leadership style and leadership practices

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	Std. Error	(β)	t	p	R	R²	F	p
Constant		1.228	.215		5.711	.000				
Transformational	Leadership Practices	.749	.043	.674	17.591	.000	.761	.580	275.737	.000
Laissez-faire		.149	.040	.145	-3.779	.000				

According to Table 7, school principals' leadership styles including transformational leadership style and laissez-faire leadership style as perceived by teachers are significantly predictive of their leadership practices (R=.76; R^2=.58; F=257.737; p<.05). School principals' transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles as perceived by teachers explain 58% of the total variance in the leadership practices. The coefficient B suggests a positive relationship between the transformational leadership style and leadership practices and a negative relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and leadership practices. In other words, while school principals' transformational leadership style as perceived by the teachers affects their leadership practices positively while their laissez-faire style affects their leadership practices negatively. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the order of significance of the predictor variables for leadership practices appears to be transformational leadership style and laissez-faire leadership style. Coefficient β measures the change in the dependent variable for the unit change in the independent variable. For example, a 0.749 increase in the transformational leadership style leads to a 0.674 positive change in the leadership practices.

DISCUSSION

In the context of education, behind school principals' endeavors to achieve change and build a successful school are their leadership styles and practices. For example, leader principals that support and empower teachers are important element that prevents teachers from being worn-out (Hirsch & Emerick, 2007). As a result of the analyses, school principals' transformational leadership style as perceived by teachers is significantly predictive and has positive relationship between the transformational leadership and the total score of leadership practices and the sub-dimensions of role

modeling (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990), creating a shared vision (Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 2014), risk taking (Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995), recognition and commendation (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005) and focusing on teamwork Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004). In addition to that managers using the transformational leadership style appear to affect the organization and the employees positively (Asghar & Oino, 2018; Boamah, Spence Laschinger, Wong, & Clarke, 2018).

Research also showed that besides significant and positive relationship, school principals' transactional leadership style as perceived by teachers are also significantly predictive of the sub-dimensions of role modeling (Avolio & Bass, 2002), creating a shared vision (Avery & Bergsteiner, 2011), risk taking (Petrick, Scherer, Brodzinski, Quinn, & Ainina, 1999), recognition and commendation (Blankstein, Houston, & Cole, 2009) and focusing on teamwork (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006), and the leadership practices in total.

Having negative and significant relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and the total score of leadership practices, school principals' laissez-faire leadership style as perceived by teachers are also significantly predictive of the sub-dimensions of role modeling (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003), creating a shared vision (Avolio & Bass, 2002), risk taking (Frischer, 2006; Gill, Levine, & Pitt, 1999), recognition and commendation (Zareen, Razzaq, & Mujtaba, 2015) and focusing on teamwork (Yang, 2015) and the leadership practices in total.

According to the results of the study, while the transformational leadership style affects the leadership practices positively and the laissez-faire leadership style affects the leadership practices negatively, the transactional leadership style does not affect the leadership practices. Similarly, in the literature, the transformational leadership style was found to affect both the potential and performance of the followers and the team positively (Bass, 1999; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2002) while the laissez-faire leadership style was found to affect the team's performance negatively (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007; Chaudhry & Javed, 2012; Furtner, Baldegger, & Rauthmann, 2013; Sosik & Jung, 2010), and the transactional leadership style was found not to affect the team's potential and performance (Jung & Avolio, 2000; Zehir, Sehitoglu, & Erdogan, 2012).

CONCLUSION

The aim of the present research was to determine whether school principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers were predictive of their leadership practices. The research showed that school principals' transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles were significant predictors of their leadership practices perceived by teachers. Also, it was demonstrated that the most important variable that affects the leadership practices at school positively is the transformational leadership style while the leadership practices were affected negatively by the laissez-faire leadership style.

The research has some implications regarding school management. Firstly, as the research suggests, the leadership style or styles school principals have or prefer may affect their leadership practices which may, in return, affect the performance, motivation and job satisfaction of the most indispensable group comprising the school society i.e. teachers. Secondly, policy makers and senior education executives may design professional development programs to teach the existing and prospective school administrators the components of the transformational leadership.

REFERENCES

Abu-Tineh, A. M., Khasawneh, S. A., & Al-Omari, A. A. (2008). Kouzes and Posner's transformational leadership model in practice: The case of Jordanian schools. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 29*(8), 648-660.

Akdogan, E. (2002). *Ogretim elemanlarinin algiladiklari liderlik stili ile is doyumu arasindaki iliski* [The relationship between the perceived leadership style of the lecturers and job satisfaction] (Unpublished MA thesis). Marmara University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Istanbul.

Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). A review of leadership theories, principles and styles and their relevance to educational management. *Management, 5*(1), 6-14.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(3), 261-295.

Asghar, S., & Oino, I. (2018). Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction, *Market Forces, 13*(1), 1-13.

Avery, G. C., & Bergsteiner, H. (2011). Sustainable leadership practices for enhancing business resilience and performance. *Strategy & Leadership, 39*(3), 5-15.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1998). You can drag a horse to water but you can't make it drink unless it is thirsty. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(1), 4-17.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002). *Developing potential across a full range of Leadership TM: Cases on transactional and transformational leadership*. London: Psychology Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio B. J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire.* Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership.* Virginia: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Science.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(1), 9–32.

Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of leadership studies, 7*(3), 18-40.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 207-218.

Bateman, T., & Snell, S. (Eds). (2009). *Management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Blankstein, A. M., Houston, P. D., & Cole, R. W. (2009). *Building sustainable leadership capacity* (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Boamah, S. A., Spence Laschinger, H. K., Wong, C., & Clarke, S. (2018). Effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and patient safety outcomes. *Nursing Outlook, 66*(2), 180–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2017.10.004.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(7), 258-264.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of organizational change management, 17*(2), 177-193.

Dubinsky, A. J., Yammarino, F. J., & Jolson, M. A. (1995). An examination of linkages between personal characteristics and dimensions of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 9*(3), 315-335.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(4), 569.

Frischer, J. (2006). *Laissez-faire leadership versus empowering leadership in new product developing.* Danish Centre for Philosophy and Science Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark.

Furtner, M. R., Baldegger, U., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2013). Leading yourself and leading others: Linking self-leadership to transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *22*(4), 436-449.

Gill, R., Levine, N., & Pitt, D. C. (1999). Leadership and organizations for the new millennium. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *5*(4), 46-59.

Hirsch, E., & Emerick, S. (2007). Teacher working conditions are student learning conditions: A report on the 2006 North Carolina teacher working conditions survey. *Center for Teaching Quality*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED498770.pdf

Hodgetts, R. M. (1990). *Management: Theory, process and practice*. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich Publishers.

Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size*. University of Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agriculture Sciences, EDIS, Florida.

Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(8), 949-964.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *The leadership practices inventory: Observer*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lunenberg, F., & Ornstein, A. (1991). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McColumn, B. R. (2010). *Principals' leadership styles and their impact on school climate: Assistant principals' perceptions* (Electronic Theses & Dissertations). 393. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/393

McKenna, E. (2000). *Business psychology and organizational behaviour: A student's handbook.* New York: Psychology Press.

McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2000). *Organizational behavior*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Petrick, J. A., Scherer, R. F., Brodzinski, J. D., Quinn, J. F., & Ainina, M. F. (1999). Global leadership skills and reputational capital: Intangible resources for sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *13*(1), 58-69.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, S.B. and Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviours, *The Leadership Quarterly, (1)*2, 107-42.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Organizational behaviour* (15th edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Robbins, S. P., Decenzo, D. A., & Coulter, M. (2012). *Fundamentals of management* (8th ed.). Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall

Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., III, & Rose, R. R. (2014). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges.* Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Rubin, R. S., Munz, D. C., & Bommer, W. H. (2005). Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(5), 845-858.

Sosik, J. J., & Jung, D. I. (2010). *Full range leadership development: Pathways for people, profit, and planet.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, *7*(4), 221-258.

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *12*(1), 80-92.

Yang, I. (2015). Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: conceptual exploration. *Journal of Management Development*, *34*(10), 1246-1261.

Yavuz, M. (2010). *Liderlik uygulamalari olceginin Turkce'ye uyarlama calismasi* [Adaptation of the leadership practices inventory (LPI) to Turkish]. *Egitim ve Bilim, 35*(158), 143-157.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Zareen, M., Razzaq, K., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2015). Impact of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles on motivation: A quantitative study of banking employees in Pakistan. *Public Organization Review*, *15*(4), 531-549.

Zehir, C., Sehitoglu, Y., & Erdogan, E. (2012). The effect of leadership and supervisory commitment to organizational performance. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 58*, 207–216. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.994.