Global
Journal
of
Current Research

ISSN: 2320-2920
CIF: 3.269

A Premier Publication of Centre for Rural Development Ecology & Environment Protection

Full Length Research Article

Gender differences in Leadership based on Transformational and Transactional Styles in Seven Private Schools in Dubai

Soulafa Ahmad Al Khatib
Education Department, The British University in Dubai, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
	Leadership has been an important field of research in educational administration for years especially because of the imperative role the leaders have in causing change and implementing it. Many researchers have studied leadership styles in different domains not only in education and have concluded that some styles are more dominant than others such as the transformational and transactional leadership styles. Some scholars consider leadership to be a gendered concept and have set distinct characteristics for female and male leaders. An explanatory sequential mixed method approach was used to investigate whether women lead differently than men and the impact of gender on being transformational or transactional leaders in 7 private schools in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The findings indicate that females have shown more transformational leadership behavior with a mean of M=3.735 than males (M= 2.833), in addition to their belief in rewarding staff for good performance (Contingent Reward) while males have demonstrated behaviors of transactional leadership.

Introduction

Leadership has been an important field of research in educational administration for years especially because of the new changes in education and the influential role of effective leadership in causing changes and improvement (Kilinc 2014; Cohen et al. 2009). Leaders in the educational field have an imperative role in the development and growth of any institution and that is by demonstrating certain leadership style and skills which affect different elements like job satisfaction, engagement, and achievement (Bird et al. 2009; Mahdinezhad 2013; Allen et al. 2015). Hoy and Miskel (2010 in Avci 2015) claim that with the growing expectations from education, has grown the importance of educational leadership to be very critical and influential (Lunenburg & Ornstein 2013 in Avci 2015) in the success or failure of any educational institution. This rapid growth and development has led to the need of implementing efficient leadership styles (Burns 1978; Bass 2008; Yukl 2008; kotter 2001). Varied leadership styles have varied influence on any organization (Nahavandi 2002).

Leadership is the process during which the leader affects his/her followers to reach common goals and objectives as well as the vision and mission of any institution (Lunenburg & Ornstein

2013 in Avci 2015). Many researchers have studied leadership styles in different domains not only in education to conclude that transformational and transactional styles are the dominant and most noticeable ones (Dvir et al. 2002; Whetstone 2002; Bass et al. 2003; Avolio & Bass 2004). Leaders might be both, but transformational has proven to be the most effective (Gardner & Stough 2002).

Coleman (2003) considers leadership to be a gendered concept. It has always been identified by men. Even though we see many women occupying leading position in the 21st century, there is still a proneness to suppose that men are the rightful leaders. It is more a male characteristic (Schein 1994). Although leadership researchers have now moved towards discussing styles instead of the stereotypes of gender (Leithwood, jantzi & Steinbach 1999), a new question emerges whether gender has a role in determining leadership style. There is richness on studies on educational leadership in Western societies (Dimmock & Walker 2005; Hallinger et al. 2005), but there is limited literature about leadership practices outside this context. There are more efforts in the past 20 years in gaining a base of knowledge about educational leadership globally (Hallinger & Leithwood 1996; Dimmock &Walker 2005) and the scarceness in the number of

female leaders in some developing and developed countries (Normore & Trinidad 2005) as well as the rareness of scientific work on female leaders in the third world. Gender is considered as a challenge to leadership and there is a need to research it (Rosenbach & Taylor 1998).

This background has led the researcher to investigate whether women lead differently than men and the impact of gender on being transformational or transactional leaders in 7 private schools in the UAE. The researcher used a mixed method to answer the research question: Do women lead differently than men and what leadership style does each demonstrate transformational or transactional? In the attempt to answer the main question, the researcher set as sub questions: what are the characteristics of transformational and transactional leaders? What are the gender stereotypes in leadership? Do leaders adopt a particular leadership style based on gender? Are women more transformational leaders than men? Are men more transactional leaders than women?

Based on literature review and the focus of this study and its questions, the following hypotheses relative to the gender and its influence on the leadership style were extracted:
Hypothesis 1: Female leaders demonstrate leadership qualities that are transformational.

Hypothesis 2: Male leaders demonstrate leadership qualities that are more transactional.

Literature Review
Transformational and Transactional Leadership
Bolman and Deal (1991) states that *"the school leader's responsibility is to serve not only to answer questions".* Similarly Grogan (2003, p.24) describes leaders as being *"predicated on caring about those he or she serves".* Leadership before Burns (1978) was described as democratic, autocratic or laissez faire based on the work of Lewin and Lippitts in 1938. Vernadire (1997) elaborated on leadership styles by stating that leader's activities or the fact of being people oriented or work oriented determines his /her style. He claimed that autocratic and laissez faire styles produce work with poor quality and quantity or even no quality while he supported the democratic style. The concept of transformational and transactional leadership styles appeared first in the work of Burns (1978) and was elaborated on later by Bass and his associates (Bass & Avolio 1989; Bass et al. 1987). In his definition of leadership "I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivation – the wants and the needs, the aspirations and expectations – of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations", Burns (1978, p.19) differentiated between transformational and transactional styles.

Ekman (2003, p.2) claims that *"Good leadership fosters change that is both transformative and sustainable. It can be concerned with moral or organizational matters…. Most importantly, it requires a worthy goal-vision, if you will …but it also requires persistence".* The qualities mentioned are those of a transformative leader who plays the role of a facilitator who encourages change (Yukl 1999). Transformative leader urges his

followers to go beyond their expectations, beyond their self-interest and think of the group goals. He/she inspires his co-workers to find their inner motive and influence them to share the same vision and work towards it. He/She is a change agent who motivates his followers to develop their leadership skills (Bass 1990; Leithwood 1992; Johns & Moser 2001; Stewart 2006; pulson et al. 2011).

Transformational leaders are charismatic, creative and dynamic people (Bolkan & Goodboy 2009; Hood et al. 2009) who challenge their followers to be more creative and find new and daring solutions to existing situations. They demonstrate the ability to empower their followers and trigger their intrinsic motivation and desire for achievement and self-development (Odetunde 2013; Bolkan & Goodboy 2009). There is an exchange of roles where leader is both follower and leader and followers are leaders at certain times. Leader and his/her team are empowered to raise one another to places they never expected to reach alone (Norris 1999; Sergiovanni 1992). *"Transforming leadership is ultimately a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders"* (Burns, 1978, p.4).

Transformational leadership is classified into 4 categories or as named by Bass (1985) the 4 I's:

a. Idealized Influence: A charismatic personality that demonstrates enthusiasm, confidence and power, creates a climate of trust and considers values and principles that go beyond self-interest and cares about the good of the group (Noris et al. 2002; Antonakis et al. 2003; Jones & Rudd 2008; Odetunde 2011; Pulson et al. 2011).

b. Inspirational Motivation: A leader who demonstrates belief in his/her followers, is overly optimistic about the future, creates an atmosphere of teamwork and collaboration, inspires self-development and set an idealized vision that is attainable (Noris et al. 2002; Antonakis et al. 2003; Jones & Rudd 2008; Odetunde 2011; Pulson et al. 2011).

c. Intellectual Stimulation: A leader who has a daring vision and stimulates creativity and new ways and strategies in looking into and doing things differently, encourages thinking outside the box (Nicholson 2007; Politis 2004) and helps in creating commitment to change and better accomplishment (Herold et al. 2008).

d. Individualized Consideration: A leader who cares for his co-workers and treats them according to their uniqueness. He/She focuses on followers' strengths and coaches them to grow (Nicholson 2007; Odetunde 2013).

Research that examined transformational leadership found that there is positive correlation between this leadership style and many aspects of the school like job satisfaction (Bogler 2001), students' achievement (Leithwood and Sun 2012; Leithwood & Jantezi 2006), organizational effectiveness (Dundum, Lowe & Avolio 2002; Avolio & Bass 2004), strengthening followers' sense of belonging and effectiveness and increasing productivity (Koh, Steers and Terborg 1995; Snodgrass & Schachar 2008).

Transactional leadership is based on reinforcement theory. An agreement is set between leader and followers to comply with the organization principles and goals and they will be rewarded for attaining the objectives and punished for not complying (Hoover et al. 1991; Bass 1985). In this type of leadership, there is little emotional exchange and less room for innovation and creativity (Sergiovanni 1990). Transactional leaders depend on structure, policies and principles trying to keep themselves and their institution safe and secure in a more stable environment that lacks competition (Sergiovanni 1990; Hoover et al. 1991; Mahdinezhad et al. 2013).

Transactional leadership is classified into 3 subcategories:

a.Contingent Rewards: A leader that clarifies the work to be done and expresses appreciation and gives rewards for achievement (Hoover et al. 1991; Nicholson 2007; Odetunde 2013).

b.Management by Exception (Active): A leader who observes followers to ensure work is done according to standards and to avoid problem from happening (Antonakis et al. 2003; Odetunde 2013; Avci 2015).

c.Management by exception (Passive): This leader waits for the problem to happen and get serious to intervene (Bass 1997; Hoover et al. 1991; Bass et al. 2003).

Research that examined transformational and transactional leadership implied that transformational leadership is more effective and preferred by staff than transactional leadership. It has better impact on commitment, satisfaction, learning, improvement, culture, climate, staff morale and student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi 1997; Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach 1999; Lawrence 2000; Sahin 2004; Odetunde 2013; Avci 2015). Norris et al. (2002) discuss the need for transformational leaders to cope with the changes and challenge and inspire followers in their endeavor to promote their skills and self-trust to meet the demands of the transformation in today's educational field.

Gender Differences in Leadership

Rosener (1990), Rosenbach and taylor (1998), Morris et al. (1999), Cleveland, Stockdale and Murphy (2000), Stelter (2002), Eckman (2004), Burns and Martin (2010) and many others have studied the issue of gender differences in leadership. Stelter (2002) argues that gender differences in leading might be accounted to different factors assuring that female and male not only lead differently, they are also followed differently. Many studies have supported the stereotype that males are better suited and more competent for leading position than females. Despite the fact that there is no innate differences between men and women leading abilities (Oakley 2000), stereotypes remain that describe men as more capable leaders (Abu-Tineh 2012). Henderson (1994, p. 51) referred that to staff preference for male leaders because they *"were believed to possess the characteristics of good managers – emotional stability, ability to make correct decisions, analytic ability, and the like"*. "Where gender is perceived within the context of social status, female leaders may be perceived more negatively than male leaders" argued Stelter (2002, p. 1). Leadership based on gender hinders female leaders' growth (Deem 2003). The stereotype considering women as ineffective leaders leads to the differentiated treatment of women in leadership (Brown 1979). This traditional view of more masculine –oriented leadership is felt actually with women still underrepresented in leadership roles (Henderson 1994; Stelter 2002). Burns (1978) explained that women in nature are known to be dependent, nurturing and submissive so they lack the leadership qualities that make men more suitable.

This type of discussion has resulted in women doubting their abilities to lead (Joasil 2008). To overcome such situation, researchers studied male and female leadership styles. It was noticed that women are more people oriented, care for collaboration, motivate others for common goals attainment and shows sympathy and care (Coleman 2003 in Brundrett et al. 2003). Rosener (1990) emphasized that women create a positive interactive environment and "encourage participation, share power and information, enhance other people's self-worth and get others excited about their work" (p.120), while men represented the figure of authoritarian leaders who are goal oriented (Stelter 2002). Gray (1993) and Coleman (1996) presented two gender paradigms (Table 1):

Table 1: Gender Paradigms

The Nurturing / Feminine Paradigm	The Defensive / Aggressive Masculine Paradigm
Caring	Highly regulated
Creative	Conformist
Intuitive	Normative
Aware of individual differences	Competitive
Non-competitive	Evaluative
Tolerant	Disciplined
Subjective	Objective
Informal	Formal

Source: Gray (1993, p. 111)

With these qualities, it was concluded by many researchers that women are tended to lead in a transformative style. Characteristics of women leaders are more associated with transformative leadership style while men are described as more transactional (Poulson et al. 2011; Alban-Metcalfe & Alimo-Metcalfe 2000), a concept that this research will try to prove.

Brusko (2010) confirmed the importance of gender differences in managing conflict and confirmed the dominant and avoidant style of male leader. In a meta-analysis of 45 studies comparing men and women leaders, Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and Van Eryen (2003) concluded that women demonstrated more transformational leadership characteristics than men and are

engaged in more contingent rewards, while men demonstrated more transactional characteristics especially management by exception active and passive. This leads to a negative comparison between men and women with transformational leadership qualities such as collaboration, empowering staff and emphasizing communication are more associated with women leader (Hall 1996; Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinback 1999; Yoder 2001). Holtkamp's (2002, p. 1) study on the characteristics attributed to female principals identified five significant qualities, *"drive to achieve, use of spiritual values, involvement in professional organizations, involvement as a community leader, and valuing personal relationships".* These findings of women's leading qualities have led to the belief that women are better suited for leading position in today's organizations (Pounder & Coleman 2002) because of the social skills and values that women have developed, and which drifted them away from the aggressive, traditional attitudes men possess (Rosener 1990; Helgesin 1990).

Even though some evidence and studies have confirmed the differences between men and women in leadership, some findings have proved no differences. Kurger's (1996) study on 98 heads in Netherlands found that men and women operate the same in decision-making process and use democratic style in including others. A concept that Jirasinghe and Lyons (1996) emphasize by stressing that male and female leaders have almost the same leading style in the education field more than other sectors. Both sexes believe that they follow a more socialized and people-directed way (Coleman 2002). Studies done by Kolb (1999) and Shimanoff and Jenkins (1991) claimed that men and women lead with equal effectiveness and there are more similarities than differences in their leading behaviors. A meta-analysis of 82 studies on gender leadership clarified no differences in leadership effectiveness (Northous 2004). Some other studies argued that evidence showed that women and men's traits and managerial abilities do not differ (Davidson & Burke 1994).

Women Leaders in the UAE

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) rapid growth is typically represented in the growing role of the Emirati women who are effective partners in the development process. According to the World Economic Forum's 2014 Global Gender Gap Report, the UAE was ranked as a leading country in gender equality in the region (OECD 2014). The UAE has considered gender equality to be of paramount importance. Women take equal rights as men, same legal status, equal education opportunities, claim to titles and can practice any profession (Ministry of State for Federal National Council Affairs 2008). THE UAE do not differentiate between males and females in education, employment or getting services. The UAE government has set policies for women empowerment and has worked towards achieving it and removing the obstacles that impede the full engagement of women in the workforce. Sheikh Mohammed bin Rashed Al Maktoum declared on December 18, 2006 that "A place without women is a place without spirit" (Ministry of State for Federal National Council Affairs 2008) to emphasize the government view and the leading role the UAE is taking in the region in women empowerment.

- *95% of female Emirati enroll in higher education or study abroad.*
- *90% was the literacy rate in 2007.*

- *The ratio of the females to males in the workforce has increased and women are occupying high positions in different fields like business, engineering, media, government and health.*
- *Women accounts for two thirds of all public sectors posts and 30% in senior and decision-making posts (Kirder 2010).*
- *60.9% of school principals in Abu Dhabi are females while it is 49% in the other TALIS (Teaching and Learning International Survey which collects data from 30 different countries around the world about learning environment and working conditions) and on average they are younger (49 years) and have more years of experience in their position than in most TALIS countries (OECD 2014).*
- *46% of upper secondary principals in Abu Dhabi are females (OECD 2014).*

Methodology

Data Collection Method

An explanatory sequential data collection method was used to investigate male and female principals' leadership styles. Using different types of data collection would lead to a better understanding of the research question than using only quantitative or qualitative approach (Creswell 2014). The quantitative stage of the investigation employed a survey as a tool to provide numeric description of leaders' qualities and skills. Yukl et al. (2002) highlight that survey is the research method used most in studying leadership qualities. This stage was used to objectively deduce the facts about leaders' skills (Krug 1992). Survey is used for its reliability because it is anonymous which allows more honesty. The survey was self-administered by the researcher to ensure a high response rate, the participants completed the survey on one occasion, and provide answers in case of uncertainty or queries (Cohen et al. 2007).

For more in-depth information and to reach some findings that were not produced by the statistical analysis means (Krug 1992), a qualitative stage was used. "Qualitative analysis affords the opportunity for a researcher to dig beneath surface responses and better understand the quality and behaviors of principals" as argued by Stick and Hauserman (2013, p.186). Through semi-structured open –ended interview questions, the researcher sought to reach more comprehensive and detailed description of leadership styles from leaders' perceptions. Data triangulation is important because collecting data from different resources and different participants reduces the risk of bias and "puts the researcher in a frame of mind to regard his or her own material critically" (Fielding & Fielding 1986, p. 24).

Research Protocol

An organizational framework was prepared to identify the tools and process followed for data collection and analysis. Ethical guideline was orally discussed with the participants (teachers and principals). The participants were informed of the purpose of the study and assured of the confidentiality and anonymity. Before the interviews, principals were assured that they would receive transcribed copies of their answers for approval.

Sampling, time and location

A purposeful sampling method was used to collect data over a period of two months (May and June). 43 English teachers (23 Females and 20 males) from 7 private charity schools in the UAE were chosen to fill the self –constructed survey on the qualities of the school principals they were dealing with. English teachers

only were chosen because the survey was constructed in English and the 7 schools chosen for the study are using the ministry of education (MOE) curriculum, so all subjects are taught in Arabic and teachers of other subject have limited English language knowledge which makes them incapable of answering the survey. Accessibility was another reason for choosing those schools. The time was limited for conducting the study, that is why the researcher chose the school she can get consent from easily to conduct the study. The 7 principals (3 females and 4 males) of the schools were interviewed by the researcher's colleague to ensure validity and avoid researcher's personal interference or subjectivity in recording the answers (Cohen et al. 2007).

Tools

Survey: For the purpose of this study, a 36- item survey was prepared to ascertain teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership qualities. The first section of the scale which is composed of 5-point Likert scale (From 1: Not at all to 5: Frequently, if not always), consists of 19 items about transformational leadership and 14 items about transactional leadership. 1 meant that the behavior was not used or did not exist at all, 1-2 meant that the behavior was minimally used, 2-3 meant that the behavior was used once in a while, 3-4 meant that the behavior was used fairly often while 4-5 meant that the behavior was frequently if not always used. The second section consists of demographic information about the gender of the principal, the teachers' years of experience in teaching and the number of years they have worked with the principal evaluated. The items of transformational leadership were divided according to the 4 subcategories of the transformational style or the 4 I's: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration.

The items of the transactional leadership were divided on the 3 subcategories of the transactional style: contingent rewards, management by exception active and management by exception passive. The items were written based on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) designed and modified by Bass and other colleagues. Bass designed the MLQ in 1985 based on results obtained from surveying army officers. It was later modified by many researchers. MLQ is known to be the most widely used with high internal reliability instrument to measure transformational and transactional leadership components (Tejeda et al. 2001). The items used in this study survey were collected from Avolio et al. (1999) 36 items MLQ 5x survey. Because of time limitation, there was no possibility to obtain license and buy the original MLQ, that is why the researcher had to construct her own form of MLQ trying to include most of both transformational and transactional qualities. 43 surveys were distributed and 41 returned.

Interview: For more in-depth information, interviews were conducted with the principals of the 7 schools chosen. Open ended interview was selected because it enables the participant to express their unique understanding, opinion and definition of certain situation (Silverman 1993 in Cohen et al. 2007). To avoid researcher's influence on the interviewees and their responses and to reduce bias (Cohen et al 2007; Fraenkel & Wallen 2003), the researcher asked her colleague to conduct the interviews. The interview questions were translated to Arabic because the participants have limited abilities to express themselves in English. Answers were later translated to English to be analyzed with other data. 7 principals, 3females and 4 males, participated. Each participant was asked the same set of questions which were selected and modified for the purpose of this study and were grounded in the literature (Holtkamp 2002). Questions were asked in the same order giving the participants the freedom to express their beliefs about the key components of their leadership style. Some interview questions discussed the principal's background and culture while others discussed the principal's opinion about the qualities of good leader, how they manage their school, what are their future goals and to what they attribute success. The use of interview tool helped in providing a detailed description which confirmed findings of the statistical analysis, triangulation of data as well as theme classification (Creswell 2014) based on the subcategories of transactional and transformational styles.

Results

Several procedures were used to analyze both quantitative and qualitative data. Qualitative and quantitative research approaches were initially analyzed independently and then merged while discussing the findings. Quantitative data was analyzed using statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 and different statistical techniques were used mainly, one-way analysis of variance, t-test, means and standard deviations. The independent –sample t-test was used to determine whether the mean of transactional and transformational components differed between male and female leaders.

Based on the descriptive statistics on the different sub-categories of the transformational and transactional leaderships styles, it was noticed that the means of female leaders' behaviors are higher than the means of male leaders' behaviors in Inspirational Motivation (IM), Idealized Influence (II), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individual Consideration (IC) which are th4 I's of transformational leadership. Female leaders mean is also higher in Contingent Rewards (CR), a factor of transactional leadership through which the leader rewards his/her followers for good performance and achievement according to policies and regulations set. While male leaders' means are higher than those of females in management by Exception –Active (MA) and Management by Exception –Passive (PA).

Table 2: Transformational and transactional leaderships mean scores.

Leadership Style	Sub-Categories	Means	
		Male	Female
Transformational	Inspirational Motivation	2.9495	3.7962
Leadership Style	Idealized Influence	3.1217	3.9666
	Intellectual Stimulation	2.5652	3.5416
	Individual Consideration	2.6956	3.6389
Transactional Leadership	Contingent Reward	2.7630	3.4861
Style	Management by Exception -	3.2826	2.9028

Active Management by Exception - Passive	2.6159	2.4351

To determine if this mean is statistically significant, an independent sample t-test was conducted to confirm the differences. A detailed sample of one component of transformational leadership which is idealized influence with all its items which explain that leader goes beyond self-interest for the best of his/her group, creates an atmosphere of trust and honesty, displays power and confidence and is very enthusiastic about his/her work, proves that there is a statistically significant difference of 0.94 at 99.9% confidence interval, $t(39)= -2.556$, p. <0.05 (table 3 first item) .

Table 3: Independent Samples Test for Idealized Influence

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
II1	Equal variances assumed	.002	.962	-2.300-	39	.027	-.93237-	.40544	-1.75245-	-.11229-
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.322-	37.846	.026	-.93237-	.40153	-1.74534-	-.11939-
II2	Equal variances assumed	.886	.352	-2.996-	39	.005	-1.08696-	.36277	-1.82073-	-.35318-
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.035-	38.157	.004	-1.08696-	.35813	-1.81185-	-.36206-
II3	Equal variances assumed	2.551	.118	-2.198-	39	.034	-.98068-	.44615	-1.88310-	-.07825-
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.276-	38.953	.028	-.98068-	.43085	-1.85218-	-.10918-
II4	Equal variances assumed	2.749	.105	-2.043-	39	.048	-.76329-	.37370	-1.51916-	-.00741-
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.125-	38.791	.040	-.76329-	.35926	-1.49008-	-.03649-
II5	Equal variances assumed	.254	.617	-1.181-	39	.245	-.46135-	.39048	-1.25118-	.32847
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.195-	37.977	.240	-.46135-	.38622	-1.24323-	.32052

All subcategories were analyzed in the same way. Another example that shows leader's belief in his faculty members' ability proved that female leaders also demonstrated this behavior more than male leaders. There is a statistically significant difference of 1.086 at 99.9% confidence interval, t (39)= -2.659, p<0.05. All subcategories showed significant differences confirming studies that emphasized the female leaders' transformative leading style and the male leaders' transactional leading style.

The analysis of interview data also confirmed the statistical results. Male principals claimed that successful leadership depends on organization and achieving goals. One of the male principals even discussed quality of work which is more aligned with bureaucratic style. He discussed that there must be a hierarchy of authority where roles are clearly defined and there are set criteria for performance (Saeed et al. 2011). Male leaders insisted on abidance by rules, policies and regulations and honesty and dedication in work. The behaviors they focused on are those of management by exception active and passive. While female leaders were more emotional in explaining their leadership behaviors. They emphasized teamwork and positive relation among staff. They claimed that a positive atmosphere encourages better production.

Based on statistical analysis and interviews, it was concluded that gender affects leaders' style. Females have shown more transformational leadership behavior than males, in addition to their belief in rewarding staff for good performance (Contingent Reward) while males have demonstrated behaviors of transactional leadership. They believed in working according to regulations, planning and problem-solving.

Those findings confirm results of similar studies (Poulson et al. 2011; Alban-Metcalfe & Alimo-Netcalfe 2000; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & Van Eryen 2003), while still they cannot be published because of the limited sample. It is recommended that the study be repeated and expanded on in schools of different curricula where all teachers can participate in the survey and get a license to use the original MLQ survey for more validity and reliability.

Recommendations
Based on the findings presented, it is recommended to have a larger size to confirm the results. The sample chosen was for

principals of different nationalities, so it might be helpful to choose one nationality and investigate the impact of culture in determining male and female leadership styles. Further studies can also administer the survey on the principals as well for self-evaluation. Then compare the responses of the principals to those of their followers to ensure validity and transparency.

Conclusion

According to Bass and Avolio (2002), most leaders embody characteristics of both transformational and transactional leaderships, while studies relating both styles to leader's gender have proven the dominance of one style according to the leader's gender. Based on this study women principals have demonstrated more transformational leadership which is a style more preferred by followers (Gardner & Stough 2002; Bogler 2001; Koh, Steers and Terborg 1995; Snodgrass & Schachar 2008). Those findings raise an important question. With such findings leaning towards the preference of transformational leadership and the dominance of this style among female leaders, one can reasonably ask whether the increase in women leaders in the educational field will have a positive impact or reflection on education in all its factors. Further studies can be done to confirm the results of this study, but with a larger sample especially because of the scarcity of similar studies in the Arab world.

References

Abu –Tineh, A. (2012). Leadership Effectiveness in Jordanian Educational Institutions: A comparison of Jordanian female and male leaders. *Educational management Administration & Leadership,* vol. 41(1), pp. 79-94.

Alban-Metcalfe, R. J. & Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2007). Development of a private sector version of the (Engaging) Transformational Leadership Questionnaire. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* vol. 2, pp. 104-121.

Anthonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasurbramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 14(3), pp. 261-295.

Allen, N., Grigsby, B. & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does leadership matter? Examining the relationship among Transformational leadership, school climate, and student achievement. *NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation,* vol. 10(2), pp. 1-22.

Avci, A. (2015). Investigation of transformational and transactional leadership styles of school principals, and evaluation of them in terms of educational administration. *Educational Research and Reviews,* vol. 10(20), pp. 2758-2767.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* vol. 72, pp. 441-462.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical Report*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

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

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional –transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist,* vol. 52, pp. 130-139.

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership, theory, research, and managerial applications.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J. & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group and Organizational Studies,* vol. 12, pp. 73-87.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: How prototypes, lenience, and general satisfaction reatle to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement.*

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership. Theory, research and managerial applications.* 3rd edn. New York: The Free Press.

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

Bird, J., Wang, C., Watson, J. & Murray, L. (2009). Relationships among principal authentic leadership and teacher trust and engagement levels. *Journal of School Leadership*, vol. 19(2), pp. 153-171.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, vol. 37(5), pp. 662-683.

Bolkan, S. & Goodboy, A. K. (2009) Transformational leadership in the classroom: fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology,* vol. 36, pp. 296-307.

Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.

Brown, S. M. (1979). Male versus female leaders: a comparison of empirical studies. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research,* vol. 5(5), pp. 595-611.

Brundrett, M., Neil, B. & Smith, R. (2003). *Leadership in Education.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Brusko, L. (2010). Organizational chaos: A survey of conflict management strategies, gender roles, and status in an organizational setting. *UW-L Journal of Undergraduate Research XIII.*

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper and Row.

Burns, G. & Martin, B. N. (2010). Examination of the effectiveness of male and female educational leaders who made use of the invitational leadership style of leadership. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice,* vol. 16, pp. 30-56.

Cleveland, J. N., Stockdale, M. & Murphy, K. R. (2000). *Women and men in organizations: Sex and gender issues at work.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved from https://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=24471453

Cohen, J., McCabe, E., Michelli, N. & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher

education. *Teachers College Record*, vol. 111(1), pp. 180-213.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Marrison K. (2007). *Research methods in education.* 6th edn. NY: Routledge.

Coleman, M. (1996). Management style of female headteachers. *Educational Management and Administration,* vol. 24(2), pp.317-332.

Coleman, M. (2002). *Women as Headteachers: Striking the Balance.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research Design.* 4th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davidson, M. J. & Bruke, R. J. (1994). *Women in Management: Current Research Issues.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Deem, R. (2003). Gender, organizational cultures and the practices of manager academics in UK universities. *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 10(2), pp. 239-259.

Dimmock, C. & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational Leadership: culture and Diversity.* London: Sage.

Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B. & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In Avolio, B. J., Yammarino, F. J., eds. Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The road ahead. *Oxford: Elsevier Science*, vol. 2(12), pp.35-66.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J. & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal,* vol. 45(4), pp.735-744. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3069307.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. & Van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin,* vol. 129, pp. 569-591.

Eckman, R. (2003). Standing up when it matters. *Council for independent Colleges Newsletter,* April 2.

Eckman, E. W. (2004). Does gender make a difference? Voices of male and female high school principals. *Planning and Changing,* vol. 35(3&4), pp. 192-208.

Fielding, N. & Fielding, J. (1986). *Linking data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* Boston, MA.: McGraw-Hill.

Gardner, L. & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal,* vol. 23(102), pp.735-744.

Gray, H. L. (1993). Gender issues in management training. In Ozga, J., *Women in Educational management.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Grogan, M., (2003). Laying the groundwork for a reconception of the superintendency from feminist postmodern perspectives. In Young, M. D. & Skrla, L. (2003). *Reconsidering feminist research in educational leadership,* pp. 9-34. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hall, V. (1996). *Dancing on the ceiling: A study of women managers in education.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Hallinger, P. & Leithwood, K. (1996). Culture and educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration,* vol. 34(5), pp. 4-11.

Hallinger, P., Walker, A. D. & Bajunid, I. A. (2005). Educational leadership in East Asia: Implications for education in a global society. *UCEA Review*, vol. 45(1), pp. 1-4.

Hauserman, C.P. & Stick, S.L. (2013). The leadership teachers want from principals: Transformational. *Canadian Journal of Education,* vol. 36 (3), pp. 184-203.

Heldesin, S. (1990). *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership.* New York: Doubleday.

Henderson, G. (1994). *Issues and strategies.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S. & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 93, pp. 346-357.

Holtkamp, L. (2002). Crossing Borders: An analysis of the characteristics and attributes of female public school principals. *Advancing Women in Leadership,* vol. 10(1), pp.2-20.

Hood, J. D., Poulson, R. L., Mason, S. A., Walker, T. C. & Dixon, J. Jr. (2009). An examination of traditional and nontraditional students' evaluations of professional leadership styles: transformation versus transactional approach. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* vol. 9(1), pp. 1-12.

Hoover, N. R., Petrosko, J. M. & Schulz, R. R. (1991). *Transformational and Transactional Leadership: An empirical test of a theory.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1991.

Jirasinghe, D. & Lyons, G. (1996). *The Competent Head: A Job Analysis of Heads' Tasks and Personality Factors.* London: Falmer Press.

Joasil, L. (2008). *A study into the relationship between observed and model values of men and women leaders in higher education.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Capella University: USA.

Johns, H. E. & Moser, H. R. (2001). From trait to transformation: The evolution of leadership theories. *Education,* vol. 110(1), pp. 115-122.

Jones, D. & Rudd, R. (2008). Transactional, Transformational, or Laissez-Faire leadership: An assessment of college of Agriculture Academic Program leaders'(Deans) leadership styles. *Journal of Agricultural Education,* vol. 49(2), pp. 88-97.

Kilinc, A. (2014). Examining the relationship between teacher leadership and school climate. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice,* vol. 14(5), pp. 1729-1742.

Kirdar, S. (2010). United Arab Emirates. A chapter in Kelly, S. & Breslin J. (2010), *Women's rightsin the Middle East and North Africa: Progress Amid Resistance.* New York, NY: Freedom House.

Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M. & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and

student performance in Singapore. *Kournal of Organizational Behavior,* vol. 16, pp. 319-333.

Kolb, J. A. (1999). The effect of gender role, attitude toward leadership, and self confidence on leader emergence: Implications for leadership development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly,* vol. 10(4), pp. 305-320.

Kotter, J. P. (2001). What leaders really do? *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 79(11), pp. 85-96.

Krug, S. E. (1992). Quantitative findings regarding school leadership and school climate. Occasional papers: School leadership and education reform. *The National Center for School Leadership,* pp. 1-19.

Lawrence, E. T. (2000). *The relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles of the senior executives/ department heads and their immediate subordinates' perceived satisfaction, extra effort, effectiveness, and organizational culture typology in the hospital setting.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nova Southeastern.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1997). Explaining variation in teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership: A replication. *Journal of Educational Administration,* vol. 35(4), pp.312-331.

Leithwood, K. Jantzi D. & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing Leadership for changing times.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* vol. 17(2), pp. 201-227.

Mahdinezhad, M., Bin Suandi, T., Bin Silong, A. & Omar, Z. B. (2013). Transformational, transactional leadership styles and job performance of academic leaders. *International Education Studies,* vol. 6(11), pp. 29-34.

Ministry of State for Federal National Council Affairs (2008). Women in the United Arab Emirates: a Portrait of Progress.

Morris, S. B., Guattin, L. & Coleman, M. (1999). Leadership stereotypes and styles of female Singaporean Principals. *Compare,* vol. 29(2), pp. 191-202.

Nahavandi, A. (2002). *The art and science of leadership.* 3rd edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: PrenticeHall.

Nicholson II, W. D. (2007). Leading where it counts: An investigation of the leadership styles and behaviors that define college and university presidents as successful fundraisers. *International Journal of Educational Advancement,* vol.7(4), pp. 256-270.

Noris, C. (1999). Cultivating creative cultures. In Hughes, L.(1999). *Principals as Leader.* 2nd edn. Columbus, OH: Merill. pp.60-80.

Normore, A. H. & Trinidad, C. (2005). Leadership and gender: A dangerous liaison? *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal,* vol. 26(7), pp. 574-590.

Norris, C., Barnett, B., Bason, M. & Yerkes, D. (2002). *Developing educational leaders. A working model: The learning community in action.* Columbia University, New York: Teachers college Press.

Northous, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and Practice.* 3rd edn. California: Sage Publication.

Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEO's. *Journal of Business Ethics,* vol. 27(4), pp. 321-334.

Odetunde, O. J. (2013). Influence of transformational and transactional leaderships, and leaders' sex on organizational conflict management behaviour. *Gender & Behaviour,* vol. 11(1), pp. 5323-5335.

OECD (2014). Education GPS: The world of education at your Fingertips. Country Profile Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates).

Politis, J. D. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership predictors of the 'Stimulant' determinants to creativity in organizational work environments. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management,* vol. 2(2), pp. 23-34.

Poulson, R., Smith, J. Hood, D., Arthur C. & Bazemore, K. (2011). The impact of gender on preferences for transactional versus transformational professorial leadership styles: An empirical analysis. *Review of Higher education and self-Learning,* vol. 4(11), pp. 58-70.

Pounder, J. S. & Coleman, M. (2002). Women-better leaders than men? In general and educational management it still 'all depends'. *Leadership and Organizational development Journal,* vol. 23(3), pp. 122-133.

Rosenbach, W. E. & Taylor, R. L. (1998). *Contemporary Issues in Leadership.* 4th edn. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=2715587

Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review,* vol. 68(6), pp.119-125.

Saeed, R., Azizollah, A., Zahra, A., Abdolghayoum, N., Zaman, A. & Peyman, Y. (2011). Effect of female principal's management styles on teacher's job satisfaction in Isfahan –Iran, girls high schools. *International Education studies,* vol. 4(3), pp. 124-132.

Sahin, S. (2004). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles of school principals and school culture (The case of Izmir, Turkey). *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice,* vol. 4(2), pp. 387-396.

Schein, V. E. (1994). Managerial sex typing: A persistent and pervasive barrier to women's opportunities. In Davidson, M. & Burke R. (1994). *Women in Management: Current Research Issues.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Sergiovanni, T. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance schools.* San Francisco: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Shimanoff, S. B. & Jenkins, M. M. (1991). Leadership and gender: Challenging assumptions and recognizing resources. In Cathcart, R. S. & Samovar, L. A. (1991). *Small Group communication: a reader.* 6th edn. Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown. pp. 504-522.

Snodgrass, J. & Shachar, M. (2008). Faculty perceptions of occupational therapy program directors' leadership

styles and outcomes of leadership. *Journal of Allied Health*, vol. 37(4).

Stelter, N. Z. (2002). Gender differences in leadership: Current social issues and future organizational implications. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* vol. 8(4), pp.88-92.

Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: an evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy,* vol. 54. Retrieved from http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap.

Sun, J. & Leithwood, K. (2012). Transformational school leadership effects on student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools,* vol. 11, pp. 418-451.

Tejeda, M. J., Scandura, T. A. & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations. *Leadership Quarterly,* vol. 12(1), pp. 31-52.

Vernadine, T. (1997). *What research says about administrators' management style, effectiveness and teacher morale*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 411569.

Whetstone, J. T. (2002). Personalism and moral leadership: The servant leader with transforming vision. *Business Ethics: A European Review,* vol. 11(4), pp.385-392.

Yoder, J. D. (2001). Making leadership work more effectively for women. *Journal of Social Issues.*

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly,* vol. 10(2), pp. 285-305.

Yukl, G. (2008). *Leadership in Organizations*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.