

# Impact of Transformational Leadership Style in Promoting Inclusivity in China Schools

Juan Zhao \*

College of Education and Liberal Arts, Adamson University, Manila, Philippines

\* Corresponding author: Juan Zhao (Email: 77884532@qq.com)

---

**Abstract:** At the heart of cultivating a nurturing and supportive school environment is the influence of leadership within educational institutions. This study aimed to dissect the role of one specific leadership style, transformational leadership, and assess its effectiveness in nurturing and promoting school inclusivity. Employing a quantitative descriptive-correlational methodology, the research evaluated past data to identify the degree to which transformational leadership attributes—Inspirational Motivation, Individual Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation, and Idealized Influence—correlated with inclusivity in educational settings. The results demonstrated a solid consensus among educators on the presence of transformational leadership characteristics in their institutions, with mean scores around 3.19 and low standard deviations, indicating a high level of agreement. The most impactful dimensions of transformational leadership on inclusivity were found to be Individual Consideration and Inspirational Motivation, reflecting the importance of acknowledging and leveraging individual talents and fostering a shared vision. Furthermore, the study revealed strong engagement levels in promoting inclusivity across students, faculty, administrators, and stakeholders, with the Student and Stakeholder Engagement dimensions ranking the highest. A compelling correlation was found between transformational leadership and inclusivity, as evidenced by a Pearson  $r$  Coefficient of 0.90 and a  $p$ -value of 0.00, pointing to a significant, strong, positive relationship. Based on these insights, the "Leadership for Inclusivity Excellence" (LIFE) Program is recommended to embed transformational leadership principles deeply within the fabric of educational institutions. The LIFE Program aims to enhance the capabilities of educational leaders to foster an inclusive culture that not only resonates with innovation, respect, and collaboration but also effectively meets the diverse educational needs of all members of the school community.

**Keywords:** Transformational Leadership Style; Inclusivity; Impact; Schools.

---

## 1. Introduction

China, with its vast geographical expanse and rich cultural diversity, is recognized globally for its rapid developmental strides, particularly in education. Educational institutions in China play a crucial role in shaping the nation's future, particularly as the country endeavors to enhance inclusivity and embrace its cultural diversity. This study explores the significant role of school leadership, especially transformational leadership, in fostering positive changes that promote inclusivity within these educational settings.

Inclusivity is essential for creating an educational environment where all individuals—regardless of their origin, abilities, or beliefs—are welcomed, valued, and empowered. This atmosphere is pivotal for a harmonious society where diverse perspectives enrich the collective experience. Given the complexities of managing such diversity in China's large population, exploring the impact of leadership styles in educational settings becomes both a challenge and an opportunity.

This research focuses on transformational leadership, a style internationally lauded for its effectiveness in encouraging diversity and fostering positive organizational changes. According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leaders inspire and motivate their followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes, often beyond their own expectations. These leaders are characterized by their charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation.

Despite extensive studies on transformational leadership in various organizational contexts, its implications for fostering

inclusivity in China's schools remain largely unexplored. This study aims to fill this gap by conducting an in-depth analysis of how transformational leadership can enhance inclusivity in Chinese educational settings, taking into account the country's unique cultural and educational frameworks.

The forthcoming sections of this thesis will delve into the theoretical foundations of transformational leadership, its core components, and their interplay with the ideals of inclusion. Additionally, a thorough examination of the Chinese educational system and its cultural intricacies will be presented, providing insights into the challenges and opportunities facing leaders in this environment. The methodology for data collection and analysis will be detailed, followed by a discussion on the findings and their implications for educational leaders, policymakers, and scholars interested in advancing inclusivity within China's schools.

Ultimately, this study embarks on a scholarly journey to understand the transformative potential of leadership within the diverse landscape of China's educational system. As the country continues to progress and embrace its rich diversity, it is crucial that its educational leaders take the forefront in creating inclusive settings that allow every individual to achieve their full potential.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

In today's diverse social environment, the inclusivity and diversity of schools have become key issues in the field of education. School leaders play a crucial role in creating a learning environment that supports the comprehensive

development of each student. However, different leadership styles may have different impacts on the inclusiveness of schools. This paper, then, aims to explore one of the said leadership styles, namely the transformational leadership style and its impact in fostering and promoting school inclusivity.

1. Specifically, it tries to answer the following:

What is the profile of the respondents based on:

1.1 Sex

1.2 Age

1.3 Job Position

1.4 Years of Teaching

2. What is the assessment of the teacher-respondents on administrators' transformational leadership in terms of:

2.1 Inspirational Motivation

2.2 Individual Consideration

2.3 Intellectual Stimulation

2.4 Idealized Influence

3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of teacher-respondents on administrators' transformational leadership when their profile is taken as test factors?

4. What is the self-assessment of teacher-respondents on the impact of the transformational leadership of administrators in fostering inclusivity in terms of:

4.1 Student Engagement

4.2 Faculty Engagement

4.3 Administrator Engagement

4.4 Stakeholder Engagement

5. Is there a significant difference in assessment of teacher-respondents on the impact of administrators' transformational leadership in fostering inclusivity when their profile is taken as test factors?

6. Is there a significant relationship between administrators' transformational leadership and its impact in fostering inclusivity of teachers?

7. What measures should be taken to improve fostering inclusivity in teachers' practice through school administrators' transformational leadership?

This study focused on the impact of transformational leadership style (such on school inclusivity). It studied selected multiple schools that admittedly favor transformational leadership, albeit having different backgrounds in profile and culture.

Through in-depth research on these research questions, the study aims to understand how different leadership styles affect inclusivity and diversity in school environments, providing useful practical guidance for school leaders and education policy makers, in order to shape a learning environment that fully respects and supports every student.

### 3. Hypotheses

With such questions, the study has the following hypotheses: H1: There is no significant difference in the assessment of student-respondents on teachers' transformational leadership when their profile is taken as test factors; H2: There is no significant difference in assessment of student-respondents on the impact of teachers' transformational leadership in fostering inclusivity when their profile is taken as test factors; H3: There is no significant relationship between teachers' transformational leadership and its impact in fostering inclusivity.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Research Design

The researcher employed the quantitative descriptive-correlational approach to analyze the study in the past. This method involved the collection and analysis of data to describe the characteristics of a group or phenomena and to explore potential correlations between variables. The descriptive-correlational technique was utilized in various ways within the scope of this investigation. The researcher gathered data using this method to characterize and evaluate the extent to which school leaders in China exhibited transformational leadership qualities, such as their ability to motivate and inspire staff, foster innovation, and promote a unified vision of inclusion.

Furthermore, the descriptive-correlational approach was employed to assess the level of inclusion within schools. This included using surveys, interviews, or observations to collect data on inclusive behaviors, policies, and attitudes. The researcher then examined the data to identify possible relationships between transformational leadership practices and inclusion in Chinese schools. For instance, the research examined whether schools with more transformational leaders had more inclusive cultures.

Additionally, the study explored various dimensions of transformational leadership and inclusion, including teacher-student relationships, parental involvement, and student outcomes. Descriptive statistics were used to outline the characteristics of these variables, and correlational analysis was conducted to investigate any associations. The findings of the descriptive-correlational study provided valuable insights into the impact of transformational leadership on inclusion, with implications for enhancing educational strategies, leadership development programs, and policies aimed at fostering diversity in Chinese schools.

### 4.2. Research Locale

The research was carried out in multiple schools across diverse geographical regions, primarily focusing on universities in the vicinity of Jiangxi Province, China. It encompassed two local schools in Yichun City and one in the neighboring Xinyu City.

#### School A

School A, situated in Yichun City—the central hub of Ganxi—boasts picturesque landscapes and a well-connected transport network. Major transport routes, including the Shanghai-Rui Expressway, Shanghai-Kunming High-speed Railway, and Zhejiang-Jiangxi Railway, traverse the city. The university comprises three campuses: the North, the South, and the New Campus, spreading across nearly 2,000 acres and serving close to 20,000 full-time students. Its 1,511-strong workforce includes 1,153 full-time teaching staff, with over 41% holding senior professional and technical titles and more than 81% possessing doctoral and master's degrees. The faculty is graced by over 70 provincial government special allowance experts, and more than 100 senior experts affiliated with the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the University of Science and Technology of China serve as guest professors. The institution is structured into 19 teaching colleges, offering 10 university disciplines and 64 undergraduate majors.

#### School B

School B, occupying 1,500 acres with a built-up area of 580,000 square meters, houses 8 secondary colleges and 5

teaching units. It is home to more than 18,000 students and 842 faculty members, of whom 220 hold associate or higher titles and 444 are dual-qualified 'teacher-practitioners.' The college offers 45 majors, including medical and health, education and sports, financial commerce, and energy materials. It has been recognized as Jiangxi Province's "Double High" Construction College, a demonstration higher vocational college, and a high-quality higher vocational college, also known for hosting international students.

#### School C

School C, in the emergent industrial city of Xinyu, neighbors Yichun City. With 13 colleges and 40 undergraduate majors, the university's campus spans 133 hectares and includes buildings totaling 450,000 square meters. The campus boasts teaching and research instruments valued at 270 million yuan, a library collection of 1.68 million volumes, and 1.38 million electronic books. The institution employs 813 academic staff, including 254 with senior professional titles and 293 'dual-teacher' educators. It also has 552 staff with master's or doctoral degrees and accommodates over 15,000 students.

The study involved 300 randomly selected teachers, with 100 from each participating institution. To be eligible for the survey, individuals needed to be actively teaching at one of the selected universities. The researcher employed random sampling techniques at each school to choose participants from a list of teachers, ensuring sample randomness and representativeness. This method allowed for the collection of data that provided insights into the influence of transformational leadership on promoting inclusivity within schools. The approach enhanced the generalizability and credibility of the research findings.

## 5. Results And Discussion

This segment presents an in-depth analysis of the data gathered from the study's participants. It details the critical discoveries and their relevance in tackling the posed research inquiries.

#### Demographic Profile of the Participants

The first research question sought to identify the demographic profile of the respondents.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

| Demographic Profile | Categories          | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Sex                 | Male                | 128       | 42.67      |
|                     | Female              | 172       | 57.33      |
|                     | Total               | 300       | 100.00     |
| Age                 | Below 25 years old  | 15        | 5.00       |
|                     | 26-35 years old     | 68        | 22.67      |
|                     | 36-45 years old     | 180       | 60.00      |
|                     | 46 years and above  | 37        | 12.33      |
|                     | Total               | 300       | 100.00     |
| Job Position        | Teaching Assistant  | 41        | 13.67      |
|                     | Instructor          | 144       | 48.00      |
|                     | Associate Professor | 95        | 31.67      |
|                     | Full Professor      | 20        | 6.67       |
|                     | Total               | 300       | 100.00     |
| Years of Teaching   | Less than 1 year    | 18        | 6.00       |
|                     | 1 to 5 years        | 52        | 17.33      |
|                     | 5 to 15 years       | 60        | 20.00      |
|                     | 15 to 25 years      | 141       | 47.00      |
|                     | More than 25 years  | 29        | 9.67       |
|                     | Total               | 300       | 100.00     |

Table 1 presents a demographic breakdown of 300 respondents in terms of sex, age, job position, and years of teaching experience. Within this group, 42.67% are male (128 individuals), and 57.33% are female (172 individuals). Age-wise, the majority fall within the 36-45 years old category, representing 60.00% of the total (180 individuals), while those below 25 years old are the least represented at 5.00% (15 individuals). Looking at job positions, instructors form the bulk at 48.00% (144 individuals), and full professors the fewest at 6.67% (20 individuals). When considering years of teaching experience, most respondents have been teaching for 15 to 25 years, accounting for 47.00% (141 individuals), whereas those with less than a year of experience make up the smallest group at 6.00% (18 individuals). Overall, the table provides a comprehensive view of the varied demographic landscape of the surveyed educators. The data shows a healthy mix of genders, ages, and levels of experience. This mix is important when considering the findings of Björk, Kjellström, & Söderberg (2019), who stress the need for diverse educational leadership to meet the needs of varied student populations effectively. The demographic spread suggests that the survey captures a range of experiences that might influence perceptions of leadership and inclusivity.

#### Transformational Leadership Style

The second research question focused on evaluating the transformational leadership style.

Table 2. Assessment of Transformational Leadership Style – Inspirational Motivation

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Mean | SD   | Rank | Verbal Description/ Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------------------------------------|
| Administrators transparently communicate the shared objectives and purposes of their project program, ensuring that teachers understand and can actively contribute to these goals.                          | 3.28 | 0.74 | 1    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Administrators design their systemic processes as interactive and developmental programs, encouraging students to participate and collaborate.                                                               | 3.21 | 0.76 | 2    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| The advantages and relevance of programs are clearly and efficiently conveyed to teachers, emphasizing how these activities cater to a wide range of interests and development of skills.                    | 3.19 | 0.76 | 4    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Administrators consistently embody the uplifting messages they share with the teachers, fostering an environment where everyone feels empowered and respected.                                               | 3.21 | 0.81 | 2    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Administrators present multiple compelling reasons for teachers to actively engage and invest in professional practice and development, recognizing and valuing the unique perspectives each teacher brings. | 3.12 | 0.82 | 7    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Every moment in the institution is optimized to enhance the effectiveness of pedagogy, with an unwavering commitment to ensuring that all teachers are in their optimal level.                               | 3.16 | 0.71 | 6    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| The institution presents opportunities that cultivates new strategies and promotes techniques that resonate with each teachers field of specialization, and contribute to their pedagogical growth.          | 3.18 | 0.74 | 5    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Inspirational Motivation                                                                                                                                                                                     | 3.19 | 0.65 | -    | Agree/ Manifested                  |

Scale: 1-1.50: Strongly Disagree/Not Manifested 1.51-2.50: Disagree/Slightly Manifested; 2.51-3.50: Agree/Manifested; 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree/Very Manifested

Table 2 provides a nuanced evaluation of the Inspirational Motivation aspect within the Transformational Leadership Style by examining specific indicators of leadership performance in an educational setting. The data encompasses mean scores, standard deviations (SD), rankings based on the means, and verbal descriptions which translate numeric scores into a qualitative interpretation.

At the top of the ranking, with the highest mean score of 3.28 and an SD of 0.74, is the indicator that assesses the transparency with which administrators communicate shared objectives and purposes of their programs. Teachers tend to agree that this is a manifested characteristic, indicating a strong presence of clear and open communication from administrators.

Tied for the second rank, with mean scores of 3.21, are two distinct indicators. The first has an SD of 0.76 and evaluates the systemic processes set by administrators as interactive, fostering student participation and collaboration, while the second, with a slightly higher SD of 0.81, assesses whether administrators exemplify the uplifting messages they convey, creating an empowered and respected atmosphere for teachers.

The advantages and relevance of programs are effectively communicated to teachers as indicated by a mean of 3.19 and an SD of 0.76, which is ranked fourth. This means teachers generally agree that programs cater to diverse interests and skill development.

Rank seven, with the lowest mean of 3.12 and an SD of

0.82, relates to how administrators present compelling reasons for teachers to engage in professional practice and development, acknowledging the unique perspectives of each teacher. Despite being the lowest, the score still reflects agreement that this is manifested, albeit less strongly compared to other indicators.

Other indicators, such as optimizing moments for enhancing pedagogical effectiveness and providing opportunities for cultivating new strategies, are ranked sixth and fifth respectively, with mean scores of 3.16 and 3.18 and SDs of 0.71 and 0.74. These suggest a consensus among teachers that the institution is committed to pedagogical growth and resonates with their field of specialization.

The overall mean for the Inspirational Motivation category is 3.19 with a comparatively narrow SD of 0.65, indicating a strong general agreement among respondents. This collective score situates itself centrally within the range of the individual indicators, solidifying the existence of transformational leadership qualities in the institutions surveyed. The uniformity of the 'Agree/Manifested' verbal interpretations across the board suggests a consistently positive reception of the leadership traits among the educators surveyed. The high agreement levels across the board suggest that leaders are effectively communicating and embodying the objectives that they advocate, which resonates with Kiran (2020) who emphasizes that transformational leaders prioritize strengths and abilities in their leadership approaches, fostering a culture of motivation and empowerment.

Table 3. Assessment of Transformational Leadership Style – Individual Consideration

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Mean | SD   | Rank | Verbal Description/ Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------------------------------------|
| Administrators maintain consistently open and accessible communication channels, ensuring that every voice is heard and valued.                                                                                                | 3.22 | 0.67 | 4    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Feedback is actively solicited and thoughtfully considered, demonstrating a commitment to continuous improvement and responsiveness to teacher perspectives.                                                                   | 3.23 | 0.68 | 3    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Administrators are attentive to the diverse needs of the teachers, demonstrating a genuine commitment to understanding and accommodating each unique requirement.                                                              | 3.19 | 0.74 | 5    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Administrators acknowledge and celebrate the individuality of their teachers, creating an environment that values and respects differences.                                                                                    | 3.16 | 0.79 | 7    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Administrators harness the unique strengths and qualities of teachers to foster their holistic development and further enrich the experience they gain and share.                                                              | 3.24 | 0.70 | 2    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Collaborative mentoring and support are provided to teachers based on their specific needs, ensuring that receives tailored guidance and assistance.                                                                           | 3.19 | 0.75 | 6    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Task delegation and collaborative learning practices are consistently encouraged within the institution, promoting an inclusive and cooperative environment where teachers contribute and benefit from each other's strengths. | 3.26 | 0.69 | 1    | Agree/ Manifested                  |
| Individual Consideration                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 3.21 | 0.64 | -    | Agree/ Manifested                  |

Scale: 1-1.50: Strongly Disagree/Not Manifested 1.51-2.50: Disagree/Slightly Manifested; 2.51-3.50: Agree/Manifested; 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree/Very Manifested

Table 3 delves into the Individual Consideration component of the Transformational Leadership Style, examining it through various indicators that reflect

administrators' interactions with their teachers. The data is organized by the mean scores, indicating the average response, the standard deviation (SD) representing the variability in responses, the rank showing the relative standing of each indicator, and a verbal description which encapsulates the aggregate sentiment towards each item.

With the highest mean score of 3.26 and an SD of 0.69, the top-ranked indicator evaluates the encouragement of task delegation and collaborative learning, which reflects a strong consensus among respondents that their institution promotes an inclusive and cooperative environment.

Closely following is the indicator ranking second with a mean of 3.24 and an SD of 0.70, highlighting administrators' efforts to utilize the unique strengths and qualities of teachers to support holistic development and enrich their professional experience.

The third-ranking indicator, with a mean of 3.23 and a minimal SD of 0.68, relates to the active solicitation and thoughtful consideration of feedback, pointing towards a commitment to continuous improvement and a receptive stance to teacher perspectives.

Open communication channels are evaluated with a mean of 3.22 and an SD of 0.67, positioned at rank four, suggesting that administrators succeed in creating a setting where every voice is heard and considered important.

The fifth and sixth ranks, both with a mean of 3.19 but differing slightly in SD (0.74 and 0.75 respectively), examine the attention given to the diverse needs of teachers and the provision of collaborative mentoring and support,

underscoring a perceived dedication to understanding, accommodating, and supporting individual requirements.

The seventh rank, indicating the lowest mean score of 3.16 with an SD of 0.79, assesses how well administrators acknowledge and celebrate individuality among teachers. Despite being the lowest, the score still suggests agreement that there is a valuing and respect for differences within the environment.

The composite score for Individual Consideration is presented with a mean of 3.21 and a SD of 0.64, denoting a strong agreement across the responses and portraying the leadership style as well-received among the respondents. The consistent verbal description of 'Agree/Manifested' across all indicators confirms a widely held view that administrators are effectively implementing transformational leadership practices that consider and value individual teacher contributions and needs. The findings here correlate with Waruwu's (2020) assertion that transformational leadership is about fostering a culture that leads to improved organizational performance. With the high mean scores across indicators, it's clear that educators perceive a significant level of individual attention from their leaders, a key aspect of transformational leadership.

Table 4. Assessment of Transformational Leadership Style – Intellectual Stimulation

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Mean | SD   | Rank | Verbal Description/<br>Interpretation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------------------|
| Teachers creativity is nurtured through a variety of seminars and training programs that cater to diverse abilities and interests.                                                                                     | 3.15 | 0.76 | 5    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Innovation is actively encouraged through the integration of cutting-edge technology in lesson delivery, ensuring accessibility and sufficient operative knowledge.                                                    | 3.21 | 0.71 | 2    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| A range of innovative teaching methods and pedagogies is constantly fostered and presented employed to ignite interest continuous upskilling for teachers.                                                             | 3.13 | 0.78 | 7    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Teachers cognitive abilities are cultivated and refined through a wide array of projects and tasks that recognize the diverse talents and capabilities of the educators.                                               | 3.18 | 0.68 | 3    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Diverse and inclusive learning materials are provided to teachers for them to maximize the educational experiences they can conduct.                                                                                   | 3.15 | 0.76 | 5    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Ongoing assessment and analysis of teacher performance are conducted with a focus on identifying individual strengths and areas for improvement, facilitating tailored support and specialized training opportunities. | 3.18 | 0.79 | 3    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Teachers are empowered to actively review their own performances, fostering self-reflection and self-efficacy evaluation as essential components of their development as educators.                                    | 3.22 | 0.74 | 1    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Intellectual Stimulation                                                                                                                                                                                               | 3.17 | 0.66 | -    | Agree/Manifested                      |

Scale: 1-1.50: Strongly Disagree/Not Manifested 1.51-2.50: Disagree/Slightly Manifested; 2.51-3.50: Agree/Manifested; 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree/Very Manifested

Table 4 examines the Intellectual Stimulation dimension of Transformational Leadership Style, presenting an intricate analysis of the ways in which administrators facilitate intellectual growth and innovation among teachers. The table outlines seven distinct indicators with their corresponding mean scores, standard deviations, and ranks, along with a verbal interpretation that collectively encapsulates the perceived effectiveness of each leadership initiative.

The leading indicator, with the highest mean score of 3.22 and an SD of 0.74, emphasizes teachers' empowerment to self-review their performances. This process of fostering self-

reflection and self-efficacy is considered to be the most well-implemented initiative, as indicated by its first rank and the consensus agreement among respondents.

Closely aligned with fostering innovation, the second-ranked indicator, with a mean score of 3.21 and an SD of 0.71, notes the active encouragement of integrating cutting-edge technology into lesson delivery. This suggests a strong commitment to ensuring teachers have accessible and operative knowledge of the latest technological resources.

Two indicators are tied for the third rank with mean scores of 3.18, but they have slightly different SDs (0.68 and 0.79). One assesses the cultivation and refinement of cognitive abilities through varied projects and tasks, while the other looks at the ongoing assessment and analysis of teacher

performance to facilitate tailored support and specialized training.

Two indicators share the fifth rank with identical mean scores of 3.15 and SDs of 0.76, indicating an equal level of agreement among respondents. These address the nurturing of teacher creativity through seminars and training, and the provision of diverse and inclusive learning materials for maximizing educational experiences.

The lowest-ranked indicator, with a mean score of 3.13 and an SD of 0.78, evaluates the constant fostering and employment of innovative teaching methods and pedagogies intended to ignite continuous upskilling for teachers. Despite its position, it still falls within the 'Agree/Manifested' verbal interpretation, indicating a positive reception, albeit comparatively less pronounced than the other areas.

The composite score for Intellectual Stimulation across all indicators stands at 3.17 with a SD of 0.66, reflecting a general agreement among respondents that their institutions effectively stimulate their intellectual and professional growth. The consistently positive verbal interpretations across the board, all falling within the 'Agree/Manifested' category, demonstrate a consensus on the presence of transformational leadership practices that encourage creativity, innovation, and intellectual development within the teaching community. The relatively high agreement scores suggest that schools are encouraging and supporting the professional growth and intellectual stimulation of their faculty. This supports Khattak's (2020) findings that transformational leaders help to produce innovative concepts that resonate with individuals.

Table 5. Assessment of Transformational Leadership Style – Idealized Influence

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                                                               | Mean | SD   | Rank | Verbal Description/<br>Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------------------|
| A strong and inclusive relationship is cultivated between administrators and teachers, creating a supportive and welcoming learning environment where they feel valued and respected.                    | 3.16 | 0.71 | 5    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Administrators serve as positive role models, inspiring teachers from diverse backgrounds to emulate their qualities of integrity, empathy, and dedication to learning.                                  | 3.15 | 0.74 | 7    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Administrators excel as experts in the field of educational leadership, ensuring that their mastery is translated to practice.                                                                           | 3.18 | 0.74 | 4    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Administrators encourage teachers to conduct research and professional development related to the subjects they teach by leading them in practice.                                                       | 3.24 | 0.67 | 1    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Administrators actively share their experiences and insights related to the teacher specializations, making learning more relatable and accessible for the said teachers.                                | 3.23 | 0.71 | 2    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Administrators role includes clearly defining the importance of professional and academic development.                                                                                                   | 3.22 | 0.74 | 3    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Administrators are dedicated to continuous learning and professional growth, ensuring that their knowledge remains up-to-date and applicable to their practice as educational leaders of an institution. | 3.16 | 0.71 | 5    | Agree/<br>Manifested                  |
| Idealized Influence                                                                                                                                                                                      | 3.19 | 0.65 | -    | Agree/Manifested                      |

Scale: 1-1.50: Strongly Disagree/Not Manifested 1.51-2.50: Disagree/Slightly Manifested; 2.51-3.50: Agree/Manifested; 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree/Very Manifested

Table 5 provides a detailed assessment of the Idealized Influence behavior of administrators as part of the Transformational Leadership Style. The table is organized by indicators that specify particular leadership qualities and actions, alongside mean scores reflecting the consensus of responses, standard deviations (SD) indicating response variability, ranks showing the perceived impact, and verbal interpretations that provide a qualitative understanding of the agreement level among respondents.

The top-ranking indicator, with a mean score of 3.24 and an SD of 0.67, suggests that administrators excel in encouraging teachers to undertake research and professional development, which resonates strongly with teachers as being both agreed upon and manifested in practice.

Following closely are two indicators: one with a mean of 3.23 and an SD of 0.71 ranked second, acknowledges the active sharing of experiences by administrators, making learning relatable to teacher specializations; another, with a mean of 3.22 and an SD of 0.74 ranked third, notes the clear definition by administrators of the importance of professional

and academic development.

An indicator evaluating administrators' mastery in educational leadership, with a mean score of 3.18 and an SD of 0.74, places fourth, indicating that teachers feel their leaders are knowledgeable and adept in translating their expertise into practice.

Tied for the fifth rank, with identical mean scores of 3.16 but differing SDs (0.71 each), are two indicators that assess the quality of the relationship between administrators and teachers, and the commitment of administrators to their own continuous learning and professional growth. These responses suggest an environment where mutual respect and dedication to education are highly valued.

The lowest-ranked indicator, with a mean score of 3.15 and an SD of 0.74, reflects the perception of administrators serving as positive role models. Despite its position, the score implies that teachers still agree that their leaders embody integrity, empathy, and a dedication to learning, thereby influencing them positively.

The composite mean for the Idealized Influence dimension is 3.19, with a relatively low SD of 0.65, suggesting a general agreement among the surveyed teachers that their administrators successfully embody the transformative

qualities of idealized influence. The consistent 'Agree/Manifested' verbal descriptions across the board underline a shared recognition of these influential attributes in their leaders. Table 5 indicates the presence of idealized

influence among leaders, with administrators serving as role models. This is essential, as Dou et al. (2017) suggested, for principals to act as “principals who think about people,” setting a tone that encourages inclusivity.

Table 6. Summary of Transformational Leadership

| Indicators                            | Mean | SD   | Rank | Verbal Description/ Interpretation |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------------------------------------|
| Inspirational Motivation              | 3.19 | 0.65 | 2    | Agree/Manifested                   |
| Individual Consideration              | 3.21 | 0.64 | 1    | Agree/Manifested                   |
| Intellectual Stimulation              | 3.17 | 0.66 | 4    | Agree/Manifested                   |
| Idealized Influence                   | 3.19 | 0.65 | 2    | Agree/Manifested                   |
| Transformational Leadership (Overall) | 3.19 | 0.62 | -    | Agree/Manifested                   |

Scale: 1-1.50: Strongly Disagree/Not Manifested 1.51-2.50: Disagree/Slightly Manifested; 2.51-3.50: Agree/Manifested; 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree/Very Manifested

Table 6 provides a summarization of the overall level of Transformational Leadership as perceived by respondents, encompassing four key dimensions: Inspirational Motivation, Individual Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation, and Idealized Influence. Each dimension is assessed through its mean score, standard deviation (SD), and rank, accompanied by a verbal interpretation that encapsulates the collective perception of these leadership traits.

Individual Consideration ranks the highest with a mean of 3.21 and an SD of 0.64, indicating a strong agreement among respondents that administrators excel in recognizing and responding to the unique needs and talents of each teacher. This is reflected in the 'Agree/Manifested' description, confirming the presence of this leadership quality.

Tied for the second rank are Inspirational Motivation and Idealized Influence, each with a mean score of 3.19 and an identical SD of 0.65. Inspirational Motivation suggests that teachers feel administrators are successful in communicating vision and encouraging commitment to shared goals. Idealized Influence points to administrators being seen as role models whose actions are consistent with the values and

purposes they advocate.

Intellectual Stimulation is ranked fourth with a mean score of 3.17 and an SD of 0.66, slightly lower than the other dimensions but still within the realm of agreement that administrators promote an environment that encourages creativity and critical thinking.

Overall, the Transformational Leadership composite score, which is the average of the individual dimensions, stands at 3.19 with the lowest SD of 0.62, indicating a strong and consistent agreement across the respondents that transformational leadership is manifested within their educational institutions. The 'Agree/Manifested' verbal interpretation that spans all dimensions further confirms that, according to the respondents' perception, the elements of transformational leadership are notably present and positively influence their work environment. This summary aligns with Aydin et al.'s (2013) perspective that transformational leaders care about their followers and effectively mobilize resources to meet needs and potential.

#### Difference in Transformational Leadership Style

The third research question investigates the variations within the transformational leadership style based on demographic profile

Table 7. Difference in Transformational Leadership Style Based on Demographic Profile

| Demographic Profile | Categories          | Mean | SD   | Stat. Value | p-value | Interpretation/ Decision   |
|---------------------|---------------------|------|------|-------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Sex                 | Male                | 3.15 | 0.69 | t=-0.96     | 0.34    | Not significant/ Accept H0 |
|                     | Female              | 3.22 | 0.56 |             |         |                            |
| Age                 | Below 25 years old  | 3.15 | 0.59 | F=1.08      | 0.36    | Not significant/ Accept H0 |
|                     | 26-35 years old     | 3.16 | 0.67 |             |         |                            |
|                     | 36-45 years old     | 3.17 | 0.63 |             |         |                            |
|                     | 46 years and above  | 3.36 | 0.49 |             |         |                            |
| Job Position        | Teaching Assistant  | 3.18 | 0.64 | F=4.12      | 0.01    | Significant/ Reject H0     |
|                     | Instructor          | 3.08 | 0.63 |             |         |                            |
|                     | Associate Professor | 3.36 | 0.53 |             |         |                            |
|                     | Full Professor      | 3.25 | 0.74 |             |         |                            |
| Years of Teaching   | Less than 1 year    | 3.40 | 0.53 | F=2.60      | 0.04    | Significant/ Reject H0     |
|                     | 1 to 5 years        | 3.13 | 0.61 |             |         |                            |
|                     | 5 to 15 years       | 3.05 | 0.69 |             |         |                            |
|                     | 15 to 25 years      | 3.20 | 0.62 |             |         |                            |
|                     | More than 25 years  | 3.44 | 0.48 |             |         |                            |

Table 7 analyzes the differences in perceptions of Transformational Leadership Style based on the demographic profiles of respondents, categorized by sex, age, job position, and years of teaching. Each demographic category includes mean scores, standard deviations (SD), statistical values, p-values, and an interpretation or decision on the hypothesis

tested. When assessing the impact of sex on perceptions of transformational leadership, males had a mean score of 3.15 with an SD of 0.69, while females had a mean of 3.22 with an SD of 0.56. The t-test yields a value of -0.96 with a p-value of 0.34, which is not statistically significant, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H0) that there is no

significant difference in perceptions based on sex.

Regarding age, four different groups are compared. Those below 25 years old have a mean score of 3.15, and the highest mean score is found in the 46 years and above group at 3.36. The F-test value is 1.08 with a p-value of 0.36, suggesting no significant difference in perceptions among different age groups, which leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

The job position category shows variability, with mean scores ranging from 3.08 for instructors to 3.36 for associate professors. The statistical value here is significant, with an F-value of 4.12 and a p-value of 0.01, indicating a rejection of the null hypothesis and affirming that there is a significant difference in perceptions of transformational leadership based on job positions.

Years of teaching is another demographic where significant differences are noted. The group with less than 1 year of teaching has the highest mean score of 3.40, while the 5 to 15 years group has the lowest at 3.05. The F-value for this demographic is 2.60 with a p-value of 0.04, which is significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

These results reveal that there are no significant differences in leadership styles based on sex or age, but there are differences based on job position. This finding echoes the ideas of Tingle et al. (2019), who found that school administrators' competencies are directly related to students' academic success, and those in different positions will perceive the influence of leadership differently.

#### Impact on Inclusivity

Table 8. Assessment of Impact on Inclusivity – Student Engagement

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Mean | SD   | Rank | Verbal Description/<br>Interpretation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------------------|
| Active cultivation of an inclusive classroom culture where every student feels welcomed, valued, and respected, setting the tone for positive student relationships is promoted.                                              | 3.27 | 0.70 | 5    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| There is encouragement of open and supportive communication between students, creating an environment where diverse perspectives are heard, understood, and celebrated.                                                       | 3.33 | 0.66 | 1    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| There is initiation and support of peer mentorship programs that enable older students to guide and mentor younger ones, fostering a sense of belonging and support among students of different grades.                       | 3.25 | 0.69 | 6    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| A promotion of collaborative group projects that involve students from various backgrounds, encouraging them to work together, appreciate differences, and leverage their collective strengths is fostered.                   | 3.29 | 0.69 | 3    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| Establishment of workshops and discussions that address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, providing opportunities for students to learn, share experiences, and build empathy is present.                           | 3.25 | 0.70 | 6    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| There is creation of leadership development opportunities for students of all backgrounds, empowering them to take on leadership roles within the school community, thereby promoting inclusivity through student leadership. | 3.30 | 0.63 | 2    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| There is assurance that students diverse achievements and contributions are celebrated and recognized, reinforcing the idea that everyone's unique talents and backgrounds enrich the school community.                       | 3.29 | 0.68 | 3    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| Student Engagement                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 3.28 | 0.61 | -    | Agree/Engaging                        |

Scale: 1-1.50: Strongly Disagree/Not Engaging; 1.51-2.50: Disagree/Slightly Engaging; 2.51-3.50: Agree/Engaging; 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree/Very Engaging

Table 8 presents an assessment of the impact of transformational leadership on inclusivity, specifically focusing on student engagement. The table features a set of indicators related to the strategies employed to foster an inclusive classroom culture, along with corresponding mean scores, standard deviations (SD), and ranks. Each indicator is accompanied by a verbal description or interpretation of the responses.

The encouragement of open and supportive communication among students ranks highest with a mean of 3.33 and an SD of 0.66. This indicator is recognized as the most effective in creating an environment where diverse perspectives are actively heard, understood, and celebrated, as reflected in the 'Agree/Engaging' interpretation.

Ranked second, with a mean of 3.30 and the lowest SD of 0.63, is the creation of leadership development opportunities for students of all backgrounds. This initiative is perceived as empowering and instrumental in promoting inclusivity through student leadership roles.

Two indicators tie for the third rank, both with a mean score of 3.29. One assesses the promotion of collaborative group

projects involving students from diverse backgrounds, and the other evaluates the celebration and recognition of students' diverse achievements. Both suggest that these practices are well-received, engaging, and contribute to the inclusive atmosphere within the school.

The active cultivation of an inclusive classroom culture, which sets a positive tone for student relationships, has a mean score of 3.27 and an SD of 0.70, ranking it fifth. It demonstrates a strong agreement with the effectiveness of this practice in creating a welcoming educational environment.

Two indicators share the sixth rank with identical mean scores of 3.25. One evaluates the initiation and support of peer mentorship programs, while the other considers the establishment of workshops on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Both carry an SD of 0.69 and 0.70 respectively, indicating a slightly wider but still moderate spread in responses. Despite their lower rank, the indicators are still within the scope of agreement, signifying engaging approaches to inclusivity.

The composite score for Student Engagement, representing the overall impact, stands at 3.28 with an SD of 0.61. This score, which is not assigned a rank, illustrates a consensus that the strategies for fostering inclusivity in student engagement are effective. The high mean scores across various indicators

suggest that administrators are effective in cultivating an inclusive culture. In particular, the highest-ranked indicator emphasizes open and supportive communication, resonating with the findings of Dou et al. (2017) which highlighted the role of administrators as facilitators of an inclusive learning

environment. The encouragement of peer mentorship and collaborative projects received agreement from respondents, aligning with Björk et al.'s (2019) discussion on the importance of leadership in promoting diverse educational practices.

Table 9. Assessment of Impact on Inclusivity – Faculty Engagement

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Mean | SD   | Rank | Verbal Description/<br>Interpretation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------------------|
| There is consistent prioritization of inclusive professional development opportunities for faculty, ensuring that all members have access to resources and training to support diverse teaching and learning needs.          | 3.22 | 0.73 | 5    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| Collaborative development of a diverse and inclusive curriculum that reflects the perspectives, cultures, and experiences of all students, fostering a sense of belonging and representation is promoted and implemented.    | 3.28 | 0.66 | 4    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| Promotion of the adoption of inclusive pedagogical practices among faculty, encouraging the use of varied teaching methods that cater to different learning styles and abilities is highlighted in the institution.          | 3.29 | 0.69 | 2    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| The practice establishes and supports collaborative faculty committees focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion, where educators can share best practices and work together to address challenges related to inclusivity. | 3.22 | 0.68 | 5    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| Common practice aids in mentorship programs and peer support networks among faculty, creating spaces for experienced educators to guide and mentor newer colleagues and share insights related to inclusivity.               | 3.21 | 0.70 | 7    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| Administrators encourage the development of inclusive assessment strategies that consider the diverse strengths and needs of students, ensuring that evaluation methods are fair and equitable.                              | 3.29 | 0.63 | 2    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| There is proper recognition of faculty members who demonstrate exceptional commitment to inclusivity in their teaching and collaborative efforts, inspiring others to follow suit.                                           | 3.30 | 0.66 | 1    | Agree/<br>Engaging                    |
| Faculty Engagement                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 3.26 | 0.61 | -    | Agree/Engaging                        |

Scale: 1-1.50: Strongly Disagree/Not Engaging; 1.51-2.50: Disagree/Slightly Engaging; 2.51-3.50: Agree/Engaging; 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree/Very Engaging

Table 9 provides an evaluation of the impact of transformational leadership on inclusivity in the context of faculty engagement. The table lists indicators associated with inclusive practices for faculty, detailing mean scores, standard deviations (SD), and ranks, with a qualitative verbal description accompanying each.

The indicator receiving the highest agreement, with a mean score of 3.30 and an SD of 0.66, acknowledges the recognition of faculty members who show an exceptional commitment to inclusivity. This suggests that such recognition is a powerful motivator for faculty, as it's seen as the most engaging practice.

Tied for the second rank are two indicators, both with a mean of 3.29, but with slightly different SDs (0.69 and 0.63). One indicator pertains to the promotion of inclusive pedagogical practices, which points to a consensus on the use of varied teaching methods that address different learning styles. The other assesses the development of inclusive assessment strategies, emphasizing the importance of fair and equitable evaluation methods for students.

The fourth rank, with a mean score of 3.28 and an SD of 0.66, is given to the collaborative development of a diverse and inclusive curriculum, which suggests that faculty perceive this collaborative effort as vital for fostering belonging and representation within the student body.

Two indicators are tied for the fifth rank, each with a mean score of 3.22. One focuses on the prioritization of inclusive professional development opportunities, while the other looks at the establishment of faculty committees on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Both of these indicators receive agreement on their engaging nature, though they indicate a slightly wider

range of responses among faculty.

The seventh rank, with a mean of 3.21 and an SD of 0.70, is related to mentorship programs and peer support networks among faculty. Despite its lower rank, it is still considered to be an engaging practice, highlighting the importance of experienced educators in guiding and mentoring their colleagues on inclusivity.

The composite score for Faculty Engagement, which averages the scores of all indicators, stands at 3.26 with an SD of 0.61. This score suggests a collective agreement among faculty members that the inclusivity strategies being implemented are effective and engaging, reflecting a positive impact of transformational leadership on fostering an inclusive environment for faculty. The highest rank was given to the recognition of faculty members' commitment to inclusivity, a finding that supports Kiran (2020), who mentioned the importance of prioritizing strengths and abilities in transformational leadership. The encouragement of inclusive pedagogical practices reflects Waruwu's (2020) notion that transformational leadership involves empowering and supporting teachers as decision-making partners. This table underscores that transformational leadership's role in faculty inclusivity is well-recognized and valued, contributing to an inclusive educational environment.

## 6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study reveals that transformational leadership plays a pivotal role in fostering an inclusive environment within educational institutions. The survey data presented across Tables 1 to 14 provide robust evidence supporting the hypothesis that transformational leadership styles have a positive impact on inclusivity for students, faculty, administrators, and stakeholders.

From the demographic breakdown to the assessment of leadership's impact on inclusivity, it is evident that transformational leadership characteristics such as inspirational motivation, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and idealized influence resonate with educators' experiences in promoting inclusivity. The high mean scores and the strong, positive Pearson  $r$  coefficient signify a widespread agreement among educators that transformational leadership practices are effective and engaging.

Moreover, the lack of significant differences in perceptions of leadership based on sex and age, with some notable differences associated with job position and teaching years, suggest that while inclusivity is a universal goal, the approach to achieving it might need to be tailored to specific roles within the educational hierarchy.

The findings corroborate the assertions made by educational theorists and practitioners alike, underscoring the need for educational leaders to embody transformational qualities to meet the diverse needs of the school population. Transformational leaders, as depicted in this study, are those who communicate effectively, encourage a culture of mutual respect and empowerment, and inspire innovation and creativity within the school community.

Furthermore, the study's insights into the different dimensions of engagement highlight the multi-faceted nature of inclusivity. It is not only about academic policies and classroom strategies but also about the cultural and social ethos that permeates throughout the educational institution, all of which are influenced by the style and approach of its leaders.

This research reaffirms the significance of transformational leadership in education as a catalyst for change, emphasizing that the deliberate cultivation of an inclusive environment is key to the development of a diverse, supportive, and engaged educational community. The implications are clear: to foster inclusivity effectively, educational institutions must continue to embrace and develop transformational leadership capabilities among their administrators, nurture engagement at all levels, and acknowledge and celebrate the diverse contributions within their communities.

In light of these findings, educational policymakers, administrators, and practitioners are encouraged to adopt and further cultivate transformational leadership practices to enhance inclusivity and to prepare students to thrive in an increasingly diverse and globalized world.

## 7. Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, three generic recommendations are proposed:

1. **Enhance Leadership Training Programs:** Educational institutions should consider implementing comprehensive leadership training programs that emphasize the importance of inclusivity and diversity. These programs should train school leaders in various leadership styles, particularly focusing on those found to be most effective in promoting an inclusive culture. This training should include case studies, role-playing scenarios, and real-world problem-solving scenarios to help leaders understand and implement practices that enhance diversity.

2. **Regular Assessment and Feedback Mechanisms:** Schools should establish regular assessment mechanisms to evaluate the effectiveness of different leadership styles in promoting

inclusivity and diversity. These assessments can be conducted through surveys, interviews, and focus groups involving teachers and students. Feedback obtained from these assessments should be systematically used to refine and improve leadership practices and policies continuously.

3. **Foster a Culture of Open Communication:** Encourage a school-wide culture of open communication where teachers and students can express their views and experiences regarding inclusivity and diversity freely. School leaders should facilitate this by being approachable and receptive to feedback, and by ensuring that there are multiple, accessible channels for communication. This approach will not only help in identifying issues related to inclusivity but also in crafting more tailored and effective leadership strategies to address them.

A comprehensive initiative specifically designed to embed the principles of transformational leadership within the fabric of educational institutions to cultivate a truly inclusive environment is proposed: Leadership for Inclusivity Excellence (LIFE) Program.

Building on the study's findings that transformational leadership significantly impacts inclusivity within educational institutions, the LIFE Program aims to enhance the skills and practices of educational leaders. It will equip them to foster an inclusive culture that resonates with innovation, respect, and collaboration, addressing diverse educational needs.

## References

- [1] Akhigbe, J. O., & Sunday, P. I. (2017). Organizational trust and workplace deviant behavior in higher institutions in Rivers State. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, 5(10), 48-62. Retrieved from <https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijmsr/v5-i10/5.pdf>.
- [2] Akilli, S. H., & Cingoz, A. (2015). The relationship between organizational trust and job performance: The mediating role effect of public service motivation. The 2015 Egpa Annual Conference. Toulouse, France. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/30924152/>.
- [3] Al Draj, F., & Al Saed, R. (2023). Mediating role of employee empowerment for transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(1). [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(1\).2023.06](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(1).2023.06).
- [4] Alajmi, S. (2017). Organizational trust: A gateway to psychological empowerment. *Journal of Management Research*, 9(1), 55-69. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v9i1.10382>.
- [5] Alessa, G. S. (2021). The dimensions of transformational leadership and its organizational effects in public universities in Saudi Arabia: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.682092/full>.
- [6] Al-Hartsi, S. (2017). The interactive effect between justice and organizational trust and its reflection in improving the job performance of employees – An analytical study of the opinions of a sample of employees in small and medium enterprises. *Journal of Business Administration and Economic Studies*, 3(2), 26-48. Retrieved from <https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/52609>.
- [7] Babiker, K. A-D. H. A. (2015). Transformational leadership and administrative creativity. Cairo: Arab Organization for Administrative Development, League of Arab States. Retrieved from <https://www.noor-book.com/en/book/review/266931>.
- [8] Bakkar, A. I. (2012). The level of organizational justice practiced by principals of public secondary schools in Amman

- Governorate and its relationship to the level of organizational trust in their schools from the point of view of teachers (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East University, Amman, Jordan. Retrieved from <https://search.mandumah.com/Record/723577/Details>.
- [9] Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). Successful school leadership: Linking with learning and achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 15(1), 3-31.
  - [10] Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2019). *Shaping school culture: Pitfalls, paradoxes, and promises*. John Wiley & Sons.
  - [11] Dick, V. R., & Tavares, S. M. (2016). Organizational Identification and "Currencies of Exchange": Integrating Social Identity and Social Exchange Perspectives. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 46(1), 34-45.
  - [12] Fang, Yang-Chun, & Chen, Jia-Yan. (2019). The Impact of Inclusive Leadership on Employees' Innovative Behaviors: The Mediation of Psychological Capital. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10.
  - [13] Faris, M. J. (2014). The relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment: A field study on Al-Azhar University – Gaza. *Journal of the Islamic University for Economic and Administrative Studies*, 22(2), 156-195. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0013430>.
  - [14] Goetsch, D., & Stanley, D. (2021). *Quality management for organizational excellence: Introduction to total quality* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
  - [15] Hamad, Y. A., Ali, A-T. A., & Ali, B. B. (2016). The impact of administrative leadership on the performance of Zain telephone company employees. *Journal of Al-Neelain University*, 7(28), 1858-6228. Retrieved from <https://search.mandumah.com/Record/902358>.
  - [16] Hui, L., Sajjad, H., Wang, Q., Muhammad, A., Khaqan, Z., & Amina, S. (2019). Influence of transformational leadership on employees' innovative work behavior in sustainable organizations: Test of mediation and moderation processes. *Sustainability*, 11(6), 1594. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11061594>.
  - [17] Hussain, I., Nazir, M., Khan, Q., & Shah, S. (2022). Linking green human resource practices and environmental performance: The role of green innovation as mediator and environmental strategy as moderator. *RADS Journal of Business Management*, 3(2), 1-15. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357794477\\_Linking\\_Green\\_Human\\_Resource\\_Practices\\_and\\_Environmental\\_Performance\\_The\\_Role\\_of\\_Green\\_Innovation\\_as\\_Mediator\\_and\\_Environmental\\_Strategy\\_as\\_Moderator](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357794477_Linking_Green_Human_Resource_Practices_and_Environmental_Performance_The_Role_of_Green_Innovation_as_Mediator_and_Environmental_Strategy_as_Moderator).
  - [18] Jamal, T., Zahid, M., Martins, J. M., Mata, M. N., Rahman, H. U., & Mata, P. N. (2021). Perceived green human resource management practices and corporate sustainability: Multigroup analysis and major industries perspectives. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3045. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063045>.
  - [19] Khasawneh, M (2021). The impact of transformational leadership on the quality of work-life – An applied study in telecommunications companies – The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. *Journal of Economic, Administrative and Legal Sciences*, 5(4), 200-180. <https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.W090820>.
  - [20] Lashari, M., Moazzam, A., Salman, Y., & Irfan, S. (2016). Impact of organizational trust on organizational justice commitment: A case of the University of Sargodha. *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, 53(2). Retrieved from <https://www.prdb.pk/article/impact-of-organizational-trust-on-organizational-justiceand-9170>.
  - [21] Mahfuz, J. (2016). The influence of organizational trust on job performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *International Journal of Business Research*, 16(5), 53-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18374/IJBR-16-5.4>.
  - [22] Marques De Lima Rua, O. M. M., & Araújo, J. M. C. (2016). How organizational commitment has a mediating effect on the relation between transformational leadership and organizational trust. *Cuadernos de Gestión*, 16(1), 43-62. <https://doi.org/10.5295/cdg.140484om>.
  - [23] McClean, E. J., Burris, E. R., & Detert, J. R. (2013). When does voice lead to exit? It depends on leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(2), 525-548.
  - [24] McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2009). A tale of two climates: Diversity climate from subordinates' and managers perspectives and their role in store unit sales performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(4), 767-791.
  - [25] McMurray, A. J., Islam, M. M., Sarros, J. C., et al. (2011). The impact of leadership on workgroup climate and performance in a non-profit organization. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33(6), 522-549.
  - [26] Mosalli, M. A. (2013). The impact of emotional intelligence on managers' performance and administrative leadership styles: A field study on hotels in the City of Aleppo (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Aleppo.
  - [27] Muhammadiyah, O. (2016). The impact of job empowerment on the creative behavior of workers in the Jordan Tourism Promotion Authority (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East University, Amman, Jordan.
  - [28] Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
  - [29] Rashad Al Saed and Mohammad Al Saed (2023). The impact of transformational leadership on enhancing organizational trust: Moderating role of empowerment. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(4), 101-112. [doi:10.21511/ppm.21\(4\).2023.08](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(4).2023.08).
  - [30] Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
  - [31] Sarah, S. (2019). The impact of organizational trust on job performance – A field study in the Republican Directorate of the Production Department at the base of Arara (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Kasdi Merbah University, Algiers, Algeria.
  - [32] Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2013). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (10th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
  - [33] Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/2Fijme.4dfb.8dfd>.
  - [34] Top, C., Abdullah, B. M. S., & Faraj, A. H. M. (2020). Transformational leadership impact on employees performance. *Eurasian Journal of Management & Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.23918/ejmss.v1i1p49>.