**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study was to examine transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness of male and female leaders within the context of education and health departments in Pakistan and Turkey. This research examined in detail the three leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional and Laissez Faire) with respect to gender (male and female), region (Pakistan and Turkey) and department, (Education and Health). Surveys were sent to four hundred (n=400) male and female leaders in education and health departments where 184 questionnaire were returned from Pakistan and 120 sample respondents contributed from Turkey. Among 12 factors (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x short Form), nine factors were employed to evaluate components of leadership style, while the remaining three factors were labeled as an outcome measures. There found to be but small differences in the leadership styles (transformational, transactional & laissez faire) of males and females. In comparison to transformational and transactional leadership styles, males and females both scored higher on transformational leadership style as compared to transactional leadership style. The score of laissez faire leadership style remained below of both the transformational and transactional leadership styles. Examining the leadership styles with respect to region, the results indicated significant differences in the leadership styles of leaders in Pakistan and Turkey.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Leadership has long been an area of interest for scholars and researchers for thousands of years. A number of researchers including Bennis (1989); Kotter (1990); Bass (1990); Bass (1997); Kouzes and Posner (2002) and Yukl (2002) have widely explored, written about and practiced leadership for centuries and there are still many dimensions yet to be researched about. A definition by Bass (1997) that encompasses the majority of different definitions surrounding the construct of leadership states that: “Leadership has been conceived as the focus of group processes, as a matter of personality, as a matter of inducing compliance, as the exercise of influence, as particular behaviors, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, as an instrument to achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, as an initiation of structure, and as many combinations of this definition”.

Bass has discussed leadership in terms of various approaches and styles. According to Bass (1990) there are three well-known leadership approaches and styles that is laissez faire, transactional and transformational leadership. According to Bass (1990), laissez faire leaders do not take any responsibility and make their followers work relatively on their own and do not take interest in making decisions for the organization. He further explains that leaders adopting transactional leadership ask for clarifying job tasks for their followers and communicating about the successful execution of the given tasks towards achievement of desirable rewards.” While “transformational leaders emphasize the long-term perspective. Along with current needs of their employees or themselves, they also focus on future needs and requirements. They also keep into account the long term issues instead of considering merely the short-term problems and opportunities confronting the organization.” Laka-Mathebula highlights that “transformational leaders tend to have a holistic perspective of intra-and extra-organizational factors.”

Over a period of past 50 years, the focuses of leadership theories have been shifted from a scientific management perspective to human relations and organizational behavior spectrum. Taking start with the Lewin and Lippitt’s (1938) leadership research studies, various leadership studies and numerous leadership theories have been developed. The main list of leadership theories includes Trait Theory, Situational Theory, Contingency Theory and Transactional and Transformational leadership theories. Burns (1978) asserts, “One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership”.
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Laissez Faire: a management style in which leaders do not take any responsibility and make their followers work relatively on their own and do not take interest in making decisions for the organization.

Transformational:leadership style that emphasizes the long-term perspective. Along with current needs of their employees or themselves, they also focus on future needs and requirements. They also keep into account the long term issues instead of considering merely the short-term problems and opportunities confronting the organization.”
Leadership researchers (e.g., Avolio, 1999) made a comparison between transformational leadership and transactional leadership, where subordinates’ self-interest was raised by initiating an agreement set up or contract relationship between a leader and followers. According to Antonakis, et al. (2003), transactional leadership approach asks for clarification of subordinates’ duties and responsibilities, issue of rewards in return of services being rendered and execution of corrective measures in case of any failure so as to fulfill organizational objectives. According to researchers, laissez-faire leadership style is in fact an abrogation of leadership and is considered to be most ineffective. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is the instrument, which clearly assess the distinctions between aspects of leadership style.

The modern fastly moving scenario of postsecondary education system asks for more understanding, considerate, adaptive and flexible leaders. According to Burns (1978); Bass (1985); Dvir, et al. (2002), and Bass, et al., (2003), transformational leaders (adaptive leaders) work with their subordinates to achieve efficiency, better performance and produce novel and creative solutions to abstract queries. The worth noting point identified by different researchers like Dvir et al. (2002) and Day, et al. (2004) report that transformational leadership as compared to transactional leadership steps forward in enhancing performance and expectations.

In the South African context, Ristow, et al. (1999) state that transformational leadership is positively related with organizational effectiveness in the administration of cricket in South Africa. Hayward, Davidson, Pascoe, Tasker, Amos and Pearse (2003) determined a positive linear relationship between transformational leadership and employee performance in a South African pharmaceutical organization. Evidence has been gathered in South African retail and manufacturing sectors, as well in the armed forces of the United States, Canada and Germany that points towards the marginal impact transactional leaders have on the effectiveness of their subordinates in contrast to the strong, positive effects of transformational leaders. Furthermore, in the Canadian financial industry it was found that transformational leadership is more strongly correlated with higher employee satisfaction and individual/organizational performance than transactional leadership.

Most studies focus on examining if women and men leaders differ in the extent they apply transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Several studies conducted by Rosener (1990); Druskat (1994) and Bass, et al. (1996) focusing on transformational leadership highlight that females perceive themselves, and are perceived, as adopting transformational leadership styles more than males. However, there have also been studies conducted by Komives (1991) and Maher (1997) that failed to discover gender differences in transformational leadership.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This research employed descriptive statistical analyses, logistic regression analysis and chi-square based on information obtained through survey research. SPSS version 17 was used to create a data base. This quantitative method was selected because it serves to describe the relationship among different variables. Research conducted via survey is possibly the best method available to a researcher interested in collecting original data for describing a population too big to observe directly.

Four hundred (n=400) questionnaires were distributed, three hundred and fifty (n=350) were returned where three hundred and four (n=304) found valid. Female respondents are 174 and males are 130, which constitute 57.2% and 42.8% respectively. One hundred and eighty four (n=184) sample data is collected from Pakistan out of which 151 collected from Peshawar and 33 from Abbottabad which constitute 49.7% and 10.9% respectively. One hundred and twenty (n=120) sample respondents contributed from Turkey, which constitute 39.5% of the total data. The contribution of Education and Health departments in the research data is 164 (53.9%) and 140 (46.1%) respectively. In addition, four hundred (n=400) leaders surveyed in the sample, three hundred and fifty (n=350) completed the questionnaires. Three hundred and four (n=304) found valid and have been included in the analysis amounting to a response rate of approximately 87.5%.

According to Bass and Avolio (1993), “the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5x-Short (Revised) is designed to measure transactional and transformational leadership styles. The MLQ 5X proved to be having excellent internal consistency, reliability, and construct validity. This instrument is a self-administered questionnaire consisting of 45 items being individually evaluated on 5-point, Likert-type, ordinal scale”. The rating scale has the following designations: “0” = “Not at all”, “1” = “Once in a while”, “2” = “Sometimes”, “3” = “Fairly often”, “4” = “Frequently, if not always”.

Logistic Regression Model

According to DeMaris (1992), “the Logistic Regression Model” is:
“log odds (dependent variable) = (B for var1)*Var1 + (B for var2)*Var2 + ... + (B for varn)*Varn + (B for the constant)*Constant.”

Logistic Regression model for each of the leadership styles and leadership outcomes used in this research is illustrated below.

**Transformational Leadership**

*Idealised Influence Attributed (II A)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{10} + β_2Q_{18} + β_3Q_{21} + β_4Q_{23}”

*Idealised Influence Behaviour (II B)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i)” = β_0 + β_1Q_{6} + β_2Q_{14} + β_3Q_{23} + β_4Q_{34}”

*Inspirational Motivation (IM)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{9} + β_2Q_{13} + β_3Q_{26} + β_4Q_{36}”

*Intellectual Stimulation (IS)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{2} + β_2Q_{8} + β_3Q_{30} + β_4Q_{32}”

*Individualised Consideration (IC)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{15} + β_2Q_{19} + β_3Q_{29} + β_4Q_{31}”

**Transactional Leadersh**

*Contingent Reward (CR)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{1} + β_2Q_{11} + β_3Q_{16} + β_4Q_{35}”

*Management by Exception Active (MBE A)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{4} + β_2Q_{22} + β_3Q_{24} + β_4Q_{27}”

*Management by Exception Passive (MBE P)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{3} + β_2Q_{12} + β_3Q_{17} + β_4Q_{20}”

*Laissez Faire (LF)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{5} + β_2Q_{28} + β_3Q_{38} + β_4Q_{33}”

**Leadership Outcome**

*Extra Effort (EE)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{39} + β_2Q_{42} + β_4Q_{44}”

*Effectiveness (EFF)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{37} + β_2Q_{40} + β_3Q_{43} + β_4Q_{45}”

*Satisfaction (S)*

“Logit (p_i) = ln (p_i / 1 - p_i) = β_0 + β_1Q_{38} + β_2Q_{41}”

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Frequency distribution with respect to gender, region, and department is presented below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The share of male respondents in the sample (n = 304) is 130 (42.8%) and that of females constitute 174 (57.2%).
Table 2. Region wise frequency distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pakistan and Turkey constitute 184 (60.5%) and 120 (39.5%) in the sample (n = 304) respectively.

Table 3. Department wise frequency distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transformational Leadership

Following are the results of chi-square and p values for various components of transformational leadership. All the five components of transformational leadership (i.e. II A, II B, IM, IS and IC) found to be statistically significant (p<.05).

Table 4. Idealized Influence Attributed (II A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td>192.816</td>
<td>200.447</td>
<td>89.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Idealized Influence Behavior (II B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>142.368</td>
<td>34.980</td>
<td>200.184</td>
<td>159.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Inspirational Motivation (IM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.059</td>
<td>128.079</td>
<td>77.395</td>
<td>90.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Intellectual Stimulation (IS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.033</td>
<td>41.888</td>
<td>27.638</td>
<td>39.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Individualized Consideration (IC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>138.632</td>
<td>147.447</td>
<td>160.632</td>
<td>174.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above tables and graphs show that females score high on Idealized Influence Attributed (II A), Idealized Influence Behavior (II B) and individualized Consideration (IC). Bass (1985) describes that leaders adopting Idealized Influence (II) take stands on difficult issues, emphasis trust, display conviction, and highlight their most significant values openly leading to enhanced organizational commitment. In addition he considered this aspect was labeled as Charismatic Leadership.

This study examined whether there were significant differences in the leadership styles with respect to gender (male and female), region (Pakistan and Turkey) and department (Education and Health). It was also investigated whether males are more transformational leaders or those of females. This study further probed into which country (Pakistan or Turkey) and which department (Education or Health) adopt transformational leadership style as compared to transactional leadership style. In other words, leaders in which country and in which department are transformational in their approach and behavior. This study sorted out whether there was an association between leadership styles (i.e. transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire) and leadership outcomes (extra Effort, effectiveness and satisfaction) and if so up to what extent and value. Three leadership styles with particular reference to transformational leadership were examined with respect to gender, region and department.

The results of this study shows that males scored with respect to transformational leadership style are 4.13 and female score was 4.16. Therefore, females scored slightly higher on transformational leadership style as compared to their male counterparts. Therefore, With regard to gender differences and leadership styles, the results of this study strongly supported by the previous findings of research studies conducted by Eagly, Karau and Johnson (1992a); Eagly, Makhijani and Klonsky (1992b); Eagly, Karau, Miner, and Johnson (1994); Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995); Kabacoff (1998); Maher (1997); Helgesen (1990); Loden (1985); Murphy, Eckstat, and Parker (1995); Moen (1995); Ah-Nee Benham, and Cooper (1998); Brunner (2000); Carless (1998); Carli (1999); Jago and Vroom (1982); Yammarino, Dubinsky, Comer, and Jolson (1997); Thomas (2000); Druskat (1994); Alimo-Metcalfe (1995); Sparrow and Rigg (1993); Ernst (1998); Floit (1997); Komives (1991); Edgar-Gradstein (1999); Bynum (2000); Remondini (2001); etc.

This study witnessed some differences (but small) in the leadership styles of males and females. With respect to the gender factor, some scholars report that male and female managers employ different leadership styles. Several studies conducted by previous researchers also indicate that “women are perceived and perceive themselves, as using transformational leadership style more than men” (Bass et al., 1996; Druskat, 1994; Rosener 1990). Females scored higher on transformational leadership as compared to their male counterparts. Females reported to have scored higher on Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (behavior), Inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration as compared to males.

In this study females scored slightly higher on transactional leadership style. With regard to Laissez faire leadership style, males and females showed slight differences. In comparison to transformational and transactional leadership styles, males and females both scored higher on transformational leadership style as compared to transactional leadership style.
This is in the line of previous researchers stating that “women are relationship-oriented and men are task-oriented”. Female managers spend significant amount of time in enhancing the long-term relationship with their subordinates and colleagues.” They are sensitive, warm, tactful and expressive.

With regard to gender differences and leadership styles, the results of this study are strongly supported by the previous findings of research studies conducted by Jago and Vroom (1982); Bass (1985); Loden (1985); Helgesen (1990); Komives (1991); Eagly, Karau & Johnson (1992a); Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky (1992b); Sparrow & Rigg (1993); Druskat (1994); Maher (1997); Murphy, Eckstat, & Parker (1995); Regan & Brooks (1995); Moen (1995); Almo-Metcalfe (1995); Yammarino, Dubinsky, Comer, and Jolson (1997); Carless (1998).

With regard to gender and laissez faire leadership style, males and females both showed less inclination towards laissez faire leadership in this study. According to researchers including Bass (1990b), laissez-faire leadership styles found to be the least effective and the least satisfying styles of leadership. To examine the relationship between transformational leadership style and leadership outcomes in this study, transformational leadership style reported to have positively significant correlations with all the three leadership outcomes far greater than transactional leadership style. Research identified that there found to have an association between transformational leadership style and high levels of organizational outcomes. With regard to differences in the leadership styles with respect to region (Pakistan and Turkey) in this study, there found to be significant differences in the leadership styles of Pakistan and Turkey. More specifically transformational leadership found to be highly significant between Pakistan and Turkey.

All components of transformational leadership except Intellectual Stimulation (IS) proved to be showing the supremacy of transformational leadership in Pakistan as compared to Turkey. All components of transformational leadership showed greater differences between the two countries. There found to have significant differences in the transactional leadership style and laissez faire leadership of both the countries. In comparison of transformational and transactional leadership styles with regard to region, Pakistan and Turkey both scored higher on transformational leadership style as compared to transactional leadership style.

Examine the differences in the leadership styles with respect to department (Education and Health) in this study, there found to be small differences in the leadership styles of both the departments. With regard to transformational leadership, there found to be some (but not significant) differences in the education and health departments with mean scores. All components of transformational leadership except Idealized Influence (Attributed and Behavior) scored higher in education department as compared to that of health. The overall score of transformational leadership remained higher in education department as compared to that of health.

With regard to transactional leadership style, there found to be slight differences in education department and health department. More specifically, education department scored slightly higher in transactional leadership as compared to that of health department. Both the departments reported to have some differences in the laissez faire leadership style.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendations with special reference to Pakistan**

1. This study was conducted in education and health departments only. In order to broaden the scope of the study, regarding transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness, this study should be replicated in other organizations e.g. judiciary, police, banks, business, manufacturing, military, politics, sports, etc. Research needs to be conducted and enhanced in the social sector and religious organizations as well.

2. Additional research needs to be conducted with leaders at all levels within the organization. Further research needs to be conducted with a large population, such as including teachers, lecturers in education department and medical officers, assistant medical officers, doctors etc in health department. Study should be widened to carry out research in non-teaching area e.g. clerical staff etc.

3. Research should be initiated in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Pakistan to have a comparative overview of NGOs and governmental organizations with special reference to transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness.

4. Research is needed in various public and private sector organizations in Pakistan with special reference to transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness.
5. It is recommended that a survey be conducted with the leaders’ followers (or raters) to determine their response to the leaders’ level of transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x is a self-reported instrument, additional research should be conducted using this instrument with both superiors and subordinates of leaders in education and health departments to validate the self-reported data of participants.

6. Research is needed in the field of leadership keeping into account the new trends and approaches of leadership to have an overview of the existing loopholes in the way of development of organizations.

7. This study was conducted in Pakistan and Turkey. In order to widen the scope and significance of the study regarding transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness, this study should be replicated in other regions or countries including developed and under-developed countries.

8. As this study comprised of data from colleges in the education department, research needs to be conducted at higher education level (e.g. university level) and elementary school level as well. The prevailing leadership styles in these organizations, their performance and effectiveness are suggested to be examined with special concern of transformational leadership.

Recommendations with special reference to Turkey

1. This study needs to be conducted pertaining to various leadership positions being occupied by females in Turkey to have an overview of glass ceiling effect and to find out ways as to how to overcome the problems being faced by them while reaching to different leadership positions in organizations.

2. It is recommended that a comparative survey be conducted in public and private sector organizations in Turkey with special reference to transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

3. Another recommendation is that this study be replicated using different demographic variables. Demographic variables that might be correlated with self-perceived transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness include age, race etc. of the leader.

4. This study should be initiated in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Turkey as well to have a comparative overview of NGOs and governmental organizations with special reference to transformational leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness.

5. The research needs to be conducted in various educational institutions of Turkey to have a comparative study of public sector and private sector colleges and universities with special reference to transformational leadership and gender role orientation.

6. The study is suggested to be initiated in the business sector of Turkish economy with special reference to leadership role and its effectiveness.

7. Vast research study is needed in the field of leadership keeping into account the modern and new approaches of leadership to have an overview of the prevailing bottlenecks in the way of progress and developments of organizations.

8. Further contribution could be made to understanding the impact of transformational leadership practices by using methods other than survey research, thus circumventing the limitations associated with this approach.
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