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The current study is an attempt to explore relationship between transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour, and school effectiveness in primary schools in Selangor, Malaysia based on teachers’ perception. This study also investigates the level of transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour, school effectiveness and their differences based on school type and location. According to the literature review, number of studies on school effectiveness in Malaysian primary schools is still low. Besides, more investigation is required on the dimensionality of transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour in school to identify their contribution to school effectiveness. Leithwood (1994) model of transformational leadership with associated Leithwood & Jantzi (1995) questionnaire, Organ (1988) model of organizational citizenship behaviour with associated questionnaire by Podsakoff et al. (1990), and seven correlates of effective school model by Lezotte (1997) based on Lezotte & Snyder (2011) correlates of effective school questions were applied for data collection. This study utilized stratified random sampling method by choosing 72 primary schools and 490 teachers with the response rate of (n=410) in 6 districts of Selangor state (Gombak, Hulu Langat, Hulu Selangor, Klang, Kuala Langat and Kuala Selangor) and from three types of National, National type Chinese and National type Tamil school based on their urban and rural locations. Data analysis conducted by using descriptive statistic, analysis of one-way ANOVA, independent t-test, coefficient correlation and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). Moreover, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was done to better fit the model. Reliability and validity analysis (content, construct, convergent, and discriminant) were conducted to confirm that the instrument is valid as well as reliable.

The result of descriptive analysis showed that the level of transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour and school effectiveness dimensions were at high level in primary schools in Selangor based on teachers’ perception. The result of this study showed that, out of eight dimensions of transformational leadership, only two dimensions shows significant difference. First, dimension of “providing individualized support” is significantly higher in Chinese National Type schools compared to Tamil National Type schools; and second, “strengthening school culture” dimension is significantly higher in urban compared to rural schools. Out of the five dimensions of
organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions “civic virtue” behaviour by teachers is significantly higher in National schools compared to Chinese National Type schools. The finding also showed that there is no significant difference between organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions based on school location. The result showed that the level of school effectiveness is significantly higher in National schools compared to Chinese National Type schools. The level of “monitoring of students’ progress” is significantly higher in National compared to Chinese and Tamil schools and “opportunity to learn and time on task” dimension is significantly higher in National compared to Chinese schools. The result of correlation analysis indicated that, there is a positive, significant and high relationships between transformational leadership dimensions and overall school effectiveness. As well, positive, significant, and moderate relationships were found between organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions and overall school effectiveness.

The result of SEM indicated that the significant predictors of overall school effectiveness included two dimensions of transformational leadership (shared vision and models behaviour), and three dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour (altruism, conscientiousness and civic virtue) which accounted for 62% of variance in overall school effectiveness. Moreover, overall transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour collectively, accounted for 57% of variance in overall school effectiveness. This study proposed several recommendations to the Ministry of Education, headmasters, teachers, and school administrators, to improve the level of school effectiveness by practicing transformational leadership dimensions especially “building shared vision” and “models behaviour” dimension. Moreover, they can develop, maintain, and elevate the level of school effectiveness by exhibiting civic virtue, altruism, and conscientiousness behaviours as the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour in primary schools in Selangor, Malaysia.
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Keputusan analisis deskriptif mendapati bahawa persepsi guru terhadap amalan kepemimpinan transformasional guru besar, tingkahlaku kewarganegaraan organisasi dan keberkesanan sekolah adalah pada tahap tinggi. Dari lapan dimensi amalan kepemimpinan transformasional berdasarkan jenis dan lokasi sekolah, hanya dua...

Keputusan SEM mendapati peramal signifikan terhadap keseluruhan keberkesanan sekolah meliputi dua dimensi kepemimpinan transformasional (visi yang dikongsikan, dan tingkahlaku contoh (model behaviour), dan tiga dimensi tingkahlaku kewartanegaraan organisasi (altruisme, kesedaran dan nilai sivik) menerangkan 62% varian dalam keseluruhan keberkesanan sekolah. Selanjutnya, secara keseluruhan kedua-dua kepemimpinan transformasional dan tingkahlaku kewartanegaraan organisasi memperhalkan 57% varian dalam keseluruhan keberkesanan sekolah. Kajian ini mengesorkan beberapa cadangan kepada Kementerian Pendidikan, guru besar, guru dan pentadbir sekolah untuk meningkatkan tahap keberkesanan sekolah melalui amalan kepemimpinan transformasional terutamanya di bawah dimensi “membangun kan visi yang dikongsi bersama” dan dimensi “tingkah laku dicontohi”. Selanjutnya tahap keberkesanan sekolah boleh dibangun, ditingkat serta dilestarikan dalam kalangan sekolah rendah melalui amalan dimensi nilai sivik, altruism dan kesedaran di bawah tingkahlaku kewartanegaraan organisasi di sekolah rendah di Selangor, Malaysia.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

School effectiveness has been well studied since 1960s focusing on student achievement. School effectiveness in practice is a very much broader concept and there is no agreement regarding to its definition. Colemans’ report (1966) stated that family background and socio-economics regardless of the instructional method were the major determinants of students’ achievement. However, since 1980s, researchers believed that schools were successful in educating all students regardless of their socioeconomic status or family background. Although, the focus of early school effectiveness studies were based on student achievements, other studies believed that, other factors are highly influential in establishment of effective school. Researchers have laid emphasis on school and its activities including financial and material resources, class size, teachers’ qualifications, classroom and teaching methods as major factors affecting school effectiveness (Ghani et al., 2011; Lezotte & Snyder, 2011). Furthermore, research findings during early 80’s until now found that school activities were able to improve the school effectiveness (Ghani et al., 2011). Early effective schools researchers attempted to locate schools that were successful in educating students of all backgrounds, regardless of socio-economic status or family background (Lezotte, 1991; Lezotte & Snyder, 2011). Such schools were found in varying locations and communities, and researchers tried to isolate which values, strategies, and practices those schools had in common (Lezotte, 2001).

Effective schools researchers identified the successful schools have unique characteristics and processes, which, help all children learn at high levels (Lezotte, 1991; Kirk & Jones, 2004). In other words, unique characteristics of the majority of effective schools are correlated with student success (Edmond, 1979; Lezotte, 1991; Brookover & Lezotte, 1977). The researchers found that all of the effective schools had strong instructional leadership, a strong sense of mission, demonstrated effective instructional behaviours, held high expectations for all students, practiced frequent monitoring of student achievement, operated in a safe and orderly manner, had a positive home-school relations and opportunity to learn and student time on task (Lezotte, 2001). These factors became known as the correlates of effective schools, which are providing leading indicators to add value to student learning (Purkey & Smith, 1983; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; Hoy, Tarter & Hoy, 2006; Lezotte, 1991; Sammons, Hillman & Mortimore, 1995; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2008; Lezotte & Snyder, 2011).

Educational organizations have changed dramatically during the last decade with effort to increase effectiveness (Tafvelin, 2013). Establishment of effective schools will improve the working environment and professional status of school through teachers and administrators (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Edmonds, 1979; Samsons et al., 1995). Additionally, to implement the correlates of effective school and to transform education system, it is required to discuss new leadership towards managing school challenges and to train administrators, who are able to articulate a vision for success, inspire others to embrace the vision and capable of managing the daily process of school (Bush, 2011;
Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005a). Leadership is one of the basic and most important needs of any organization. Leadership is required to compliment organizational system and to develop the staff motivation and performance (Haider & Riaz, 2010). In fact, a leader should provide what is needed by the followers to keep them productive and to proceed towards the shared vision (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005a). Leaders must have the ability to make necessary changes, directing the process system to be effective and sustainable (Bush, 2011). This leadership approach, which is required to empower leaders’ community and their colleagues, called transformational leadership (Dolence & Norris, 1995; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005a; Bush, 2011).

Transformational leadership is one of the integrative leadership theories, which have been established, based on combining trait, behavioural, contingency approaches and its main attribute is to implement organizational change effectively (Bass, 1996; Lussier & Achua, 2007; Sadeghi & Lope Pihie, 2012). Moreover, transformational leadership theories have focused on understanding leader effectiveness (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Transformational leadership theory includes three parts, which are 1) transformational, 2) transactional, and 3) laissez-faire leadership According to Bass and Avolio (1995, 2004). In transformational leadership style, leaders can create significant organizational change, foster higher level of motivation, and loyalty among followers. Moreover, they introduce a new image or view of the future and create a commitment among followers (Bass, 1999; Kinicki & Kreitner, 2008). Transactional leadership focuses on the exchanges happen between leaders and their followers (Northouse, 2007), in which it helps follower to fulfill their own benefits (Bass, 1999). Although applying transactional leadership results in expected outcomes, transformational leadership results in performance that goes beyond expectation and leads organizations to effectiveness (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Erkutlu, 2008; Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008). Individuals who exhibited transformational leadership were found to be more effective leaders with better task outcome than were individuals who exhibited only transactional leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Dvir et al, 2002; Erkutlu, 2008; Northouse, 2007; Waldman et al, 2001). In contrast to transformational and transactional leadership styles, leaders who adopt the laissez-faire leadership style exercise little control over the followers and avoid making decisions and are absent when needed (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Organizational effectiveness is advantages of transformational leadership in comparison with transactional leadership (Northous, 2012; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Pihie, Sadeghi & Elias, 2011).

Transformation leadership only recently has become the subject of systematic empirical inquiry in school contexts. Leithwood (1994) argued that transformational approaches to school leadership are especially appropriate to the challenges facing schools entering the 21th century (Nir & Hameiri, 2013). According to Leithwood (1994), transformational leadership conceptualized into eight dimensions, which are building school vision, establishing school goals, demonstrating high performance expectations, developing people providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, models behaviour, building school culture, and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Bush, 2011; Leithwood, 2012).

The model developed by Leithwood and their colleagues should provide a particularly good fit with effectiveness the school because it focuses on linking specific school leadership practices to school improvement indicators (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). In an effective school, vision planning, developing
leadership, higher level of motivation, high performance expectations, and higher levels of personal commitment to the organizational goals should be developed through transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Hebert, 2010; Smith, 2011; Leithwood & Sun, 2012).

Transformational leadership emphasizes on emotions, values and shares the fundamental aim of fostering capacity development and higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). Most studies in the field of leadership have focused on identification of those behaviours exhibited by the leaders that make followers more aware of the importance and values of task output, activate their higher order requirements, and persuade them to go beyond self-interest for organizational goals (Lee, Veasna & Wu, 2013). The transformational leadership in educational setting focuses on the commitments and capacities of the school’s members. Higher levels of personal commitment to the school goals and greater capacities for accomplishing those goals are assumed to yield extra effort and greater productivity (Leithwood et al., 1999; Leithwood, 2005; Bass, 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Hallinger & Leithwood, 2013; Bush, 2011).

Additionally, transformational leaders are proactive in a way that they can enhance staff’s capabilities, map new directions, manage the resources, facilitate and support employees and respond to organizational problems and challenges (Bass, 1999; Conningham & Corderio, 2006). Transformational leadership increases organizational effectiveness and encourage followers to put the organizational vision and goals before their personal priorities (Reuvers, Van Engen, Vinkenburg & Wilson Evard, 2008).

As working under changing conditions becomes a crucial feature of effective schools, they necessarily rely more on teachers who are willing to contribute to the successful changes, regardless of their formal job descriptions. These non-prescribed behaviours by teachers are recognized as “organizational citizenship behaviours” (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Bogler & Somech, 2005; Duyar & Normore, 2012; Somech & Oplatka, 2014; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Organizational citizenship behaviours has been defined as a set of helpful, voluntary and extra role behaviours exhibited by employees that are not recognized by the formal reward system and have a positive effect on the functioning of organization. Achieving the school visions fundamentally depends on teachers who are more willing to go beyond their responsibilities to contribute to successful change because formal job description cannot cover the entire range of behaviours required to reach the school goals (Somech & Oplatka, 2014; Somech & Ron, 2007; Belogolovsky & Somech, 2012; Lev & Koslowsky, 2012; Zeinabadi, 2010).

Teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviours affect the school’s social environment and improve school effectiveness because they make the resources available for more constructive purpose, assist to coordinate tasks within the school and make teachers capable of adopting environmental changes effectively (DiPaola et al., 2005; Somech & Oplatka, 2014; Duyar & Normore, 2012; Sesen & Basim, 2012). Overall, researches on organizational citizenship behaviours in educational setting are relatively new but have a lasting value and fundamental implications for the study of school effectiveness (Somech & Oplatka, 2014).

Organ (1988) clarified the construct of organizational citizenship behaviour by offering five different types of discretionary behaviours, which are altruism, conscientiousness,
courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Organ’s (1988) model of OCB has been recognized as a comprehensive model among others because educational and non-educational researchers often use Organ’s (1988) five-component model as a basis to investigate and measure the organizational citizenship behaviour (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011). According to the multidimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviour models provided by several researches, most of them were agreed on a lack of consensus about its dimensionality (Somech & Ron, 2007).

Education is the most important factor for development and success of any country. Malaysia has a centralized educational system; therefore, any transformation, policymaking decisions and overall direction of the country’s education is designated by Ministry of Education (MoE) and schools are responsible for implementation of the policies that have been planned. Hence, implementation of successful educational policy depends on the effectiveness of leadership among principals and heads of department in schools. Several researches in Malaysia pointed out that there is a positive relationship between school leadership and school effectiveness (Marzuki, 1997; Muda, 2004; Ghani, 2012).

According to Malaysia’s education vision, it is required to inculcate unity among multi-ethnic students and to bridge the educational gap between urban and rural schools as well as to improve school effectiveness in Malaysian schools. In addition, some researchers have referred to demographic variables such as type of school and school location (urban and rural) associated with effective school performance (Othman & Muijs, 2012). Since primary schools have a major share in the Malaysian Education System, their effectiveness plays a crucial role in academic advancement (Ponnusamy, 2010).

The main goal of the Malaysian Ministry of Education is to make sure that the education system is transforming based on the demands of national development and to transform school system to the world-class education system with international standards and high level of education for all students regardless of their gender and socioeconomic background (Malaysia education Blueprint, 2013-2025). Successful educational policy implementation depends on the effectiveness of leadership among principals and heads of department in schools and educational institutions across the country (Ghavifekr et al., 2014). Therefore, to process this transformation, it is required to ensure high performing school leaders in every school who are capable of directing the process system to be effective and sustainable, empowering others to take responsibility and to transform school visions and goals toward school effectiveness (Ghavifekr et al., 2014). Hence, school leaders need to have a clear vision and appropriate strategies for the school’s development (MoE, 2013). Consequently, there is a need for trained principals who adopt transformational leadership practices, motivates teachers to rise above their personal expectations, and help to achieve common school vision and missions (MoE, 2013).

Moreover, the foundation for educational progression lies within the primary schools and it is highly essential to initiate the Malaysian educational vision from the very basic grade (primary level) in educational settings in Malaysia (Othman & Muijs, 2012). According to Jamil, Razak, Raju & Mohamed (2011), teachers as the most important human resources in school play an important role in Malaysian education by developing the quality of education. Teachers by understanding the concept and vision
of school can strengthen team cooperation among school stakeholders, which is helpful to elevate the effectiveness of the school (Hsieh et al., 2010; Lee, 2011). For the above reason teachers perception could be a valuable resource of data gathering to determine the influential factors of school effectiveness.

According to Bush (2003), the role of transformational leadership in school effectiveness has not been fully investigated. Similarly, Salleh, Razikin & Saidova (2009) stated that, there is less evidence on practicing transformational leadership’s dimensions effectively. Furthermore, school effectiveness literature specified that, only a few studies have discovered the relationship between the role of each dimensions of teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviours and their impacts on school effectiveness (DiPaola et al., 2005; Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Belogolovsky & Somech, 2012; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2014; Lo & Ramayah, 2009). Therefore, to fill the gap of research regarding transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviours and school effectiveness, theoretically and empirically the current research aims to explore the relationship between the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviours and transformational leadership dimensions with overall school effectiveness in Selangor state in Malaysian primary schools.

1.1.1 An Overview of Education System in Malaysia

The National Education System of Malaysia according to Ministry of Education portal (2014) includes:

1. Pre-school / Kindergarten education for children aged 4 to 6
2. Primary education from age 7 to 12 (Standard 1 to Standard 6 for 6 years)
3. Lower Secondary from age 13 to 15 (Form 1 to Form 3 for 3 years)
4. Upper Secondary from age 16 to 17 (Form 4 to Form 5 for 2 years) with the option to choose from:
   a) Academic secondary education
   b) Technical/Vocational secondary education
   c) Religious secondary education
5. Post-secondary education / Pre-university from age 18 (for 1 to 2 years) either Form Six (for 1.5 years) or Matriculation (for 1 year)

There are two categories of public primary schools in Malaysia: National and National-type. National-type schools are further divided into Chinese National-type schools and Tamil National-type schools. Primary education involves six years, referred to as year 1 to year 6. Year 1 to Year 3 are classified as Level 1 while Year 4 to Year 6 is considered as Level 2. Primary education starts at the age of 7 and ends at 12 (MoE, 2014).

At the primary and secondary school levels, the government-funded education system is centralized and the Ministry of Education establishes the national curriculum to be used in all schools. Primary education is free and compulsory for all children. Primary education is a period of 6 years and are divided into two categories “National,” where the medium of instruction is the National language, Malay, and which are open to students from all language groups. Other categories includes non-Malay National-type schools where Chinese language instruction is used in National Chinese primary schools SJK (C), and Tamil-language instruction is used in National Tamil primary schools SJK (T). According to MoE portal (2014), there are 10154 secondary and
primary schools in Malaysia. From these schools, 7760 of them are primary schools and there are total of 2704046 primary school students with 238073 teachers in primary schools.

1.2 Problem Statement

The study of effective school is one of the main educational reform initiatives taking place in many countries to identify the influential factors of effective schools in recent years (Botha, 2010; Petty & Green, 2007; Sun, Creemers & De Jong, 2007). Several empirical and theoretical researches in Malaysia, as well as in many other countries on school effectiveness have defined the effective school based on academic outcomes and achievement, while, school effectiveness is not only achieved by academic output (Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Botha, 2010; Ghani et al., 2008; Gray, 2004; Lezotte, 1991; Edmond, 1982). Thus, identifying other factors and correlates related to school effectiveness claimed to be required to identify, categorize and solve the challenges that schools face (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001; Kyriakides & Creemers, 2008, Botha, 2010). The seven correlates of effective school model provided by Lezotte & Snyder (2011) characterized the school effectiveness and the tasks that educators can do to make sure that their schools practicing these correlates.

According to Malaysia’s education vision (2013), it is required to transform school system to the world-class education system with international standards and high level of education to all students regardless of family background. Ghani (2012; 2014) and Kamaruddin (2011) indicated that a number of studies on school effectiveness in Malaysia are still low and there is a need to refine and elaborate the practices and theoretical models of school effectiveness based on its effective factors and correlates. Moreover, in order to implement the correlates of effective school, respected leaders needed who are capable of driving the process system to be effective and sustainable, empowering others to take responsibility, transform school visions (Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Hallinger, 2007; Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2014; Ibrahim & Wahab, 2012; Marzuki, 1997; Abgoli & Sabti, 2013). Principals’ leadership is key factor in creating effective schools (Leithwood, 2012; Marzano, 2003; Harris et al., 2003; Sammons et al., 1997), because it determines the success or failure of school (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2014; Ibrahim & Wahab, 2012; Marzuki, 1997; Abgoli & Sabti, 2013).

Transformational leadership practiced by headmasters can motivate teachers to change their attitude and values by being committed towards the mission and vision of education. The practice of transformational leadership is said to be able to move the organization led to a clear vision, mission and goals of the organization (Amin, Shah, & Tatlah, 2013; Ghani et al., 2009; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Ishak 2003).

According to the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025 (MoE, 2013), there is need to ensure high performing school leaders in every school which have ability to shared leadership, increased staff support, new leadership models and structures and commitment to the education sector as the top priority for national transformation and development. The result of a study by Yaakub & Ayob (1993) and Zanariah (2011) showed insufficient leadership practicing by Malaysian primary school headmaster in implementing their roles and responsibilities. Although, empirical researches showed that transformational leadership has a significant effect on organizational effectiveness, more investigation needs to be done on the dimensionality of transformational
leadership in order to determine the role of each dimensions of transformational leadership in school effectiveness (Moolenaar et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 1999; Shao et al., 2012; Ngang, 2011; Bush, 2011; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Moreover, there is need to determine the role of each dimensions of transformational leadership in school effectiveness (Dickinson, 2010; Leithwood, 2012; Bush, 2003). Similarly, in the context of Malaysia there is less evidence on practicing transformational leadership’s dimensions effectively (Salleh & Saidova, 2013) and more researches need to be conducted on their relationship with school effectiveness (Ghani et al., 2011; Ghavifekr et al., 2014; Iyer, 2008).

Prediction of school effectiveness is highly dependent on teachers who are willing to exhibit significant effort beyond the formal job description (Somech & Oplatka, 2014; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Researches on organizational citizenship behaviour in school setting have not been fully investigated and more comprehensive and consistent inquiry needed to better understand the organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions in school. Moreover, it is required to identify which dimension is more contributed to school effectiveness.(DiPaola, Tarter, and Hoy, 2007; Hoy and Miskel, 2013; Jimmieson et al., 2010; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Hoy & Tarter, 2004; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005; Oplatka, 2006; Somech & Oplatka, 2014; Asgari, Khaliliyan & Baba, 2012) especially in the context of Malaysia (Lo & Ramayah, 2009; Li, 2013). Moreover, most of the empirical studies on organizational citizenship behaviour have been conducted in the west and the researcher should consider significant organizational citizenship behaviour takes different forms in varying cultures (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2000; Asgari et al., 2012).

Moreover, some researchers indicated that demographic features such as, school location (urban and rural) and type of school is important as well when it comes to school effectiveness (Rumberger & Palaridy, 2004; Rumberger & Thomas, 2000; Salleh & Saidova, 2013). According to Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025) the Malaysian Ministry of Education aspires to halve the current Urban-Rural and type of school gap by 2020. Therefore, the relationship between transformational leadership and school effectiveness should be investigated based on school location and type (Ghavifekr et al., 2014).

Furthermore, most of the researches on school effectiveness in Malaysia have been conducted on secondary schools, mostly in Kuala Lumpur state and mainly focused on urban schools (Iyer, 2008; Kamaruddin, 2011; Ghani et al., 2011). Among the educational setting, the effectiveness of primary schools plays a crucial role in academic achievement and it is highly essential to initiate the educational vision and goals from the very basic grade in educational settings (Ponnusamy, 2010; Othman & Muijs, 2013). According to Southworth (2008), there have been some changes in the role and responsibilities of primary schools leadership regarding to changes in the primary school evaluation system beyond the student achievement. Education at primary level forms the core of the national education system and needs to be on way so that the goals for national development can be achieved (Hamida et al., 2013). The Ministry of Education Malaysia has a number of objectives for primary education such as to facilitate the personal development of pupils, secondary school preparation, social skills and cultural understanding, religious and moral, and contribution to the society and country (MOE, 2012). Schools attempt to develop their efforts for excellence to ensure that their actions correspond with the requirements of a constantly changing environment. An effective school is able to serve as basic guidelines for a school to
achieve success because the focus study is comprehensive and not only to focus on teaching and learning process (Ghani, 2014). Therefore, these objectives of primary education are possible with the transform education system by high performing school leaders in every school and efforts and involvement from teachers (Hamida et al., 2013). Few researches have been conducted, to identify the relationship between transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour and overall school effectiveness in Malaysia primary schools. Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine the relationship between transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour and overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia based on teachers’ perception.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The main objective of this study is to determine the relationship between transformational leadership’s dimensions, organizational citizenship behaviours’ dimensions, and school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

Specifically this study is designed to:

1. To determine the level of transformational leadership dimensions in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
2. To determine the level of organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
3. To determine the level of school effectiveness dimensions in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
4. To determine differences between the levels of transformational leadership dimensions, organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions and school effectiveness dimensions based on type of school in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
5. To determine differences between the levels of transformational leadership dimensions, organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions and school effectiveness dimensions based on location of school in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
6. To determine the relationship between transformational leadership dimensions and overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
7. To determine the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions and overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
8. To identify the significant predictors of transformational leadership dimensions and organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions on overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
9. To identify the contribution of overall transformational leadership and overall organizational citizenship behaviour to the overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.
1.5 Research Questions

In this study in order to identify objective (1) to (7), eleven research questions were conducted. According to objective (8), all dimensions of transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour considered as exogenous variable to identify which dimensions are significant predictors of overall school effectiveness (endogenous variable). Moreover, the contribution of overall transformational leadership and overall organizational citizenship behaviour on overall school effectiveness was determined by objective (9). Therefore, objective 8 and objective (9) were examined by two separate research questions (12) and (13). In this study, structural equation modeling (SEM) is used to examine two hypotheses with 15 sub-hypotheses to answer the research questions 12 and 13.

1. What is the level of transformational leadership dimensions in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
2. What is the level of organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
3. What is the level of school effectiveness dimensions in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
4. Are there differences in teachers’ perception on transformational leadership dimensions based on type of school in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
5. Are there differences in teachers’ perception on organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions based on type of school in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
6. Are there differences in teachers’ perception on school effectiveness dimensions based on type of school in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
7. Are there differences in teachers’ perception on transformational leadership dimensions based on school location (urban and rural) in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
8. Are there differences in teachers’ perception on organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions based on school location (urban and rural) in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
9. Are there differences in teachers’ perception on school effectiveness dimensions based on school location (urban and rural) in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
10. What is the relationship between transformational leadership dimensions and overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
11. What is the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions and overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
12. What are the significant predictors of transformational leadership dimensions and organizational citizenship behaviours dimensions on overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
13. What are the significant contribution of overall transformational leadership and overall organizational citizenship behaviour to the overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia?
1.6 Research Hypotheses

This study explores two hypotheses with 15 sub-hypotheses in order to determine relationship between transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour and school effectiveness for examined the research questions 12 and 13. The framework of this study is based on the following hypotheses:

In this study, hypothesis H\(_1\) with 13 sub-hypotheses (H\(_{1a}\) to H\(_{1m}\)) were examined by structural equation modeling (A), to determine the effect of individual exogenous variables which include eight dimensions of transformational leadership (building shared vision, building goal consensus, high performance expectation, models behaviour, providing intellectual stimulation, providing individualized support, building school cultures and building collaborating structures) and five dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour (altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue) on the endogenous variable (overall school effectiveness).

\(H_1\): Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions are significant predictors of overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.

H\(_{1a}\): Developing a shared vision is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1b}\): Building goal consensus is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1c}\): Holding high performance expectations is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1d}\): Models behaviour is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1e}\): Providing individualized support is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1f}\): Providing intellectual stimulation is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1g}\): Strengthening school culture is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1h}\): Building collaborating structures is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1i}\): Altruism is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1j}\): Conscientiousness is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1k}\): Sportsmanship is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1l}\): Courtesy is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.
H\(_{1m}\): Civic virtue is a significant predictor of overall school effectiveness.

In order to test the hypothesis H\(_2\) with two sub-dimensions (H\(_{2a}\) to H\(_{2b}\), structural equation modeling (B) has been used to test the contribution of overall transformational leadership and overall organizational citizenship behaviour to overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia based on teachers’ perception. In this model, both constructs (transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour) considered overall to identify their contribution to overall school effectiveness for answer research question (13).
H$_2$: There is a significant contribution between overall transformational leadership and overall organizational citizenship behaviour on overall school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.

H$_{2a}$: Transformational leadership significantly contributed to overall school effectiveness.
H$_{2b}$: Organizational citizenship behaviour significantly contributed to overall school effectiveness.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The study of relationships between transformational leadership’s dimensions, organizational citizenship behaviour’s dimensions, and overall school effectiveness is important for several reasons:

First, this study will add to the growing body of research for increasing the level of school effectiveness in the way that transformational leadership dimensions by Leithwood (1994) (developing shared vision, building goal consensus, holding high performance expectations, models behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, strengthening school culture, and building collaborative structures) and organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions by Organ (1988) (altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue) contribute to increase the level of school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia.

In addition, this study will provide theoretical and empirical contribution and understanding about how with considering school as open social system, practicing headmaster transformational leadership dimension and exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviours by teachers leads to increase the level of school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia based on teacher perception.

Second, the result of this study will identify the level of school effectiveness in primary schools in Selangor state, Malaysia based on the 7 correlates of effective school (strong instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, safe and orderly environment, creating high expectations climate, frequent monitoring of students’ progress, opportunity to learn and time on task, positive school-home relations). Therefore, with consideration to the Malaysia education 2025 vision, these results will be helpful for the Malaysian ministry of education (MoE) to figure out the status-quo of school effectiveness in primary schools in Selangor state, Malaysia.

Third, in the past, many researchers have conducted the implementation of organizational citizenship behaviour in organizations and industry and few researches in educational settings and schools attempted to investigate the level of teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviours and its relationship with school effectiveness. Lock (2005) indicated that organizational citizenship behaviour, as a form of productive behaviour is necessary (Asgari, 2012). Despite the need to investigate the effect of organizational citizenship behaviours in schools, few researches have reported on the education system in primary schools. The current study aims to identify the level of teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviours’ dimensions and their relationships with school effectiveness. Therefore, this result will be helpful to provide enough
empirical findings for improvement of school effectiveness in primary schools in Selangor state, Malaysia.

Fourth, so far many books and articles have been written about transformational leadership concepts in western countries and in Malaysia but, few researches have tried to determine the transformational leadership’s dimensions as the predictor of effectiveness in educational setting. Therefore, the result of this study can be helpful for the MOE to enhance their leadership training courses (e.g. Aminuddin Baki Institute) provided for schools principals and administrators. Fifth, one of the objectives of this study is to identify the level of school effectiveness, transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviours in primary schools in Selangor state, Malaysia based on their types (National schools, National Chinese schools and National Tamil schools) and locations (Urban and Rural schools). Moreover, with reference to the Malaysian education blueprint 2013-2025 the ministry aspires to halve the current urban rural and school types (National schools, National Chinese schools and National Tamil schools) gap by 2020. Therefore, the result of this study will be useful to illustrate how close or far the schools move towards 2020 Malaysian vision.

Sixth, Preliminary results demonstrated a valid (content, construct, convergent and discriminant) and reliable dimension scale for measuring organizational citizenship behaviours, transformational leadership and school effectiveness. Moreover, translation and usage of three transformational leadership questionnaires (TLQ), organizational citizenship behaviours questionnaire (OCBQ) and school effectiveness questionnaire (SEQ) into Bahasa Malaysia will assist the researchers to investigate in this filed in other school types and districts in Malaysia.

Finally, the result of this research will provide some suggestions and recommendations for the MoE, administrator, principals, teachers and more information for implementation of school effectiveness.

1.8 Assumption of the Study

There are some assumptions to be considered in doing the current research. Firstly, the respondents understand the survey instrument and have the ability to self-report and respond objectively and honestly. The second assumption is that Jantzi and Leithwood’s (1996) Principal Leadership Questionnaire, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter (1990) based on Organ’s (1988) organizational citizenship behaviour questionnaire and self-administered school effectiveness questionnaire based on lezotte (1991), Lezotte & Snyder (2011) seven correlates of school effectiveness model, are applicable to Malaysia primary schools. The OCBQ and TLQ have been used all over the world by profit, non-profit, educational organization and institution successfully to measure organizational citizenship behaviours and transformational leadership respectively. In addition, all the questions, which have been applied to develop the SEQ, have been used internationally to measure school effectiveness. Furthermore, it is assumed that teachers as the participants are honest and have more cooperation in completing the survey questionnaires.
1.9 Scope of the Research

The theoretical scope in this research are included, school effectiveness as dependent variable based on the conceptualization of seven correlates of effective school by Lezotte & Snyder’s (2011) and Lezotte’s (1997) model and open-social system theory by Scott (2003) and Scott & Davis (2007) and open social system framework by Hoy & Miskel (2013) are chosen as the theoretical support of school effectiveness in this study. The model of school effectiveness operationalized by school effectiveness questionnaire (SEQ) which was designed and validated to be used in Malaysia context with seven dimensions including: strong instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, safe and orderly environment, high expectations for success, frequent monitoring of student progress, opportunity to learn/time on task, positive home-school relations. These dimensions serve as dependent variables.

Moreover, the independent variables includes of transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour. The transformational leadership in the model is based on the conceptualization of Leithwood (1994) which was supported by Bass & Avilo’s (1999) transformational leadership theory. The model of transformational leadership is operationalized by transformational leadership questionnaire (TLQ) which is developed by Jantzi and Leithwood (1994). TLQ has eight constructs including developing shared vision, building goal consensus, holding high performance expectations, models behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, strengthening school culture, and building collaborative structures. In addition, organizational citizenship behaviour is based on the Organ’ (1988) model which was supported by social exchange theory by Blue (1964) and operationalized by organizational citizenship behaviour questionnaire (OCBQ) which is developed by Podsakoff et al., (1990). OCBQ has five constructs including altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue.

The scope of this research is to firstly, identify the level of organizational citizenship behaviours and transformational leadership and school effectiveness dimensions in Malaysia primary schools. Secondly, to identify the level of their dimensions based on school types (National schools, National Chinese schools and National Tamil schools) and locations (Urban and Rural). Moreover, the relationships between organizational citizenship behaviours’ dimensions, transformational leadership’s dimensions and overall school effectiveness will be investigated. Finally, the best predictors of organizational citizenship behaviours’ dimensions and transformational leadership’s dimensions on school effectiveness will be identified (Table 1.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>In line with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| School Effectiveness        | Seven correlates of effective school model (Lezotte, 1997) | 1. Strong instructional leadership  
2. Clear and focused mission  
3. Safe and orderly environment  
4. High expectations for success  
5. Frequent monitoring of student progress  
6. Opportunity to learn and Time on task  
7. Positive home school relations | Self-administered questionnaire based on Lezotte & Snyder (2011) | Local Context  
Iyer (2008)  
Ghani (2011-2014) |
2. Conscientiousness  
3. Sportmanship  
4. Courtesy  
Fadael (2011), Florida  
Lezotte(1997-2011)  
Scheerens (1990-2013) |
| Transformational Leadership | Lethwood & Jantzi model of transformational leadership (1994) | 1. Developing shared vision  
2. Building goal consensus  
3. Holding high performance expectations  
4. Models behaviour  
5. Providing individualized support  
6. Providing intellectual stimulation  
7. Strengthening school culture  
Salleh & Saidova (2013)  
Selamat et al., (2013)  
Razak (2008) |
|                            | Transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985) |                                                                                      |                                                                                | International Context  
Leithwood &Jantzi (2000);  
Leithwood &Sun (2012)  
(Netherlands and Canada) |
1.10 Limitations of Research

The main limitation to this research is that, although the dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviours and transformational leadership has been studied in previous researches, in primary schools in Selangor state there is less evidence on practicing organizational citizenship behaviours and transformational leadership’s dimensions effectively. Moreover, the study based on the dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviours and transformational leadership’s dimensions in urban and rural was limited.

This study investigates the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours, transformational leadership and school effectiveness as perceived by primary school’s teachers. Moreover, the others schools stakeholders were not involved in the process of data gathering for this research. The research was conducted in primary schools in six education districts in Selangor state, Malaysia. Therefore, the result cannot be generalized to secondary schools, high schools or other educational settings and other states of Malaysia.

The use of self-report data gathering and assessment in this research is another limitation for data gathering and self-report bias may exaggerate the findings of the present study. Furthermore, researcher had no control over the answers because the respondents may answer the questions in any order they like, out of order or even skip questions.

1.11 Definition of Terms

School effectiveness: The effective school is built on a foundation of seven common characteristics of effective schools (strong instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, safe and orderly environment, high expectations for success, frequent monitoring of student progress, opportunity to learn and time on task, positive home school relations) (Lezotte, 1991; Lezotte & Snyder, 2011). In this research, school effectiveness is measured by a self-administered questionnaire based on Lezotte & Snyder (2011) which includes 47 items. The definition of mentioned seven correlates will be defined as follow:

(a) Instructional leadership: In an effective school, the principal acts as an instructional leader and has an especially important obligation to create a shared understanding and commitment to the mission to the staff, parents and students. The principal understands the principals of effective instruction and uses that knowledge in the management of the instructional program (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001). In this research, instructional leadership is measured by 6 items.

(b) Clear and focused mission: In an effective school, there is a clearly articulated mission through that the staffs share an understanding of and a commitment to the instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001). In this research clear and focused mission means, build effective terms to implement that vision and engender commitment to task and the persistent hard work needed to engender learning which is measured by 7 items.
(c) **Safe and orderly environment:** In an effective school, there is an orderly, purposeful, business-like atmosphere that is free from the threat of physical harm and attributed with desirable behaviours, such as cooperative team learning, respect for human diversity, and dignifying diversity through multicultural education (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001). In this research, safe and orderly environment means school climate with learning atmosphere, clean and maintained, cooperative team learning and respect human diversity that is measured by 7 items.

(d) **High expectations for success:** In an effective school, there is a high expectation for students’ success in which staffs demonstrate and believe that all the students could obtain mastery of the school essential curriculum (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001). In this research, “high expectation dimension” refers to the school expectation of students’ success, which is measured by 8 items.

(e) **Frequent monitoring of students’ progress:** In an effective school, student academic progress is measured frequently using a variety of assessment procedures. Results are used to improve both individual student performance and instruction (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001). In this research, monitoring of instruction means frequent monitoring and evaluation of student progress with variety of assessment, which provides feedback, and identify the subjects that students have mastered. Frequent monitoring of instruction is measured by 5 items.

(f) **Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task:** In an effective school, a significant amount of classroom time is dedicated to instruction in essential skills. (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001). In this research, opportunity to learn and student time on task means knowing what to teach and providing adequate time to teach are essential for effective instruction, which is measured by 6 items.

(g) **Home-school relations:** In an effective school, parents understand and support the school’s basic mission and are given the opportunity to play an important role in helping the school to achieve this mission (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Lezotte, 2001). In this research home-school relations means an authentic partnership exists between school and home resulting in similar goals, which is measured by 8 items.

**Transformational leadership:** According to Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach (1999), transformational leadership describes a particular type of influence process based on increasing the commitment of followers to organizational goals and leaders seek to engage the support of teachers for their vision for the school and to enhance their capacities to contribute to goal achievement. Its focus is on this process rather than on particular types of outcome (Bush, 2011).

In this study, the eight dimensions of transformational leadership (developing shared vision, building goal consensus, holding high performance expectations, models behaviour, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, strengthening school culture, and building collaborative structures) is measured with Principal Leadership Questionnaire (PLQ) by Leithwood & Jantzi & (1995) which
included 49 items. The definition for each transformational leadership dimension is defined as follows:

(a) **Building shared vision**: Behaviour on the part of the principal aimed at identifying new opportunities for his/her school staff members and developing, articulating and inspiring others with his/her vision of the future (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1994). In this research, building shared vision means developing a widely shared vision for the schools, which is measured by 5 items.

(b) **Building goal consensus**: Behaviour on the part of the principal aimed at promoting cooperation among school staff members and assisting them to work together toward common goals (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1994). In this research, establishing school goals means fostering the acceptance of group goals, and encouraging them to evaluate and develop the progress toward achieving school goals, which is measured by 5 items.

(c) **Holding high performance expectations**: Behaviour that demonstrates the principal's expectations for excellence, quality, and high performance on the part of the school staff (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1994). In this research, holding high performance expectations means principals high performance expectations from staff and expects them to be effective innovators. In this research, “high expectation dimension” refers to the school headmaster expectation from teachers and staff, which is measured by 4 items.

(d) **Models behaviour**: Behaviour on the part of the principal that sets an example for the school staff to follow consistent with the values the principal espouses. In this research models behaviour means symbolizing success and accomplishment for the school staff and models problem solving techniques that staff can readily adapt for their work (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1994) which is measured by 8 items.

(e) **Providing individualized support**: Behaviour on the part of the principal that indicates respect for school staff members and concern about their personal feelings and needs (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1994). In this research, providing individualized support means the leader respects followers and concerns about their needs and personal feelings, which is measured by 6 items.

(f) **Providing intellectual stimulation**: Behaviour on the part of the principal that challenges school staff members to re-examine some of the assumptions about their work and rethink how it can be performed (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1994). In this research providing intellectual stimulation means, challenge followers to review their work (practices) and find new ways to perform that task which is measured by 7 items.

(g) **Productive school culture**: The culture of a school is the shared norms, beliefs, values, and assumptions of the school members (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 2002). In this research productive school culture means restructuring the school’s management structures (norms, beliefs, values and assumptions) which is measured by 8 items.
(h) **Building collaborative structure**: It is defined as the formal and informal opportunities for school staff to give their professional input for making decisions (Leithwood et al., 1999). When teachers feel engaged in making significant decisions, they develop new beliefs in their capacity to not only make a difference in the classroom, but across the whole school as well (Sun & Leithwood, 2012). In this research, fostering participative decision-making means that, teachers feel engaged in making significant decisions at school, which is measured by 5 items.

**Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB)**: Organizational citizenship behaviour is defined as individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). In this study, organizational citizenship behaviour is voluntary and discretionary behaviour including altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue as described by Organ (1988). Organizational citizenship behaviour is measured by 24 items, which were provided by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter’s (1990) based on Organ’s (1988) model.

(a) **Altruism**: is a discretionary behaviour that has the effect of helping another person with an organizationally relevant task or problem (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). In this research altruism means helping specific others which is measured by 5 items.

(b) **Conscientiousness**: is a discretionary behaviour on the part of the employees that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization in the areas of attendance, obeying rules, and taking breaks and so forth (Podsakoff, et al., 1990). In this research, conscientiousness means compliance with norms, which is measured by 5 items.

(c) **Sportsmanship**: defined as spending time on constructive efforts and avoiding complaining (tolerating less-than ideal conditions; accepting of changes and performs requests without complaints) (Podsakoff, et al., 1990). In this research, sportsmanship means not to complain about trivial matters, which is measured by 5 items.

(d) **Courtesy**: is a discretionary behaviour on the part of an individual aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring (Podsakoff, et al., 1990). In this research, courtesy means consulting others before taking action, which is measured by 5 items.

(e) **Civic Virtue**: is behaviour on the part of an individual that indicates him / her responsibly participates in, is involved in, or is concerned about the life of the organization (Podsakoff et al., 1990). In this research, civic virtue means keeping up with important matters within the schools, which is measured by 5 items.

**Primary school**: According to portal of Malaysia Ministry of Education (2014), primary education in Malaysia begins at age seven and lasts for six years, referred to as Year 1 to 6. Year 1 to Year 3 are classified as Level one while Year 4 to Year 6 are considered as Level Two. Public primary schools are divided into three categories
based on the medium of instruction: National Primary School, National Type Chinese Primary School and National Type Tamil Primary School. In this research, teachers from all three types of primary schools are involved as respondents. According to the list of schools by their type in Selangor provided by MoE (2013) there is no urban National Chinese type and National Tamil type schools in Sabak Bernam and no urban National Tamil type schools in Sepang districts. Consequently, the two above-mentioned districts are not included in this study.

School Location: In Malaysia, some schools are located in areas that can be only reached using limited access road, or even river transport system. In this research, rural school has similarly defined by Johnson and Strange (2005), is located in a place inside or outside the metropolitan area, and has the population of less than 2,500 people (Marwan, 2014). In this research the information of schools in Selangor state, which have been, categorized into rural an urban areas, was obtained from Malaysian Ministry of education in 27/11/ 2013. According to information provided by MoE (2013) there are no rural schools in Petaling Perdana and Petaling Utama districts Consequently, the two above-mentioned districts are eliminate from the population of this study.

1.12 Summary

This chapter presented a general view of school effectiveness, transformational leadership, and organizational citizenship behaviour. In the field study carried out amongst the school effectiveness researches have been done by cooperation of World Bank illustrate the factors of schools that leads to improving student’s achievement and school success (Psacharopoulos, 2006). Researches indicated common factors (strong instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, safe and orderly environment, high expectations for success, frequent monitoring of student progress, opportunity to learn and time on task, positive home school relations) that could contribute toward school effectiveness (Lezotte, 1991; Lezotte & Snyder, 2011; Mortimore, 1991; Edmonds, 1982).

The study of transformational leadership dimensions, organizational citizenship behaviours’ dimensions, and school effectiveness in Malaysian primary schools in Selangor was explained through nine general objectives associated with thirteen research questions and two-research hypotheses. The main purpose of this empirical study was to determine the relationships between transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behaviours, and school effectiveness in primary schools, Selangor, Malaysia based on teachers’ perception. Some significances, limitations, and definition of terms were also discussed and defined.
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