

NASREEN AKHTER\*  
DR. MUHAMMAD RASHID\*\*  
LUBNA SALAMAT\*\*\*

## LEADERSHIP STYLES AND SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

### **Abstract**

*This study was conducted to find out the styles of leadership adopted by school heads and their impacts on the school environment. Data of study was based on 345 school heads and 1329 school teachers. Two questionnaires were used as data collection tools. To find the results of the study, mean scores of groups were compared applying t-test and ANOVA methods. Results indicated that majority of school heads prefer autocratic style to manage their school matters. Effects of impacts of leadership styles on school environment indicated that school environment was best in case of applying the democratic style of leadership. This was suggested that training for in service school heads must be arranged to train them to run their school matters applying the democratic style of leadership to build an effective educational environment in the schools.*

### **Key Words:**

*School administration; school environment; leadership style.*

### **Introduction**

Educational leadership is related to the organization of events regarding the accomplishment of administrative aims in educational setting. In the educational environment, leadership is

---

\* Assistant Professor, Department of Education The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

\*\* Dean Faculty of Education Preston University, Islamabad campus

\*\*\* M.Phil Scholar, Department of Education The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan

exercised by the heads of institutions mostly termed as principal, head master or head mistress in the school cadre (Waqar and Siddiqui, 2008).

Leadership styles are series of management approaches, actions and expertise based on persons and institutional standards and leadership interests in different situations. It is the ability of a leader to influence subordinates while running the matters of an organization (Khuong and Yarmohammadian, 2006).

Different leaders adopt different ways to perform their administrative responsibilities. Each leader tries to achieve his goals applying different tactics. The combination of different tactics to perform specific roles of management is called administrative styles or leadership styles. There are three common leadership styles namely, autocratic, democratic and laissez faire. Each style is different in nature of rules of administration, activities and procedures. A brief introduction of each style has given below.

Autocratic leadership refers governance by a leading group of people (Avery, 2004). This style represents authority of leader at each step in the administrative process. Autocratic leader exhibits his supreme power in the team where he works.

Burns (1978) explains, autocratic leader maintains his authority by delivering orders and influencing group members about what to do without taking opinions. He does not respect the talents of subordinates to apply their own theories in working situations. Power to direct resources is mandatory to achieve the goals of an institution (Waqar and Siddiqui, 2008).

Leaders having autocratic style make decisions independently. They rarely allow subordinates to join in the decision-making

process. They do not empower their subordinates. Autocratic leaders are highly directive. They expect blind respect by their subordinates. The organization is highly controlled by the autocratic leaders (Khuong and Yen, 2014).

In fact, autocratic leaders fully use their powers to achieve their targets and only respect their own ideas and philosophies. This style of management believes that authority and power of decision making are rights and responsibilities of team leader. Position and job responsibility of an autocratic leader requires him to implement rules of top management without giving right of questioning to subordinates and monitor the activities of subordinates.

In autocratic style, a team leader makes rules without involving the subordinates and imposes rules in the environment where he works. Autocratic leader is not assumed to give answer of questions raised by subordinates. No input by subordinates in decision making, dictation about procedures of work by the leader, no trust on the liberty of group members, imposing of orders on subordinates, quick decision making, close monitoring of work and total control on subordinates are characteristics of autocratic style.

Democratic leadership involves division of power and authority between leader and subordinates involving the subordinates in decision making. In this style, subordinates have freedom of expression in front of leader. Policies are constituted in consultation of employees. 'A democratic leader functions as a collector of opinions and takes a vote before making decisions' (Hussain, 2005).

Group discussions, staff meetings, freedom to innovate ideas, positive feedback of leader on expressing innovative ideas by subordinates, co-operation between co-workers and recognition of the worth of each member of team are significant characteristics of democratic leadership. Leader promotes a sense of belongingness in team members with the organization. In this style, a high degree of staff morale, motivation and job satisfaction is always enhanced (Heenan and Bennis, 1999; Hersey and Blanchard, 1988).

Democratic style of leadership is based on the principles of equality, freedom, justice and is characterized by openness and cooperation. This style is flexible, dynamic and respects the opinions of majority. It gives confidence to members of team that they are equally important for the institution. Present age is full of complexities. Organizations require flexibility in leadership and implementation of rules in the management process. Good leadership is built by constant process needing considerable time and organizational resources (Pimpa and Moore, 2012).

Time consumption is a major drawback of this style. Bhatti et al (2012) identifies that in democratic style, participation of individuals in process takes time. This approach makes procedure slow but with good ends. So, this style is suitable where team work is indispensable, quality is essential and ample time is available to produce the output.

Laissez-faire leadership style gives freedom to all team members in working environment. Laissez-fair style allows leaders to follow the non-interference policy. (Bhatti et al, 2012). Laissez-fair leader turns over almost all authority to group members and does as little leading as possible (Newstrom and Keith, 2002).

Laissez-faire administrator allows things go on at their own choices, without personal participation. Leader leaves

subordinates in the dark to discover their own tracks. He supplies resources and thoughts to subordinates and only participates whenever he needs. This style is not suitable for the situations where subordinates are not highly professional and experts in their fields. Due to liberty, employees work according to their own choices and select their own ways to work for the benefits of organization. Highly dedicated and trained persons mostly work together for the betterment of organization and try to give best results in achievement of goals of organization.

According to Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson (1996), in *laissez fair*, team spirit is developed because of liberty given by the leader. Each member struggles to make the environment a better place to work in. This is because of good involvement of subordinates in decision-making.

By above discussion it can be said that each, leadership styles gives impacts on the environment of institution. Moreover, no one style can give same results in different situations. Good leaders choose and apply their tactics according to the situations, availability of resources and skills of staff. In fact, the suitability of leadership style is important for selection of ways to lead an institution.

Educational environment refers to the sum of the principles, philosophies, security practices and managerial arrangements within the institute that cause it to work and respond in specific manners.

According to Kaczor (2006), environment of an educational institution includes relationship, personal growth or goal orientation as well as system maintenance and system change. Relationship includes involvement or affiliation with others in the

classroom and teacher support. Personal growth or goal orientation includes the personal development and self-enhancement of all members of the staff. System maintenance and system change includes the organisation of clarity of rules and strictness of teacher in enforcing the rules.

Role of institution's environment is important to teach students to learn ways to respond daily challenges of life. According to Harris and Lowery (2002) behaviour of the head of institutions, teachers, pupils and parents affect the environment of institution. But creation of good environment is one of the responsibilities of head of institution. So, understanding about the positive environment is necessary for the heads of institutions as well as teachers and pupils.

According to Halpin (1996) a head of institution needs to have four characteristics: aloofness, production emphasis, consideration and thrust in his behaviour to maintain a positive environment in the institution. Aloofness requires a head to live at distance, make rules and operate them showing an image that he is superior and different from his subordinates.

Production emphasis requires head of institution to do close supervision of matters and give directions to subordinates and students using fixed communication channels. Thrust requires head of institution to operate close supervision coupled with his own personal involvement and a conscious motivation of his teachers. Consideration compels head teacher to show his interaction with his teachers.

Mosime (2000) views that positive school climate exists when all students feel comfortable, desired, appreciated, acknowledged and protected in the school where they can collectively work and interact with fellows with care and trust. Page and Page (2000)

emphasize that role of teacher is vital in creation of positive environment in schools.

To foster positive changes in students' behaviours, teachers should exhibit positive characteristics in their behaviour. To foster self-discipline in students, teachers should demonstrate self-control in their relation with pupils. They should show spirit to achieve their targets, have friendly relations with other teachers and respect their boss to show that they respect him and his policies.

Creation of positive environment is necessary to achieve the goals of educating students. This is not easy task and requires heads of institutions to work hard. Various scholars have mentioned different tactics to achieve the goal. Prominent tips include motivation, feedback, staff development, team spirit and leadership behaviour.

Steffy (1989) emphasizes that head of institution should constantly admire the performance of teaching staff as well as students and their parents. This is necessary to inspire them and boost up their involvement and performance in the institution. Hill (1997) has suggested heads of institutions to provide feedback to teaching staff to enhance the quality of teaching. On giving good results, efforts of staff must be honoured by admitting their efforts. Giving feedback on the good performance means heads of institutions are recognizing their efforts, giving rewards and saving them from the frustration.

Harris (2002) has emphasized to launch staff development plans to create positive environment in the institutions. In his views, this is most efficient way to achieve the goals. George (2003) has stressed to develop a team spirit in the staff. In his views, team

spirit demands all members to work for same goals and share ideas and experiences regarding teaching and discipline in meetings. Robbins and Coulter (2005) has suggested leaders to lead and handle meetings tactfully, supervise environment properly and communicate the staff, students and community in attractive manners.

Gibson, et al (2003) stress to recognize potentials of each member, observe individual differences in team members and improve links with all.

### ***Statement of the problem***

Study of impacts of different styles of leadership on school environment explains that no one style of leadership always gives same results in different situations. So, different leaders adopt different styles of leadership to achieve their target. Different researchers and scholars have identified different tactics to develop positive environment in teaching learning situations at various level (Steffy, 1983; Hill, 1997; Harris 2002; George, 2003; Gibson et al 2003; Mosime, 2000; Robbins and Coulter, 2005). In the present study an effort was made to study leadership styles of school heads and analyse impacts of different leadership styles on school environment in Pakistan.

### ***Objectives of the study***

Objectives of this study were;

1. To find out the leadership styles those are mostly adopted by the heads of institutions at school level.
2. To evaluate impacts of different tactics of each style of leadership on the environment of schools at secondary level.

3. To find out the leadership tactics that can be most helpful to create a good environment at the school level in Pakistan.

### ***Research questions of the study***

This study attempted to find out answers of following research questions.

1. Which leadership styles are applied by the heads at the school level?
2. Which style is more favourable to develop effective environment at school level?
3. Which tactics of leadership can be helpful to create positive environment in the educational setting at school level?

### ***Significance of the study***

This study is helpful to evaluate the work of heads of institutions in education sector at school level. In service school heads can get guidelines to review their tactics and expected results of different tactics on the school environment. It is useful for teacher trainers to get material for teaching and propose learning sources to prospective teachers regarding the leadership styles and their impact on the working environment.

Overall, this study is important for heads to improve administrative policies and their impact to improve the quality of education at school level. Future researchers can get guidelines from this study to find out the areas for further research.

### ***Procedure of the study***

This study was descriptive in nature. Survey method was adopted to complete this study. As, this study was about the leadership styles of heads of institutions, it was decided to collect data from the heads of institutions as well as their subordinates (teachers). Heads of institutions were important to include in the study to provide information about what they do and prefer in the process of management.

Their subordinates (teachers) were important to provide information about the leadership styles of school heads and environment of the institution as well. So, population of the study was heads and teachers of educational institutions working at secondary level schools in the province of Punjab, Pakistan.

Sample of study was 345 school heads and 1329 teachers working in the secondary schools in the province of Punjab. Tool of the study were two close ended questionnaires. One was for heads of institutions and other was for the school teachers.

Eighteen items in both questionnaires regarding the leadership styles were same by the content. Twenty one items related to the environment were included in the questionnaire for teachers only. It was assumed that teachers could rate the environment related statements more objectively.

Questionnaires were developed keeping in view the requirements of the study. Content validity and face validity was analyzed by experts' opinion method. Reliability was determined applying Cronbach's alpha method. Value of  $r$  was 0.821 and 0.78 for the questionnaire for teachers and heads of institutions respectively.

To analyze data, percentage, mean score, mean difference, t- test and ANOVA statistics were applied on data using SPSS software. Following table expresses the demographic information about the sub characteristics of sample of the study.

Table 1 Demographic detail about the sub characteristics of sample of the study

Sr. no	Indicator	Sample	School Heads (345)	School Teachers (1329)
1	Gender	Male	53%	52%
		Female	47%	48%
2	Background Area of respondent	Urban	44%	52%
		Rural	56%	48%
3	Qualification	BA/B Sc.	2%	09%
		MA/M Sc.	85%	76%
		M Phil.	12%	11%
		Ph. D	1%	4%
4	Age	Below 30	18%	36%
		31 to 40	29%	37%
		41 to 50	38%	24%
		51 and above	15%	4%
5	Job Experience	1 to 10 years	75%	37%
		11 to 20	21%	19%
		Above 20	4%	44%
6	Area of study	Arts	65%	63%
		Science	35%	37%

### *Results of the study*

To find the styles of heads, 345 school heads and 1329 teachers were requested to rate the statements on a scale. Heads were requested to response keeping in mind “what they do while leading an institution”. Teachers were requested to rate statements on a scale. Eighteen statements were about the leadership styles of school heads and twenty one were about the school environment.

After feeding data, sum of scores of each respondent were calculated. Applying the t-test, mean scores of sum of score of both groups (heads of intuitions/ leaders and subordinates/ teachers) were computed and compared.

About the autocratic style (Table 2), comparison of mean scores indicates that there is a minute difference between the mean scores of both groups (heads' score 24.13, teachers' score 24.09) and results of t-test (mean difference, 0.04, t score 0.171, P value 0.864) indicates no significant mean difference between the scores of heads and teachers. This explores that heads and teachers are agreed that heads apply the autocratic style of leadership.

About the democratic style of leadership, certain difference between the mean scores of heads and teachers (heads' score 26.65, teachers' score 25.53) exists in data but results of t-test (mean difference 2.51, t-score 10.772, P value 0.000) indicates significant mean difference between the mean scores of groups. This explores that democratic style of leadership is not applied by the heads.

About the laissez fair style, slight difference between the mean scores of group (heads' score 25.53, teachers' score 24.43) is visible but results of t-test (mean difference 1.09, t-score 5.184, p value 0.000) explains no significant mean difference between groups. This explores that heads and subordinates are not agreed that laissez fair style of leadership is applied in the institutions.

Table 2 Mean difference about the styles of leadership applied at school level

Leadership style	Respondent	Mean score	SD	St. Error of Mean	Results of t – test		
					Mean difference	T–score	Sig. at 0.05 level
Autocratic	Head of institution	24.13	4.86	0.262	0.040	0.171	0.864
	Teachers	24.09	3.58	0.098			
Democratic	Head of institution	29.16	3.13	0.168	2.51	10.77	0.00
	Teachers	26.65	4.02	0.110			
Laissez fair	Head of institution	25.53	3.05	0.164	1.09	5.184	0.00
	Teachers	24.43	3.61	0.099			

### *Effects of application of democratic style on the environment of institution*

Democratic style of management is advised to achieve better results in school management. According to the table 3, all aspects showed in table have significant impacts on the school environment. ANOVA results have showed significant mean difference between groups of respondents who applied the tactics of democratic style represented in first column of the table in three ways (always, sometimes or never).

According to the results, leaders who always involved subordinates in decision making, delegated powers to their subordinates for jobs assigned to them and contacted to subordinates to address the solutions of problems faced time to time during leading staff and organize the administrative activities of staff created best environment in the institution (mean scores 81.54, 81.91 and 81.63 respectively) than those who applied the tactic sometimes (mean score 70.33, 75.50 and 71.50

respectively) or never accepted to apply the rule in their organization (mean score 76.50, 79.78 and 80.00 respectively).

This explains that involving staff in decision making, giving them powers to decide and act according to own choice to achieve goals and negotiate and accept the suggestions of subordinates to search the solutions of problems faced in running an organization are tactics to create good environment in the institution. Goals have significant importance in the success of leaders. Although, goals and mission of an organization is set by the governing bodies, but heads and leaders set directions of work to achieve the goals of organizations.

The democratic leader or administrator focuses to work for achievement of goals with the collaboration of subordinates. Results have indicated that application of three tactics of democratic style of management “setting of goals with consultation of subordinates, sharing of leadership roles with subordinates and giving liberty to apply own techniques” gave best results in situations whenever administrators/ leaders applied this rule occasionally/ sometimes (mean score 84.31, 82.62 and 83.75 respectively).

This means, sharing of thoughts of subordinates while deciding short term goals and sharing the leadership roles with colleagues to work for the success of organization are necessary but occasionally and not for consistent basis.

Results about the last administrative tactic of democratic style in the table “give awards and incentives to subordinates to appreciate their efforts” have indicated that application of this tactic on “continuous or certainly not” basis gave nearly same results (mean score 81.23 and 81.24, mean difference 1.80 and 0.02, p value 0.645 and 0.94 respectively).

This explored that giving rewards and appreciations to subordinates should be avoided on occasional (sometimes) basis. This must be on consistent (always) or certainly not (never) basis.

**Table 3 impacts of democratic style on the environment of institution**

Administrative tactics	Options	Mean score of school environment	ANOVA Results		LSD Analysis 1= Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Always					
			F	Sig n.	1&2		1&3		2&3	
					Mean difference	Sig .	Mean difference	Sig .	Mean difference	Sig .
Involve staff in decision making	3 2 1	81.54 70.33 76.50	23.11	0.000	6.17	0.24	-5.04	0.18	-11.20	0.000
Delegate powers to subordinates	3 2 1	81.91 75.50 79.78	15.42	0.000	4.28	0.002	-2.14	0.003	-6.42	0.000
Contact to subordinates to address the solution of problems	3 2 1	81.63 71.50 80.00	22.98	0.000	8.50	0.000	-1.64	0.115	1.52	0.000
Setting of goals with consultation of subordinates	3 2 1	80.61 84.31 82.71	9.11	0.000	-1.59	0.27	2.10	0.83	3.69	0.000
Sharing of leadership roles	3 2 1	82.60 82.62 80.79	3.06	0.048	-0.25	0.98	1.81	0.04	1.83	0.12
liberty to apply own techniques in teaching and solving issues	3 2 1	81.26 83.75 77.66	5.16	0.006	-6.083	0.003	-3.59	0.007	2.49	0.119
Using rewards for staff on doing	3 2 1	81.23 79.40 81.24	0.81	0.44	1.80	0.645	-0.02	0.94	-1.84	0.20

### ***Effects of application of autocratic style on the environment of institution***

Table 4 shows impact of different autocratic tactics of administrators on the environment of educational environment of organizations. It exhibits that all tactics i.e. settling conflicts under stress by heads, impose decisions on subordinates, strict monitoring of subordinates, imposing decisions on subordinates and expect that subordinates should follow all orders blindly, no consultation with subordinates regarding deciding the policies to run the organization and use of threats and punishments for subordinates to ensure the implementation of orders by heads have significant impacts on the environment of an educational institution.

Significant mean difference is evident between groups of administrators who apply these tactics with different routines i.e. “always, sometimes or never” at 0.05 level of significance.

About the tactic of heads, to settle conflicts under stress by using power of heads, environment of educational organization is always better whenever this tactic is never applied in an organization (mean score never 83.66, always 80.02).

About one of the autocratic tactics “impose decisions and own ideas on subordinates” can be an effective tactic to establish good environment in the organization if it is sometimes applied (mean score sometimes 83.91). Consistant application of this tactic has exhibited lowest effective environment (mean score always 79.69) that is showing negative impact of this tactic on the environment of an organization.

Although monitoring of subordinates is important principle of management. Without monitoring achievement of goals of

organization and discipline in the organization is not ensured. But, the strictness in this regard is not a good trick of management. According to results, strict monitoring of subordinates gives negative results in case of applying this rule on always (mean score 81.40) or sometimes basis (mean (70.33). In an organization whenever administrators never do strict monitoring, become successful to achieve their goals by establishing friendly environment in the organization (mean 86).

About the tactics to “impose decisions without giving right of questioning to subordinates” and “act without consulting subordinates” results indicates that school environment of the institution was best whenever the tactic was not applied (mean score for never 83.67 and 81.51 respectively). This directs to guide the heads that imposing decisions on subordinates without involving them in decision making is not suitable to create a good environment in an organization.

Expecting the subordinates to blindly follow the rules given by heads means subordinates can obey their boss but will not work for the betterment of organization. They will not feel responsibility to be responsible for the results in favour of organization. They will focus to follow the orders of boss staying him responsible for the consequences of polices.

Punishments and threats are techniques of autocratic style of leadership. An autocratic leader thinks that subordinates can be controlled by threatening or giving punishments to the subordinates. But, a result of this study has discovered that appreciation and respect are good incentives to motivate subordinates to work for the betterment of organization and creation of good environment in the organization. In case of situation where heads always threatened their subordinates or

gave punishments on mistakes or negligence, could not create better environment (mean score 80.41) in comparison to those who never applied the tactic (mean score 81.76). This guides administrators and leaders to give respect to subordinates and appreciate them on their efforts. This can motivate them to work well for the respect of leader and institution.

On the whole, no application of tactics of autocratic style (except serial 2 tactic) is helpful to develop highly positive environment at school level because majority of no application of this styles has showed highly better mean scores.

Table 4 impacts of autocratic style on the environment of institution

Administrative tactics	Options	Mean score of school environment	ANOVA Results		LSD Analysis 1= Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Always					
			F	Sig. n.	1&2		1&3		2&3	
					Mean difference	Sig.	Mean difference	Sig.	Mean difference	Sig.
Settling conflicts under stress by use of power of head	3	80.02	31.55	0.00	5.19	0.00	3.64	0.00	-1.56	0.03
	2	78.46								
	1	83.66								
Imposing decisions/ ideas on the subordinates	3	79.69	11.61	0.00	-2.00	0.50	2.22	0.00	4.23	0.00
	2	83.91								
	1	81.91								
Strict monitoring of subordinates	3	81.40	21.28	0.00	15.67	0.00	4.59	.128	-11.07	0.00
	2	70.33								
	1	86.00								
Impose decisions without giving right of questioning	3	80.47	33.79	0.00	9.06015	0.00	3.16	0.00	-5.90	0.00
	2	74.57								
	1	83.63								
Act without consulting subordinates	3	81.47	20.34	0.00	9.76	0.00	0.04	0.96	-9.73	0.00
	2	71.75								
	1	81.51								
Giving threats and punishments to subordinates	3	80.41	2.91	0.05	2.02	0.21	1.36	0.026	-.66	0.687
	2	79.75								
	1	81.76								

### *Effects of application of Laissez Fair style on the environment of institution*

Table 5 explains effects of different tactics of laissez fair style of leadership on the school environment. According to table, autonomy to take decision, create and explore own direction and decision making without heads' involvement are useful tactics to create good environment at school level if these tactics are applied on continuous basis (mean score of always were 81.42, 81.41 and 82.21 respectively). The tactic "determining own objectives" on never basis gives higher score for crating good environment at the school level (82.70) while giving liberty to define own job by the employees is useful only if it is applied on sometime basis (85).

Table 5 Impacts of laissez fair style on the environment of institution

Administrative tactics	Options	Mean score of school environment	ANOVA Results		LSD Analysis 1= Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Always					
			f	Sig. n.	1&2		1&3		2&3	
					Mean difference	Sig.	Mean difference	Sig.	Mean difference	Sig.
Determine own objectives.	3 2 1	81.09 78.27 82.70	7.7 6	0.0 01	4.435*	0.0 00	1.620	0.02 6	-2.81	0.0 05
Autonomy to take decision.	3 2 1	81.42 78.50 80.71	3.0 8	0.0 47	2.2105 3	0.1 31	-0.711	0.45 1	-2.92	0.0 16
Create and explore own direction.	3 2 1	81.41 67.50 81.31	21. 15	0.0 00	13.81*	0.0 00	-0.099	0.90	-13.91	0.0 00
Decision making without heads' involvement	3 2 1	82.21 80.41 79.83	7.6 7	0.0 01	-0.58	0.5 7	-2.38	0.00 0	-1.79	0.0 68
Define own job.	3 2 1	80.64 85.00 83.66	8.5 4	0.0 00	-1.33	0.4 97	3.017	0.00 1	4.35	0.0 17

## ***Discussion***

The aim of the study was to find out leadership styles of school heads and their impact on school environment. Regarding the objectives of this study, it was concluded that majority of heads are applying tactics of autocratic style (Table 1).

On the other hand it was found that democratic style has most positive effects on the school environment (table 3). Rating of effects of leadership styles (Table 3 to 5) also indicated that autocratic style has less positive effects on the school environment.

Comparison of results of this study with the results of previous literature on the topic indicates that results have resemblance with the findings of studies conducted by Katz (1994), Gardin (2003), Dahar (2011), Tariq (2011), Duze (2012) and Florence (2012). Katz (1994) reported that democratic school organization is often related to school effectiveness.

Gardin (2003) pointed out that democratic style is most helpful to create positive school climate. Dahar (2011) and Florence (2012) concluded that democratic style of leadership is the most effective style and has positive influence on the students.

Tariq (2011) found that democratic style was a better style of leadership and has positive effects on teacher performance. He reported that results of the schools under democratic administrative style were significantly higher than the autocratic and laissez- faire styles.

Duze (2012) also searched that autocratic leadership style was most commonly popular among principals of secondary schools, followed by laissez-faire and democratic. Moreover teachers' job

performance was highest under democratic and lowest under autocratic principals.

Interestingly, literature review and results of this study indicated that democratic leadership style is more effective for creation of effective environment in educational institutions but results has showed that autocratic style of leadership is more in practice of school leaders in Pakistan.

So, it is important to search the reasons for popularity of autocratic leadership style among school heads and ways to control heads to be less autocratic in their behaviour to control the management matters.

In this regard, a review of impacts of different demographic characteristics of heads on their autocratic style is important. So, mean scores about the autocratic style were analyzed in relation to the different background characteristics of heads. Results have shown in the table 6.

Results indicated in table 6 express that none of the variable except level of teacher training (sr. 3) shows significant mean difference between groups. This reveals that only training of a person can affect the leadership style of a person.

Mean scores of autocratic style of school heads having higher level teacher training (M Ed) was low (23.06) than those who were B Ed (25.47). This explores that training of heads can be used as a measure to educate them to be less autocratic in their style of leadership.

Table 6 Background characteristics and application of autocratic leadership style by school heads

Sr. no	Variable	Gender	Mean score	SD	Standard error of mean	Mean difference	T score	Sig. at 0.05 level
1	Gender	Male	23.721	5.337	0.395	-0.871	-1.665	0.097
		Female	24.593	4.236	0.333			
2	Qualification	Bachelor or masters	24.000	5.036	0.291	-1.00	-1.287	0.19
		M Phil or Ph. D	25.000	3.424	0.511			
3	Level of training	B Ed	25.471	4.912	0.397	2.408	4.707	0.000
		M Ed	23.063	4.563	0.329			
4	Background living area	Rural	24.085	5.317	0.399	-0.093	-1.79	0.85
		Urban	24.179	4.351	0.335			
5	Location of school	Rural school	24.215	5.019	0.359	0.195	0.369	0.712
		Urban school	24.020	4.669	0.381			
6	Area/ discipline of study of head	Arts	23.800	4.529	0.301	-0.950	-1.733	0.084
		Science	24.750	5.401	0.493			
7	Age of head	Before 45 years	23.673	4.665	0.363	-0.877	-1.678	.094
		After 45 years	24.550	5.015	0.373			

### Conclusions

In conclusion, this study has found that democratic style is a better style of leadership as compared to autocratic or laissez fair styles of leadership. It impacts positively on the educational environment.

Autocratic style has more negative impacts on the school environment but majority of school heads prefer autocratic style to run the schools.

This situation is alarming for the quality of education at school level. In fact, working in environment that is not fruitful in creation of effective environment, it is not possible for teachers as well as students to give quality in their performance.

### ***Recommendations***

1. School administrations may consider to prefer democratic style of leadership than the laissez fair and autocratic styles because democratic style is better for development of effective school environment and gives positive impacts on the results of schools.
2. Teacher trainers need to review the contents of courses used during in service and pre service training. Institutions offering induction training should consider selecting their training contents keeping in view the concept of effective administration.
3. A further study may be conducted to find out reasons for popularity of autocratic leadership style among the school heads in Pakistan.

### ***References***

- Avery, G. C. (2004). *Understanding Leadership: Paradigms and Cases*. London: Sage.
- Bhatti, N., Maitlo, M., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M. A. & Shaikh, F. M. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research*. 5 (2) 192-201. Retrieved from [www.ccsenet.org/ibr](http://www.ccsenet.org/ibr). doi:10.5539/ibr.v5n2p192.

- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York. Harper Collins.
- Dahar, M. A. (2011). *Relationship between the school resource inputs and academic achievement of students at secondary level in Pakistan*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Islamic International University, Islamabad.
- Duze, C. O. (2012). *Leadership styles of principals and job performance of staff in secondary schools in Delta State of Nigeria*. AFRREV IJAH: An International Journal of Arts and Humanities, 1(2) 224-245.
- Florence, Y. A. (2012). Influence of principals' leadership styles on students' academic achievement in secondary schools. *An International Journal*. 22(2)14-26.
- Gardin, R. A. (2003). *Impact of Leadership Behavior of Principals on Elementary School Climate*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Indiana University. Retrieved on July 20, 2014 from [http //www.proquest.uni.com](http://www.proquest.uni.com).
- George, J. M. (2003). *Affect Regulation in Groups and Teams in Emotions in Workplace: Understanding the Structure and Role of Emotions in Organizational Behavior*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J.M., Donnelly, J.M., & Konopaske, R. (2003). *Organizational Behavior, Structure, Processes*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Halpin, A.W. (1966). *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York: Macmillan.

- Harris, A. (2002). *School Improvement: What's in it for Schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Harris, S.L., & Lowery, S. (2002). A view from the classroom. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8) 64-65.
- Heenan, D.A., & Bennis, W. (1999). *Co-leaders: The Power of Great Partnership*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. (3rd Ed.). New York: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H., & Johnson, D.E. (1996). *Management of Organizational Behaviour: Utilizing Human Resources*. (7th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Hill, J. (1997). *Managing Performance: Goals, Feedback, Coaching, Recognition*. England: Gower Publishing Limited.
- Hussain, N. (2005). *A Study of the Impact of Management Styles on Quality of Education in Government Higher Secondary Schools*. Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis. Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad.
- Kaczor, J.A.M. (2006). *A Study of Student Achievement and School Climate and Their Respective Relationships to Middle School Size within Four Poverty Strata in South Carolina*. PhD Thesis, University of South Carolina. USA: UMI. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.pk/books?isbn=054286374X> on March 29, 2015 at 5.00 PM.
- Katz, M. (1994). Principal leadership style and teacher feelings and behavior: Arab schools in Israel. *School Community Journal*, 4(2) 53-66.

- Khuong, A.M. & Yarmohammadian, R.M.H (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*. 19 (2) 11 - 28
- Khuong, M. N. & Yen, N. H. (2014). The effects of leadership styles and sociability trait emotional intelligence on employee engagement. A study in Binh Duong City, Vietnam. *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review*. 2 (1) 121-136 retrieved from [www.ijcrar.com](http://www.ijcrar.com)
- Mosime, V. (2000). *The Major Health Risk and Behaviour among Adolescents in Ramotswa Community Junior Secondary School*. Thesis, University of Botswana: Gaborone.
- Newstrom, J.W., & Keith. L. (2002). *Human Behaviour at Work. Organizational Behaviour*. New York. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Page, R.M., & Page, T.S. (2000). *Fostering Emotional Well-Being in the Classroom*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). London: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Pimpa N. & Moore, T. (2012). Leadership style: A study of Australian and Thai public sectors. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*. 17 (2) 21-37.
- Robbins, P.R., & Coulter, M. (2005). *Management (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Steffy, B.E. (1989). *Career Stages of Classroom Teachers*. Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Company Inc.

Tariq, M. (2011). *Impact of administrative styles of secondary school heads on teachers 'performance in NWFP*. PhD Dissertation, Preston University Islamabad.

Waqar, H & Siddiqui, K (2008). *A Study about the leadership styles of Public and Private school principals*. Journal of Elementary Education. 18(1-2) 5-20.