

Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of Secondary Schools Leadership: Promotee and Punjab Public Service Commission' Selectee

Muhammad Arif*

Muhammad Hameed Nawaz†

Vol. V, No. I (Winter 2020)

Pages: 566 – 575

p- ISSN: 2616-955X

e-ISSN: 2663-7030

ISSN-L: 2616-955X



Abstract

The study was aimed to check the effectiveness of secondary schools leadership, i.e. promotee and Punjab Public Service Commission (PPSC) selectees. It was descriptive research and cross-sectional survey design in nature. Population for this study comprised of all 4188 SSTs working under promotes and selectees school leadership across Punjab province. The sample consisted of 648 SSTs selected on a systematic random basis. The opinions were taken from SSTs about their school leadership by a self-developed questionnaire which was based on four points Likert scale. Independent sample t-test and Chi-square tests were applied to analyze the data. The study concluded that Punjab Public Service Commission' selectees school leadership regarding passionate vision, developing a conducive environment and struggle for fostering collaboration are found more effective than promotee school leadership. The study recommends training may be managed for both types of leadership, especially for promotee leaders for better performance.

Key Words: Effectiveness, School Leadership, PPSC, Selectee, Promotee, Chi-Square

Introduction

Seeking-knowledge is a phenomenon that enables a nation-state to prosper in the worldwide arena. It reawakens the spirit of awareness among its youths that afire them to excel in all walks of life. Edification is extensively seen as the scholarly and the ethical preparing of people through which the possibilities of doing better are created, the character attributes are instilled in them, and the way of life of the individuals is communicated to the coming ages. Training is, without a doubt, an essential segment of the life of a country and can't be considered in total segregation. (Afridi, 2008).

Wasserberg (2011) claimed that the primary role of any school leadership is the unification of people/ staff around key values. Leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes, and effective leadership means the creation of an effective, high-functioning professional community.

The environment full of respect, regard, and warmth enhances the teaching-learning process. Leadership is the dire need for a proficient and effective process to achieve goals. In the same way, Leadership is more important for any institution as compared to something else to achieve better results. Educational leadership was a complex and challenging job. Through his strategies and mentoring, positive change can occur in schools, teachers, students and the environment (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2015).

The secondary level of Education bridges between the higher and the lower levels of educations. The role of the secondary level is so critical because the future of the students depends on this education, so they need special attention. It shapes the root level learned ideas and knowledge to prepare the students for higher-level education. The head of the secondary level has a responsibility to groom the students to get higher-level education with full zeal, attention, and motivation. It has been realized that the single leadership style is not enough to meet

*PhD Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: razamarif@gmail.com

†Associate Professor, Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

the need of a school in this modern era. A successful Head of schools must be skilful with the all-modern leadership styles,

They should fully aware of the use of these styles according to the situation; otherwise, they will not overcome the challenges faced by the institutions. Successful leadership always enhances their skills. Often, the leadership is firmly stood to achieve their objective and goals set by the higher authorities. They are the most responsible and visionary. Their leadership is based on fairness, encouragement, trust, giving and receiving feedback, and share opinions and leadership.

Little has been written, an even less research undertaken, on the role of the headteacher in developing countries. In part no doubt this is because much of the educational reform effort in many countries have been concerned more with macro top-down system-wide change with its emphasis on the disciplines of planning and finance with micro-change with a clearly managerial emphasis. However, there is no longer tenable if it ever was ([Memon, 2016](#)). There is increasing recognition that school improvement requires effective management at the level of the school, not least because of the negative power of those close to the point where policies are required to have their effect. Increasingly, however, more confirmatory reasons for giving great care to school-level management are being put forward. Effective educational change, It is argued, must be grounded in local needs and be responsive to local demands. This means that educational systems must be decentralized, and decentralization certainly brings the focus of change closer to the headteacher ([Burchfield, 2014](#))

In particular, a key purpose of decentralization of school is a way to change of classical system through grooming and development of both teachers and headteachers. The main aim of this development is increasing the achievements of the students and provides them with opportunities for quality education. Same way, the Pakistani educational system also needs a rapid change regarding teachers, headteachers and environment, through proper planning, monitoring, correction of imbalance and continuous professional development ([Wong & Dimmock, 2012](#)).

The leadership of the school plays an essential role to meet the goals. Successful leaders focus on continuous reforms. They focus on achieving the goals and targets. Their focus is on an effective learning and teaching process. They never compromise on their targets. They believe in their students' achievements. It is a universal standard that an institution has good leadership to produce a well-educated citizen for the nation. It is crystal clear the effective transformation of the education field depends on the performance and decisions made by the head of the school ([Kendall & Kendall, 2018](#)). Effective leaders have the qualities of managing, leading, advising, offering an opinion, supporting coaching, continuous assessment of team members. They know their responsibilities regarding the provision of quality education ([Price, 2015](#)).

The key person for school effectiveness is headteacher/principal who plays a key role in promoting a sense of awareness through education. A head educator/school pioneer should deserve the admiration of his/her underlings by the excellence of what s/he performs. Educating is craftsmanship, and like all different expressions, it very well may be scholarly with changing degrees of capability ([Rowan & Taylor, 2013](#)). Keeping in see the essential function of head educators/school pioneer, due consideration ought to be paid to the enlisting and staffing cycle of them. Just those people ought to be chosen who have a significant duty and positive expert disposition towards their calling. Their preparation, their expert responsibility, their insight and experience are the factors, which straightforwardly influence their exhibition. ([Shah, 2015](#)).

In Punjab, there are two ways to recruit the educational leadership in high schools, in-service promoted and PPSC selected. The ratio of selection according to the law of leadership selection in Punjab School Education Department is under practice yet as 67% through in-service promotion and 33% through Punjab Public Service Commission open merit base selection.

Both have provided with equal chance to serve as a leader of secondary school and prominent performances of school leaders remarkable by their passionate images. It is also them responsibly to develop the place of learning much beneficial to the students and teachers as well so that they can perform well accordingly. They also have given an equal chance of making school such a place where their subordinate also fosters collaboration among them and creates productive relations outside their schools ([Leithwood & Jantzi, 2017](#)). Both have given an equal chance of leadership to support their teachers, monitor their results, and provide clear guidelines. It is their foremost responsibility to emphasis on the students' learning, timetabling, the priority placed on basic learning.

It is their equal responsibility to create a conducive climate in the school, the cohesiveness of the teachers, consultative decision-making, pragmatic approach to problems, School culture, develop a clear vision of the mission, emphasis on improving results, staff training and professional development ([Ali, Qasim, Jaffer & Greenland, 2013](#)). Keeping in view these two modes of selection of these school leaders, it was considered vital to conduct a study “to compare the effectiveness of secondary school leadership of the promotee and Punjab Public Service Commission’s selectees.”

Statement of the Problem

In Punjab, some of the secondary schools are performing excellently and some them poorly. Among them, look like very conducive, and some of them are non-encouraging. The attributes responsible for developing students to learn the leadership traits are made possible due to well- committed management, efficacious work environment and academic decorum at the educational unit and school management is responsible for prevailing it in the school like other peripherals. Providing all these paraphernalia in Pakistan, especially in Punjab, the school management is doing its best to the of school leadership. In this regard it necessary to explore contributing of both promotee and selectees in the downsizing of secondary schools’ performance. This concept inspires the researcher to conduct research on the topic “A Comparative Study to Explore the Effectiveness of Secondary Schools Leadership of the promotee and Punjab Public Service Commission’ Selectee.”

Objectives of the Study

The following research objectives were formulated:

1. To compare the passionate vision of the promotee and Punjab Public Service Commission selectee secondary schools’ leader.
2. To compare the effort of promotee and selectee secondary schools’ leaders for developing conducive school environment for students.
3. To compare the struggle of promotee and selectee secondary schools’ leader for fostering collaboration within and outside the school.

Research Hypothesis

The researcher generated the following research hypotheses:

- H₀₁:** There is no significant difference between promotee and selectee school leadership’ effectiveness in the passionate vision.
- H₀₂:** There is no significant difference between promotee and selectee school leadership’ effort for developing conducive school environment for students.
- H₀₃:** There is no significant difference between promotee and selectee school leadership’ struggle for fostering collaboration within and outside the school.

Procedure of the Study

It was a descriptive study and survey design in nature. All the secondary school teachers working under the promotee and selectee leadership of the public secondary schools of Punjab are taken as the population of the study. By following [Gay, Mills and Airasian \(2009\)](#), the researcher selected 10% sample from the accessible population. The sample comprised of 648 Secondary School Teachers (SSTs) was selected through systematic random sampling. A questionnaire was self-developed to measure leadership effectiveness. The questionnaire comprised of 3 sub-constructs of the effectiveness of school leadership, e.g. passionate vision, conducive environment and fostering collaboration and Cronbach’s reliability of the SSTs questionnaire was found 0.86.

Data Analysis

Table 1. Responses of SSTs Regarding Passionate Vision of their School Leader

S. No	Statements	Type of Leadership	Fre. & %age	Highly Effective	Effective	In-effective	Highly Ineffective	\bar{x}	t	Sig
My School Leader's Vision is to										
1	Enroll hundred percent child in school	Promotees	Fre. 245	114	26	42	3.32	1.992		.086
		Selectees	%age 57.5	26.8	6.1	9.6	3.45			
2	Reduce the dropout rate in the current academic year	Promotees	Fre. 165	231	15	15	3.28	-2.194		.029
		Selectees	%age 55.8	36.4	2.6	5.2	3.41			
3	Provide quality education	Promotees	Fre. 194	184	30	18	3.30	-3.988		.000
		Selectees	%age 45.5	43.2	7.0	4.2	3.55			
4	Equipped lab with latest operates in the school	Promotees	Fre. 151	205	47	23	3.14	-4.843		.000
		Selectees	%age 35.4	48.1	11.0	5.4	3.45			
5	The increase passed students rate in the current academic year	Promotees	Fre. 189	196	25	16	3.01	-1.992		.026
		Selectees	%age 44.4	46.0	5.9	3.8	3.32			

Std.D for all Statements= .64-.82, df=646, P<0.05, (Promote=426, selectee-222)

It is indicated in the following table 1 that the computed t-values of statements 2-5 are (-1.992 to -4.843) which are less than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig values (.000-.029) of statements is less than the critical P=0.05. It shows that mean values of the statement No. 2-5 of the response of selectees leadership' SSTs significantly differ from the SSTs of promotee leadership. The computed t-value of statement No.1 is (1.992) which greater than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig value is (.086) which is greater than P=0.05. It shows no significant mean difference between promotes and selectees' leaderships' SSTs response for statements No. 1. Std.D (.64-.82) for all statements shows that respondents were constant while responding. It is concluded that the passionate vision of the majority of the selectee's school leadership, to reduce the dropout rate in the current academic year, provide quality education, equipped lab with latest operates in school, and increase passed students rate in the current academic year was highly affected. The vision to enrol hundred per cent children in the school of both (promote and selectee) leadership was highly effected.

Table 1a. Responses of SSTs Regarding Passionate Vision of their School Leader

S. No	Statements	Type of Leadership	Fre. & %age	Highly Effective	Effective	In-effective	Highly Ineffective	\bar{x}	t	Sig
My School Headmaster/Principal's Vision is to:										
1	Arrange a teacher training program for the teacher to enhance their professional skill	Promotees	Fre. 162	199	43	23	3.0	2.155		.064
		Selectees	%age 38.0	46.7	9.9	5.4	9			

		Type of Leadership	Fre.	%age	Highly Effective	Effective	In-effective	Highly Ineffective	\bar{x}	t	Sig
2	Provide opportunities for co-curricular activities	Promotees	182	42.7	208	25	11	3.3	3.39	-1.380	.041
		Selectees	125	54.1	76	21	9	3.4			
3	Build a strong relationship with the community	Promotees	174	40.8	193	36	23	3.0	3.2	-1.473	.007
		Selectees	113	48.9	86	27	5	3.2			
4	Use the latest assessment techniques to assess students'	Promotees	135	31.7	249	26	16	3.1	3.2	-1.108	.045
		Selectees	97	42.0	100	24	10	3.2			
5	Observe at least one teacher in a day	Promotees	148	34.7	240	27	11	3.0	3.2	-.342	.034
		Selectees	108	46.8	93	24	6	3.2			

Std.D for all statements= .69-.84, df=646, (Promote=426, selectee-222)

It is indicated in the following Table 1A that the computed t-values of statements 7-10 are (-.342 to -1.473) which are less than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig values (.007-.045) of statements is less than the critical P=0.05. It shows that mean values of the statement No. 7-10 of the response of selectees leadership' SSTs significantly differ from the SSTs of promotes leadership. The computed t-value of statement No.6 is (2.155) which greater than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig value is (.064) which is greater than P=0.05. It shows no significant mean difference between promotes and selectees' leaderships' SSTs response for statements No. 1. Std.D (.64-.82) for all statements shows that respondents were constant while responding. It is concluded that the passionate vision of the majority of the selectee's school leadership, to provide opportunities of co-curricular activities, to build a strong relationship with the community, to use latest assessment techniques to assess students' performance, and the vision to observe at least one teacher in a day was highly effected. The vision to arrange a teacher training program for the teacher to enhance their professional skill of both (promote and selectee) leadership was just affected.

Table 2. Responses of SSTs Regarding Effort for Developing Conducive School Environment by their School Leader (Promote=426, Selectee-222)

S. No	Statements	Type of Leadership	Fre. & %age	Highly Effective	Effective	In-effective	Highly Ineffective	\bar{x}	t	Sig
My School Head Creates a Conducive Environment in School by:										
1	Using a variety of teaching styles to stimulate students' learning	Promotees	235	55.2	158	22	11	3.45	-2.670	.008
		Selectees	100	43.3	113	7	11	3.29		
2	Ensuring a secure environment in school and classroom	Promotees	151	35.4	193	58	24	3.11	-5.062	.000
		Selectees	122	52.8	88	23	8	3.44		
3	Allowing students to come headteacher office if they have any problem	Promotees	170	39.9	173	55	28	3.14	-3.621	.000
		Selectees	119	51.5	86	16	10	3.39		
4		Promotees	184		187	33	22	3.25		

5	Developing a friendly culture for teacher and students in school	Selectees	%age	43.2	43.9	7.7	5.2	3.39	039
			Fre.	115	97	7	12		
	Allowing the teacher to add his/her opinion for the betterment of the school	Promotees	%age	49.8	42.0	3.0	5.2	3.35	2.577
			Fre.	220	150	39	17		
		Selectees	%age	51.6	35.2	9.2	4.0	3.39	564
			Fre.	120	83	21	7		
		%age	51.9	35.9	9.1	3.0			

Std.D for all statements= .71-.88, df=646, P<0.05

It is indicated in the following table 2 that the computed t-values of statements 11-14 are (-2.064 to -5.062) which are less than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig values (.000-.039) of all statements is less than the critical P=0.05. It shows that mean values of the statement No. 11-14 of the response of selectees leadership' SSTs significantly differ from the SSTs of promotes leadership. The computed t-value of statement No.15 is (2.577) which greater than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig value is (.564) which greater than P=0.05. It shows no significant mean difference between promotes and selectees' leaderships' SSTs response for statements No. 15. Std.D (.71-.88) for all statements shows that respondents were constant while responding. It is concluded that the effort for creating a conducive and secure environment in school and classroom by allowing students to come head teacher office if they have any problem and developing a friendly culture for teacher and students of the majority of selectees' school leadership was highly effective. Moreover, the effort for creating a conducive and secure environment in school by using a variety of teaching styles to stimulate students' learning, of the majority of promotes leadership was highly effective, and effort for creating a conducive environment by allowing the teacher to add his/her opinion for the betterment of school of the majority of both leadership (promote and selectee) was highly effective.

Table 2a. Responses of SSTs Regarding Effort for Developing Conducive School Environment by their School Leader (Promote=426, Selectee-222)

S. No	Statements	Type of Leadership	Fre. & %age	Highly Effective	Effective	In-effective	Highly Ineffective	\bar{x}	t	Sig
My School Head Creates a Conducive Environment in School by:										
1	Rewarding good performer teacher and students	Promotees	Fre.	145	185	54	42	3.02	-3.096	.002
			%age	34.0	43.4	12.7	9.9			
		Selectees	Fre.	105	82	31	23	3.25		
			%age	45.5	35.5	13.4	5.6			
2	Developing such environment in which each of staff member feels equal respect by head	Promotees	Fre.	146	194	51	35	3.06	-4.011	.000
			%age	34.3	45.5	12.0	8.2			
		Selectees	Fre.	120	76	29	6	3.34		
			%age	51.9	32.9	12.6	2.6			
3	Creating an effective teacher and student's interaction	Promotees	Fre.	203	133	57	33	3.19	2.775	.086
			%age	47.7	31.2	13/4	7.7			
		Selectees	Fre.	113	91	23	4	3.29		
			%age	48.9	39.4	10.0	1.7			
4	Offering freedom of opinion for all Staff members	Promotees	Fre.	172	173	51	30	3.14	-2.407	.016
			%age	40.4	40.6	12.0	7.0			
		Selectees	Fre.	117	76	30	8	3.32		
			%age	50.6	32.9	13.0	3.5			

Std.D for all statements= .70-.94, df=646, P<0.05

It is indicated in the following Table 2A that the computed t-values of statements 16, 17 and 19 are (-2.407 to -4.011) which are less than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig values (.000-.016) of all statements is less than the critical P=0.05. It shows that the mean values of the statement No. 16, 17, and 19 of the response of selectees leadership' SSTs significantly differ from the SSTs of promotes leadership. The computed t-value of statement No.18 is (2.775) which greater than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig value is (.086) which greater than P=0.05. It shows no significant mean difference between promotes and selectees' leaderships' SSTs response for statements No. 18. Std.D (.70-.94) for all statements shows that respondents were constant while responding. It is concluded that the effort for developing conducive school environment by rewarding good performer teacher and students, developing such environment in which each of staff member feels equal respect by the head, and offering freedom of opinion for all staff members of the majority of selectees' school leadership was highly effective. The effort for developing conducive school environment by creating effective teacher and students' interaction of the majority of both (promote and selectee) school leadership was highly effected.

Table 3. Responses of SSTs Regarding Struggle for Fostering Collaboration within and outside the School (Promote=426, Selectee-222)

S. No	Statements	Type of Leadership	Fre. & %age	Highly Effective	Effective	In-effective	Highly Ineffective	\bar{x}	t	Sig
My School Principal/Headmaster Foster Collaboration in School by:										
1	Believing in collaboration for school improvement	Promotees	Fre. 149 %age 35.0	196	46.0	43	10.1	3.18	-3.733	.000
		Selectees	Fre. 118 %age 51.1	94	40.7	14	2.2	3.45		
2	Providing opportunities for the teacher to work together	Promotees	Fre. 152 %age 35.7	215	50.5	29	6.8	3.15	-2.890	.004
		Selectees	Fre. 106 %age 45.9	104	45.0	13	3.5	3.34		
3	Participating in staff in important school's decision making	Promotees	Fre. 206 %age 48.4	144	33.8	52	12.2	3.25	2.745	.456
		Selectees	Fre. 115 %age 49.8	81	35.1	25	10.8	3.30		
4	Empowering leadership team for risk-taking	Promotees	Fre. 137 %age 32.2	158	37.1	76	17.8	2.93	-3.675	.003
		Selectees	Fre. 98 %age 42.4	94	40.7	25	10.8	3.23		
5	Assigning right tasks to the right person	Promotees	Fre. 150 %age 35.2	160	37.6	74	17.4	2.98	-4.218	.000
		Selectees	Fre. 111 %age 48.1	84	36.4	25	10.8	3.30		

Std.D for all Statements= .67-1.83, df=646, P<0.05

It is indicated in the following table 3 that the computed t-values of statements 20, 21, 23, and 24 are (-2.890 to -4.218) which are less than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig values (.000-.004) of all statements is less than the critical P=0.05. It shows that the mean values of the statement No. 20, 21, 23, and 24 of the response of selectees leadership' SSTs significantly differ from the SSTs of promotes leadership. The computed t-value of statement No.22 is (2.745), which is greater than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig value is (.456) which greater than P=0.05. It shows no significant mean difference between

promotes and selectees' leaderships' SSTs response for statements No. 22. Std.D (.67-.1.83) for all statements shows that respondents were constant while responding. It is concluded that struggle for fostering collaboration within and outside the school by believing in collaboration for school improvement, providing opportunities for the teacher to work together, by empowering leadership team for risk-taking and assigning right tasks to the right person of the majority of selectees' school leadership was highly effective. The effort f for fostering collaboration within and outside the school by participating in staff in important school's decision making of the majority of both (promote and selectee) school leadership was highly effected.

Table 3a. Responses of SSTs Regarding Struggle for Fostering Collaboration within and outside the School (Promote=426, Selectee-222)

S. No	Statements	Type of Leadership	Fre. & %age	Highly Effective	Effective	In-Effective	Highly Ineffective	\bar{x}	t	Sig
My School Principal/Headmaster Foster Collaboration in School by:										
1	Rotating leadership role among staff	Promotees	Fre. 172 %age 40.4	172	166	57	31	3.12	1.999	.060
		Selectees	Fre. 104 %age 45.1	104	74	36	17	3.16		
2	Gathering staff members on a regular basis in their continuing activities	Promotees	Fre. 153 %age 35.9	153	162	84	27	3.04	-2.516	.012
		Selectees	Fre. 102 %age 44.2	102	83	33	13	3.22		
3	Conducting a meeting in school time in which teacher observe each other and provide feedback	Promotees	Fre. 137 %age 32.2	137	155	89	45	2.94	-3.855	.000
		Selectees	Fre. 105 %age 45.5	105	81	38	7	3.24		
4	Conducting intervention meeting in which teacher meet to collaborate on the intervention work they are providing for students	Promotees	Fre. 155 %age 36.4	155	171	68	32	3.05	-2.345	.019
		Selectees	Fre. 105 %age 45.5	105	85	33	8	3.23		
5	Providing resource through which all staff can share their teaching material	Promotees	Fre. 204 %age 47.9	204	120	55	47	3.13	2.158	.079
		Selectees	Fre. 120 %age 51.9	120	71	29	11	3.27		

Std.D for all Statements= .82-1.02, df=646, P<0.05

It is indicated in the following Table 3A that the computed t-values of statements 26-28 are (-2.245 to -3.855) which are less than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig values (.000-.019) of these statements is less than the critical P=0.05. It shows that mean values of the statement No. 26-28 of the response of selectees leadership' SSTs significantly differ from the SSTs of promotes leadership. The computed t-values of statement No.25 and 29 are (1.999 and 2.158) which is greater than the t-table values (1.960) at df (646) and computed sig value is (.060 and .079) which greater than P=0.05. It shows no significant mean difference between promotes and selectees' leaderships' SSTs response for statements No. 25 and 29. Std.D (.82-.1.02) for all statements shows that respondents were constant while responding. It is concluded that struggle for fostering collaboration within and outside the school by gathering staff members on a regular basis in their continuing activities, conducting a meeting in school time in which teacher observe each other and provide feedback, and by conducting intervention meeting in which teacher meet to collaborate on the intervention work

they are providing for students of the majority of selectees' school leadership was highly effective. The effort for fostering collaboration within and outside the school by rotating leadership role among staff and providing resource through which all staff can share their teaching material of the majority of both (promotee and selectee) school leadership was highly effected.

Discussions and Conclusions

Vision is perhaps one of the most important qualities of a leader which provides his/her energy and direction from which they generate inspiration, motivation and excitement that pervades throughout the school. In this regard, the selectee school leaderships were highly effective and were cultivating their passionate vision by reducing the dropout rate, providing quality education, equipping lab with latest operates in school, and increasing passed students rate in every coming academic year. Moreover, they were passionate their vision by providing opportunities of co-curricular activities, building a strong relationship with the community, applying latest assessment techniques to assess students' performance in school, and by observing a teacher in the classroom whereas promotee leaderships were just effective to passionate their vision.

A conducive environment is one of the most important factors affecting student learning. It provides relevant content, clear learning goals and feedback, opportunities to build social skills, and strategies to help students succeed. In this respect selectee, school leaders were highly effective and were engaged in developing conducive school environment by allowing students to come to their office if they have any problem, by developing a friendly culture for teacher and students, by rewarding good performer teacher and students, developing such environment in which each of staff member feels equal respect, and offering freedom of opinion for all staff members ([Jantzi, Steinbach, 2008](#)). Whereas for creating a conducive and secure environment in school by using a variety of teaching styles to stimulate students' learning, the majority of promotee leadership was highly effective. The headteachers selected directly by the Punjab Public Service Commission had better school management effectiveness as compared to promoted headteachers ([Ali, Arshad & Rasool, 2019](#)).

When educationist works together, they form important professional and personal relationships. School leader and teachers often draw support from each other and can delegate tasks that allow them to feel effective. Collaboration within and outside the school contributes to school improvement and student success. For the fulfilment of this mission selectee, school leaders were highly effective and were fostering their collaboration by providing opportunities for the teacher to work together, by empowering leadership team for risk-taking, by assigning right tasks to the right person, by gathering staff members on a regular basis in their continuing activities, conducting a meeting in school time in which teacher observe each other and provide feedback, and by conducting intervention meeting in which teacher meet to collaborate on the intervention work they are providing for students. Whereas fostering collaboration by participating of staff in important school's decision making and by rotating leadership role among staff and providing resource through which all staff can share their teaching material, majority of the both (promotee and selectee) school leaderships were highly affected. The overall study concluded that the school leaders PPSC selectee was more effective as compared to promotee leaders.

Recommendations

It was found from the result of the present study that the promotee school leaders were found behind from the selectee school leader regarding developing conducive school environment. So, it is recommended that the education department should conduct in-service training to enhance the ability to develop a conducive environment by the promotee school leader.

References

- Afridi, A. K. (2008). Educational Administration & School Organization, Peshawar. *The Print man Publishing*, (p.187).
- Ali, M. A., Qasim, R., Jaffer & Greenland. (2013). Teacher-center and school-based models of collegiality and professional development. Resource Centre and the Aga Khan School System in Karachi, Pakistan. *International Journal Educational Research*, 19, 35-54.
- Ali, S. M., Arshad, M., & Rasool, S. (2019). Effective management of secondary school head teachers in Punjab: A comparative study. *Global Regional Review*, 4(3),136-144. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/grr.2019\(IV-III\).15](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/grr.2019(IV-III).15).
- Burchfield, C. (2014). School-level effects of teachers 'participation in decision making. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16.
- Foster, R. (2015). Leadership and secondary school improvement: case studies of tensions and possibilities. *International journal of leadership in education*, 8(1), 35-52.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2009). Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and applications (9th ed.). Columbus, Ohio: *Pearson Merrill*.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L. & Mulford, B. (2015). Successful principal leadership: Australian case studies. *Journal of educational administration*, 43(6), 539-551.
- Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2008). Leadership and other conditions which foster organisational learning in schools. *Organisational learning in schools*, 1(2), 67-90.
- Kendall, D., & Kendall, L. (2018). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of administrative practice in high schools and students' perceptions of the school, teachers and their own performance. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 4(1), 44-89.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2017). The effects of transformational leadership on organisational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 38(2), 12-21.
- Memon, M. (2016). The future of head teachers and educational leaders in Pakistan: Implications for pedagogical leadership. *Education*, 3(3), 23-27.
- Price, H. E. (2015). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 4 (1).
- Rowan, B. & Taylor, J. E. (2013). Distributed leadership in schools: the case of elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 25(4), 347-373.
- Shah, S. M. A. (2015). A Comparison between the Performance of in-service promoted and directly selected (By the public Service Commission) Secondary School Teachers. Rawalpindi District, (Unpublished M.Phil. Thesis), Islamabad: AIQU.
- Wasserberg, (2011). The impact of leadership on student outcomes:How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 2, 221-258.
- Wong, C., & Dimmock, C. (2012). Principals developing principals: Principal professional development in Hong Kong. Paper for the National College for School Leadership First Invitational International Conference Nottingham, October 16-18.