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1. Abstract

This paper is carried out to determine the relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational health. The study attempted to determine if there is a difference in the teacher’s perception of the principal’s leadership style and school’s health. The population in this study consists of teachers in secondary schools in Golestan province of Iran. The researcher selected the cases by sample random sampling method. The result of reliability in pilot of study revealed that both instruments are reliable to administer the instrument, because the value of Cronbach’s Alpha for independent and dependent variable were high (.922, .915). In order to analyzing data the researcher has used descriptive statistics and a Correlation Pearson for related samples. The descriptive statistics provide a mean, range and standard deviation based on the results from both survey instruments.
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1.1 Background of study

The role of the principal in creating an environment conducive to learning is very important. Principals especially are expected to make learning the center of the organization, to empower teachers, and to ensure that parents are involved in their child’s education. It is not widely known how many principals held the necessary attributes to create and maintain a healthy school climate and to what extent these attributes can be used. School climate is an important component to increasing students’ achievement in all schools. Stover (2005) has defined school climate as how student and teacher feel about their school. He has asserted that school climate is one of the clearest predictors of the educational success of school. Principal serve as a major catalyst in ensuring that the school climate is conductive to all learners.

The instructional leader, principals were expected to create and foster a community of learners (Barth 2006). This can be accomplished through creating a climate of students, teachers, and administrators who are continually learning and developing. Barth (2002) has stated “the most important responsibility of every educator was providing conditions under people learning curves”. Brain enriching learning environments focus on two critical components, challenge and feedback (Edmonds 1979). Students in an enriched learning environment have opportunities for critical and complex thinking and relevant and engaging projects. These attributes cultivate an environment that places learning at the center. Another component is interactive feedback (Edmonds (1979), which was giving individual students tailored and timely feedback in an effort to improve the specific learning of that student. The goal of this feedback is to provide ongoing monitoring of the child's progress. Principals have a major role in providing and building a brain enriched learning environment. Barth (2001) concluded "Ultimately there were two kinds of schools: learning-enriched schools and learning-impoverished schools” (p. 23).
1.2 Purpose of Study
The purpose of this study was to find whether the principal's leadership style impact the health of school climate. The study identified the leadership styles exhibited by secondary principals; identified the specific leadership styles and behaviors that promote a healthy school climate as perceived by teachers, and determine if there is a significant relationship between school health and transformational leadership. By promoting the health of school climate, it was expected the quality of educational aims’ can be better achieved.

1.3 Objectives
1. To determine the level of transformational leadership
2. To determine the level of organizational health
3. To determine the extent in which leadership style affects the perception of teachers on organizational health differences.
4. To investigate the correlation between organizational health and specific leadership behaviors of a transformational leadership.

2. A View of Literature
2.1 Vision
The first basic component of leadership is a guiding vision. The leader has an idea of what he /she wants to do professionally and personally; and it is strength to continue in the face of setback, even failures (Bennis 2003). Kouzes and Posner (2002) have mentioned to attributes of vision that spread out an understanding of what implies: First, visions must be future orientated and should be formulated as statements that point to a destination (Daft 2008).

Second, visions need to "see the future;" When we invent the future, we try to get a mental picture of what things will be like long before we have begun the journey (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 89). Third, visions have to communicate the ideal and serve as standards of greatness. Great leaders have always shot for the moon and have extended their reach far beyond mere probability to over-the-top possibility (Hammer and Champy 1993).

Organizational health in this study refers to the interpersonal relations of students, teachers, and administrators in a school (Hoy & Tarter, 1997). Miles (1969) emphasized that a healthy environment was not only an organization surviving its environment but also a structure constantly using its abilities to cope with difficulties and surviving in the long run. Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991) defined the concept of organizational health as the ability of the organization to successfully adapt to its environment.

Tsui and Cheng (1999) express that "the teacher's perception of the school environment or organizational health is an important source of data to reflect the quality of teachers' 'work life' (p. 249). This social interaction will reflect either a healthy or unhealthy organizational climate. According to Parsons (1951), in a healthy school technical, managerial and institutional levels are in harmony, and the school is able to meet its basic needs, and the energy is directed toward achieving the school's mission. Hoy, Tarter and Bliss, (1990) assert that the primary function of the school is to produce educated students. Teachers and supervisors are the agents for solving the problems associated with effective teaching and learning. Secondly, the managerial level controls the internal administrative functions of the school.

2.2 Impact of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Health
Based on the many studies conducted by Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991), teachers in a healthy school are committed to teaching and learning. They set high expectations related to student performance goals, maintain high expectations, and promote a serious learning environment. Students working hard and are motivated to achieve at high levels. "The leadership style of the principal assumed as a critical source of organizational health". (Korkmaz, 2007, p. 34) The principal ensures that instructional materials and classroom supplies are readily accessible to support the teaching and learning that is taking place in the school. Unhealthy schools in contrast are places filled with un-cooperative faculty and staff.

Tarter, Sabo and Hoy (1995) found a positive relationship between middle school health, and faculty trust, an open climate, and school effectiveness transformative leaders try to empower those around them by allowing them opportunities to grow professionally and by modeling expected behaviors.
Silins (1993) explained that transformative leaders help build a collaborative relationship between the leader and the follower which ultimately impacts the performance of the whole organization resulting in a responsive and modern environment.

2.3 Teacher's Perceptions of Transformational Leadership Style

Transformational leaders are able to invite teachers into the decision-making process to implement systematic improvement at the school level. Followers working with transformational leaders are more involved, satisfied, empowered; whereas, a transactional leader does not empower members of the organization for trying to meet organizational goals. According to Bass and Avolio (1990) the transformational leaders are more likely to appear as leaders in time of growth, change and crisis. The emerging use of transformational leadership could help change the face of the educational leadership.

Transformational leadership has had a huge impact on the performance and commitment of teachers to achieve organizational goals. School leadership research; show that transformational approaches have a positive effect on teachers’ effectiveness (Ross & Gray, 2006). Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, (1999) assert that: “teachers in schools characterized by transformational leadership behavior are more likely than teachers in other schools to express satisfaction with their principal (p. 181)". A transformational leadership approach also influences teacher efficacy. Teacher efficacy refers "to a teacher's expectation that he or she will bring about student learning" (Ross & Gray, 2006, p. 182).

2.3.1 Transformational leadership models

Most famous models considered as below: 1. Situational leadership model (Blanchard, 2006) 2. Managrial grid model (laker and Mouton 1969); 3. Alternative transformational leadership model (Naresh Khatri 2005); 4. Transformational leadership model ( Avolio and Berhard M.Bass 2003) 5. Transformational leadership umbrella (G. Yukl. A. Gordon and Tarter 2000) Bass et al. (2003), Avolio & Bass,( 2004) Bass et al, developed the components, which currently form the basis for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire through various research methods. The first component is the power of influence given to the leader by the subordinates; the second component is the ability of the leader and optimism through the effective articulation of vision. Intellectual stimulation is the leader's ability to stimulate subordinates into critically thinking about current processes and procedures and challenging the subordinates to question their beliefs and assumptions. The final component is individualized consideration that leaders develop the subordinates through a uniquely instituted coaching.

Under the relations behavior the transformational leader would decide whether a supporting or a developing behavior would suit the needs of the situation. The leader would seek for some information and consult with affected stakeholders before and during the decision-making process, and would empower the employees best suited to take care of the situation. After resolving the issues, the leader would then recognize effective performance, significant achievements, special contributions, and performance improvements. During the monitoring process of both the internal and external environments, the transformational leader analyzed information regarding events, trends, and changes, identifying threats and opportunities. The identified threats and opportunities became the focus of the future organization and the leader developed a vision that described a general path to mitigate and make less severe the threats and to maximize the opportunities.

2.4 The organizational health, trust, and decision participation

Organizational health is a general term that refers to teachers' perceptions of their work environment; it is influenced by formal and informal relationships, personalities of participants and organizational leadership (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). To develop a valid and reliable measure of middle school organizational health and to explore relationships among dimensions of organizational health as they related to faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in the principal. Six dimensions of organizational health in this study became evident after factor analysis. Those factors were identified as: teacher affiliation, collegial leadership, resource support, academic emphasis, institutional integrity and principal influence. Jantzi & Leithwood, (1996); Leithwood & Jantzi, (1990); Leithwood & Steinbach,( 1991); suggested a six-component conceptualization of transformational leadership hat includes the four posited by Bass with two additional components. The four components of Leithwood's that are synonymous to those proposed by Bass are (1) "modeling" (idealized influence), (2) "vision identification" (inspirational motivation), (3) "intellectual stimulation," and (4) "individualized support" (individualized consideration). The two additional components are "goal acceptance" and "high performance expectations."
3. Methodology

3.1 Research framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Organizational Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provided vision and</td>
<td>institutional integrity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulation, and</td>
<td>collegial leadership,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided vision or</td>
<td>resource influence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspiration,</td>
<td>teacher affiliation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modeled behavior,</td>
<td>academic emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fostered group goals,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided support,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided intellectual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>held high performance,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management by exception,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contingent reward,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first frame of diagram refer to transformational leadership, which used for secondary program school survey (SPSS) consist of 40 questions. As we see there are 8 elements in this frame that each element refer to one or more than one question. For example in order measuring the contingent reward, we can look at question number 29, 40,9,20. However each item will be explained and measured by relevant questions. At the right side we see the second frame; it shows the organizational health items. This part measured by Organizational Health Inventory for secondary schools (OHI-S); it contains five items that each of them will be measured by some questions; for instance for resource influence we can mention to number 5, 12, 16, 22, 26 & 33.

3.2 Organizational Health

The dimensions of Organizational Health used to gain an accurate picture of the school’s health. 1. The institutional integrity dimension refers to the schools ability to protect itself from unreasonable community and parental demands. 2. Collegial leadership refers to the friendly, open and collegial behavior targeting specific norms of equality. 3. Resource influence describes the principal’s ability to provide adequate instructional materials and supplies easily to all teachers. 4. Teacher affiliation refers to a sense of friendliness and strong affiliation a school. Teachers have a positive attitude about their job and have a sense of accomplishment about their jobs. 5. Academic emphasis refers to the school’s press toward academic achievement. High achievement for students is related to making a good effort, seeking extra work, and respecting high achieving students. These dimensions when averaged together provided an overall index of school health.

3.3 Method

In order to study the relationship between school climate and the principal’s leadership style, two questionnaires have been used. Gall and Borg (2003) asserted “that the use of questionnaires and surveys were used extensively in educational research to collect data about phenomena that are not directly observable” (p. 222). Initially, the secondary Program School Survey (SPSS) (Questionnaire-1) administered to teachers and to determine if a relationship exists between the two main variables. Further, the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S), (Questionary-2) distributed between teachers (same sample) at the selected schools. The distribution of the questionnaires and survey offer several advantages to the research study.

3.4 Construct Validity

A factor analysis of several samples of the instrument supports the construct validity of the concept of organizational health (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy & Tarter, 1997).
In addition, the predictive validity has been supported in other studies. See Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) for a review of that literature.

3.4.1 Administering the Instrument

It is important to guarantee the anonymity of the teacher respondent; teachers were not asked to sign the questionnaire and no identifying code is placed on the form. Most teachers do not object to responding to the instrument, which takes less than ten minutes to complete. It is probably advisable to have someone other than the principal in charge of collecting the data. What is important is to create a non-threatening atmosphere where teachers give candid responses. All of the health and climate instruments follow the same pattern of administration.

3.4.2 Scoring

The items are scored by assigning 1 to "rarely occurs," 2 to "sometimes occurs," 3 to "often occurs," and 4 to "very frequently occurs." When an item is reversed scored, "rarely occurs" receives a 4, "sometimes occurs" a 3, and so on. Each item is scored for each respondent, and then an average school score for each item is computed by averaging the item responses across the school because the school is the unit of analysis. Step 1: Scored each item for each respondent with the appropriate number (1, 2, 3, or 4). We should be sure to reverse score items 6, 8, 14, 19, 25, 29, 30, 37.

Step 2: Calculated an average school score for each item. This score represents the average school item score. We should have 37 school item scores before proceeding. Step 3: Summed the average school item scores as follows:

Institutional Integrity (II)=8+14+19+25+29+30
Collegial Leadership (CL)=1+3+4+10+11+15+17+21+26+34
Resource Influence (RI)=2+5+9+12+16+20+22
Teacher Affiliation (TA)=13+23+27+28+32+33+35+36+37
Academic Emphasis (AE)=6+7+18+24+31

These five scores represent the health profile of the school. Computing Standardized Scores of the OHI-S. Converting the school subtest scores to standardized scores with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100, which we call SdS score. Using the following formula: SdS for each dimension =100(dimension –Mean of dimension)/Standard division +500

(Source: The OHIO state university, school of Educational policy and leadership, faculty of Education &Human Ecology, USA); Example: SdS for II=100(II-16.06)/2.77+500

We can compute the difference between the school score on each dimension and the mean for the normative sample (II-16.06). Then multiply the difference by one hundred [100(II-16.06)]. Next divide the product by the standard deviation of the normative sample (2.77). Then add 500 to the result. The standardized score (SdS) for the institutional integrity subscale computed.

Health Index
An overall index of school health can be computed as follows: Health Index (HI) = ( SdS for II)+( SdS for CL)+(SdS for RI)+(SdS for TA)+(SdS for AE )/ 5

This health index is interpreted the same way as the subtest scores, that is, the mean of the "average" school is 500. Thus, a score of 650 on the health index represents a very healthy school just as a score of 350 depicts an unhealthy school climate. Most school scores, however, fall between these extremes and can only be diagnosed by carefully comparing all elements of the health inventory. We have changed the numbers into categories ranging from high to low by using the following conversion table:

Above 600 VERY HIGH
551-600 HIGH
525-550 ABOVE AVERAGE
511-524 SLIGHTLY ABOVE AVERAGE
490-510 AVERAGE
476-489 SLIGHTLY BELOW AVERAGE
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3.5 Research Design

The Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) and the secondary Program School Survey (SPSS) administered to teachers to determine if a relationship exists between the two variables. Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) recommend that correlational coefficients are best used to measure the degree and direction (positive or negative) of the relationship between two variables. This will enable the data to be further analyzed to determine if possible causal factors exist. One of the most significant advantages is correlational research that enables researchers to analyze the relationship between variables in a single study.

3.5.1 Population and Sampling Procedures

The population in this study consists of secondary teachers in secondary schools in north of Iran (Golestan province, which consist of Gorgan as Capital city and 11 Cities; and also 50 Vills). The researcher selected the cases by simple random sampling method. The secondary teachers identified in the study served as principals at their respective site for three years or more. First, All certified secondary teachers completed the secondary Program School Survey (SPSS) developed by Kenneth Leithwood and Doris Jantzi to determine how the teachers’ perceived the principal’s leadership style. Secondly, all secondary school teachers participating in the study completed the Organizational Health Inventory for (OHI-S) developed by Wayne Hoy. The demographic information is displayed and coded for comparative purposes. The school’s identity and the names of participants will be kept confidential.

Sample size

The Golestan province in North-East of Iran contain 20473Km$^2$ (square Kilometer). This area consists of 11 cities, 22 towns, 21 districts and 50 Vills. The total population of Golestan is 1627208 (2002 Census). Gorgan is capital city and it is the seat of government of state. This area has 217641 populations and it is the biggest city in this province. The researcher has selected this capital city for doing the study and the situation of Social-Economic for the people across the province is almost equal. The researcher will be able to generate the result to other sections; however the study will be emphasized on Gorgan. The whole number of teachers in Gorgan’s high schools is: 457 (http://golestan.medu.ir/2775/index.php) and other details as below:

1. The number of high schools for boys in Gorgan 26
2. The number of ordinary high schools for girls in Gorgan 25
3. The number of total high schools in Gorgan 51
4. The total number of teachers in Gorgan’s high schools 457

In this study our population is 457 people; according to Krejcie and Morgan’s table the number of sample will be: S=210. In order to choose the sample we select the cases randomly in high schools as below:

1. From each school the researcher selected 4 teachers as respondent; this selection was made randomly, the researcher has listed the numbers of teachers who work in each school, for example there were 16 teachers in school number one; so we wrote the name of all in front of their numbers and after mixing together we chose only four cases randomly and in this way each one had equal chance to be chosen.

2. $N= 51*4=204$
3. In addition from each group of schools (boys and girls) selected 3 more respondent.
4. The number of sample became 204+6=210
5. All questionnaires have been distributed at suitable time and the researcher got some helpers to perform quickly; moreover the required information has been given within collecting data.
6. All data has been entered in data base sheet and then analyzed by SPSS soft ware.

3.6 Instrumentation

The researcher used an instrument which has been used by Leithwood and Jantzi (1991) called The Secondary Program School Survey (SPSS). This survey was used to evaluate the effectiveness of British schools and to analyze the teacher perceptions of their principal’s leadership style.
The Secondary Program School Survey contained 40 questions that may describe the principal’s leadership practices in the school. These 40 questions were correlated for either a transformational or transactional leadership style. Eight segments of leadership styles are referred to this study: (a) provided vision and stimulation, provided vision or inspiration, (b) modeled behavior, (c) fostered group goals, (d) provided support, (e) provided intellectual stimulation, (f) held high performance expectations, (g) management by exception, and (h) contingent reward. The items on Secondary Program School Survey were coded such that a response of strongly disagree received a value of 1, Disagree received a value of 2, slightly disagree received a value of 3, Slightly agree received a value of 4, Agree received a value 5 and Strongly agree received a value of 6. This survey instrument developed by Leithwood and Jantzi (1991) provided an opportunity for the researcher to gather evidence to support the impact of a transformational leader on school climate. Six questions are added to the survey at the very beginning to gather demographic information on the survey participants.

The information related to number of years in the teacher profession, number of years in current position, gender, racial or ethnic background, age, and level of education. These information will display and code for descriptive analysis purposes. Each domain refers to some questions; for example about contingent reward we can point to question number 2, 6, 32, 33 A second survey instrument is used in this research study. The Organizational Health Inventory for Secondary Schools (OHI-S) is used to measure the overall openness and health of the school climate. The OHI-S developed by Hoy and Tarter (1991). The survey examined the openness of teacher-teacher and principal-teacher interactions. It is composed of 37 questions in which participants were asked to describe specific behavior patterns in their school. The items on OHI-S are coded such that a response of rarely occurs received a value of 1, sometimes occurs received a value of 2, often occurs received a value of 3, and very frequently occurs received a value of 4. The survey instruments have been done face to face by assistants who have helped the researcher. Though it took time but preferred. The assistant principal distributed and administered the survey during a faculty meeting. The survey instruments contain a cover letter from the researcher explaining the procedures related to the timeline, confidentiality, commitment and participation. Participants have been assured that the survey would be very brief in nature. And the researcher had pick up all completed surveys from each school after the assistants are done.

3.7 Validity

External validity referred to extent which findings of an experiment apply to individuals and setting beyond those that was studied (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). The instruments used in this study contained clear and concise directions and statements for survey participants. In addition, due to the extensive research and field tests conducted by the authors of the survey, it is reasonable to assume that both instruments are valid for measuring the principal’s leadership style and the school’s organizational health. Finally, in order to ensure external validity, 26 surveys are collected and analyzed to effectively address the two research questions.

3.8 Reliability

The result of reliability in pilot of study revealed that the value of Cronbach’s Alpha for 40 items of Transformational Leadership Style was (.922) which is showed a very high level of reliability of this scale. (See Table 3.1); Also the value of Cronbach’s Apha for organizational health inventory (OHI-S) was (.915) which is showed a very high level of reliability of this scale.

(Table 3.1) The reliability of this instrument is derive for each of the eight dimensions indicated in the school survey using Cronbach’s Alpha as follows: 1- provides vision and stimulation and also provides vision or inspiration, 2- models Behavior, 3- fosters group goals, 4- provides support, 5- provides intellectual stimulation, 6- holds high performance expectations, 7- management by exception, 8- contingent rewards. The overall reliability of the instrument was found by Leithwood and Jantzi (1991) to be more than .90. The reliability of the OHI-S was derived for each of the five dimensions of the inventory. The five dimensions are: 1- institutional integrity, 2- collegial leadership, 3- resource influence, 4- teacher affiliation, and 5- academic emphasis. At the first section, as we measuring the transformational leadership, we see that each domain refers to some questions; for instance; contingent rewards has explained by number: 3+5+8+9+12+30+40

So respondents while respond to whole questionnaire, the researcher will gain the results.
3.9 Data Collection

The survey instruments administered to the teachers during a faculty meeting. The survey includes some questions related to their level of educating. This was the best opportunity for researcher that the teachers had annual meeting almost in same time across the province at middle of February (2010). In this seminar, an explanation of endorsement by the school superintendent also included. Participants assured that their confidentiality would be upheld to highest level. The researcher has provided 210 questionnaires for whole respondents.

3.10 Data Analysis

Based on research questions, the researcher used descriptive statistics and a correlation Pearson for related samples. The descriptive statistics provide a mean, range, and standard deviation based on the results from both survey instruments. According to Gall, Gall and Borg (2003), “the standard deviation is the measure of variability most often will report in research studies. The standard deviation and mean provide a good description of members of the research sample score on the instruments. Descriptive statistics identify the principal’s leadership and overall school health of the organization. Correlational statistics is used to measure the degree of relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. The Secondary Program School Survey (SPSS) instrument was used to measure the level of transformational leadership of school principals. The instrument uses a six-point Likert-like scale. Hence to categorize transformational leadership into high, moderate and low, the following calculation was used: Highest possible score- Lowest possible score/Categories = 6-1/3 = 1.66

Therefore the mean score will be categorized as follows:

- Low: 1 – 2.66
- Moderate: 2.68 – 4.35
- High: 4.36 – 6

The Organizational Health inventory was used to measure organizational health. The instrument uses a four-point Likert-like scale. Hence to categorize organizational health into high, moderate and low, the following calculation was used: Highest possible score- Lowest possible score/Categories = 4-1/3 = 1

Therefore the mean score will be categorized as follows:

- Low: 1 – 2
- Moderate: 2.01– 3
- High: 3.01 – 4

5. Results

As it shown in table 4.1, there is a high correlation between two major variables.

Research Question 4: The fourth research question in this study was to find out the correlation between mean teacher organizational health inventory (OHI-s) and specific leadership behaviors of a transformational principal as perceived by teachers. To analyze these groups, the Pearson Correlation was computed between the leadership performance and sub category scores of the organizational health. (Table 4.2) Institutional Integrity: The results indicated a low correlation between transformational leadership style and the category of the Institutional Integrity of the organizational health (r = 0.021, p = 0.789), so the Institution Integrity of a school was not significantly correlated by the leadership style of the principal. (Table 4.2)

Collegial Leadership: The results brought out a significant, positive and high correlation leadership style and Collegial Leadership of the organizational health survey at 0.01 alpha level (r = 0.774, p < 0.0001). The value of $R^2$ is 0.599; hence, roughly 60% of the Collegial Leadership (friendly environment) found within a school is related to the transformational leadership style of the principal. (Table 4.2)

Resource Influence: The results showed a significant, high and positive correlation between leadership style and the category of Resource Influence of the organizational health at 0.01 alpha level (r = 0.704, p < 0.0001). The $R^2$ calculated as 0.495; so roughly 49.5% of the resource influence (ability to supply enough materials) found within a school is attributed to the transformational leadership style of the principal. (Table 4.5) Teacher
Affiliation: The results brought out an important, moderate and positive correlation between leadership style and the category of Teacher Affiliation of the organizational health survey \((r = 0.615, p < 0.0001)\). The \(R^2\) calculated as 0.378; so, roughly 38% of the work effort as defined by Teacher affiliation is caused to the transformational leadership style of the principal. (Table 4.3)

Academic Emphasis: The results showed a significant, low and positive correlation between leadership style and the category of Academic Emphasis of the organizational health survey \((r = 0.380, p < 0.001)\). The \(R^2\) calculated as 0.144; so roughly 14.4% of the Academic Emphasis found within a school is caused to the transformational leadership style of the principal. So teachers who viewed their principal as more of transformational leader were more suitable to perceive the idea that the principal’s focus was more academically oriented. Table 4.3 presents the involvement. The results of regression analysis showed that the \(R^2 = .612\) therefore 61.2% of variances of organizational health explain by transformational leadership. The results of model summary in Regression Analysis showed that data fit the model at .05 level of significant. The unstandardized prediction equation for regression model is: \(Y = +33.09 + .4X_1\)

The results show that transformational leadership has a significant contribution towards organizational health. (sig.000<.05) at .05 level of significance. (Table 4.3)

4.4 Discussion

The results of Pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant, high and positive correlation between leadership style and the perceived organizational health of school. Partly, a healthy organization denotes good interaction among its members. A healthy interaction and social exchange between two or more people in an organization are considered helpful and rewarding by each person. (Bottom, Holloway, Miller, Mislin and Whitford, 2006; Byrd, 2006; Molm, Peterson, and Takahashi, 2003).

There have been many studies conducted to determine leadership styles. These studies comprised transformational leadership styles (Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson, 2003; Bryan, S., 2002; Durante, 2005; Garman et al., 2003; Wieland, 2004), and also studies that investigated situational leadership methods (Chen, 2004; Sutton, 2004), and training situational leadership methods. Well used instruments were used to determine transformational, transactional (Durante; Garcia; Wieland, 2004) and situational leadership (Avolio and Bass, 2004; Chen) had been improved, formalized, and used by many organizations and researchers. The study supports the findings of previous studies. These studies have linked transformational leadership to organizational health; (Korkmaz 2007, Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp 1991, Liethwood and Jantzi 1999 and Bogler 2001). Previous studies have also shown that organizational health is related to trust. Sabo and Hoy (1998) found a positive relationship between trust and open climate schools. There was a high relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational health. In addition it was discovered that the teachers who saw their principal as more transformational in leadership style also saw the institution as being healthier than their counterparts.

As shown in table 4.3, teachers who judged the leadership practice as more of transformational style, saw the principal’s influence in getting resources more positively. Collegial leadership as having the highest scores shows that it is important to consider this factor in an organization. This sub-variable highlights the importance of interactions and communication in schools.

Korkmaz, (2007, p. 34) has mentioned: “’the principal guarantees that classroom components and instructional materials are and made to support the learning and teaching that are happening in the school’”. Another element in the subcategory is seemed important, is Teacher Affiliation. The results reveal that respondents were very interested in affiliation. It shows that if in a workplace all staffs feel a positive atmosphere, they will try their best to show their skills, so there will possibly be an increase of performance.

However relationships can be moralistic, but transformational leadership finally becomes moral in that it lifts the level of human organization and ethical aspiration of a follower or a leader so it has an effect of transforming them (Burns, 1978). This study confirms the previous researches conducted by Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991), where they concluded, in a healthy school the teachers can teach and learn. They posited high expectations connected to the performance goals of a student, continue to have high expectations and promote a serious learning environment that students can work hard and achieve high achievement levels. The study reveals that high school leaders in the north of Iran rated principals as having moderate transformational leadership style.
Teachers also perceived that the organizational health at northern Iranian high school is considered as moderate. The study also revealed that there is positive relationship between transformational leadership and organizational health. The study also revealed that transformational leadership was highly related to resource influence and collegial leadership. Teacher affiliation was moderate and academic emphasis was low. Moreover transformational leadership was not related to institutional integrity.

6. Conclusions

This study examined the relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational health schools in the Golestan province of Iran. The study also sought to determine the level of transformational leadership by measuring and analyzing teachers’ perception about the principals’ behaviors as leaders. Determining the level of average teachers’ judgment about their working place indicated the health climate. This study tests the relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational health in a north region of Iran. The study also sought to determine the level of transformational leadership through analyzing teachers’ belief about principals and behavior as leaders. The study also sought to determine the teachers’ perception of organizational health level of their school. The following are the findings of this study:

1. The transformational leadership level of principals at North Iran schools is moderate.
2. The organizational health level of North Iran schools is moderate.
3. There is a significant, relationship between principals’ transformational leadership level and organizational health.
4. There is significant relationship between leadership style and the Resource Influence that is category of organizational health.
5. There is a significant, high positive correlation between the Collegial Leadership of organizational health and leadership style.
6. There is a significant, moderate positive correlation between Teacher Affiliation of organizational health and leadership style.
7. There is a negligible correlation between Institutional Integrity of organizational health and leadership style.
8. There is significant, high positive correlation between perceived organizational health of school and leadership style.
9. There is a significant, low positive correlation between academic emphasize of organizational health and leadership style.
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Table 3.1 Reliability of item scores for Transformational Leadership Style and Organizational Health among 30 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Coefficient estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Health</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Correlation of two variables; Transformational Leadership Style and Organizational Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership Style</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Health</td>
<td>.782**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 4.2: Correlation of Transformational Leadership Style and Organizational Health Sub Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Integrity</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Leadership</td>
<td>.774**</td>
<td>-.231**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Influence</td>
<td>.704**</td>
<td>-.252**</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Affiliation</td>
<td>.615**</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.619**</td>
<td>.613**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emphasis</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 4.3 Regression Analysis of transformational leadership and organizational health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leaders</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>15.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Organizational Health