



The Role of School Principal's Motivating Language in Promoting School Climate: A Comparative Study of Private and Public Schools

Sara Sabir

University of Education, Multan Campus, Pakistan

Abstract

This paper provides a synthesis of theoretical and empirical literature on leader motivating language and school climate and investigates if leader language promotes positive climate specifically both in private and public schools. This paper involves the use of primary data collected through questionnaire as a research tool and both descriptive and inferential statistics to empirically analyze the effect of leader language on school climate. The comparative analysis of private and public schools revealed that motivating language of school principal from both sectors influences teachers and that they rated the leader language as modestly effective and overall school climate as moderately good. The results proved that leader motivating language optimizes school climate, thus giving the school principals an insight into the benefits of making accurate language choice for favourable employee and organizational outcomes.

Keywords: Motivating Language, School Climate, Principal, Private, Public, Schools

*Corresponding author: Sara Sabir; Email: saraomairbucha@gmail.com

Submission Date: 20 November 2018

Acceptance Date: 22 December 2018

Introduction

“Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world”. The importance of education can be easily justified by these words of Mandela. Education is the fundamental entity that grooms the personality of an individual from the very beginning (Awan and Zia, 2015). Not only this, but quality education plays a vital role to channelize the progress and development of any country owing to the increasing competition in knowledge and technology all over the world in the 21st century (Awan and Saeed, 2014).

As stated by Arne Duncan, U.S. Secretary of Education, ‘there are no good schools without good principals’ (Duncan, 2018). This promises that good school principals, being multidimensional leaders, can positively affect all the school components including managing the staff, students and the related community (Murtedjo & Suharningsih). Language is a medium through which principals can manage all these components and create a positive school climate.

Overall, Pakistan has total 227,136 institutions with mainly two school systems 158,288 (70%) public and 68,848 (30%) private institutions with 49% teachers working in private schools and 51% in public schools (Ailan, n.d). Unfortunately, the education system of Pakistan is under crisis (Sajjad & Lee, 2016; Akhtar, 2013). A scarcity of trained and motivated teaching staff who delivers lectures with no lesson planning encouraging rote learning system to pass the examination with maximum marks, low allocation of budget, directionless school policies with disoriented implementation, inefficient management are a few problems being encountered by schools in general (Sajjad & Lee, 2016). The KSAO's of the teachers catalyze the effectiveness of school system.

With such unhealthy school climate, the staff is least motivated and these credentials are not meaningfully utilized, adversely affecting the student learning and school progress. Management or Principals need to be aware that a positive school climate can help tackle these school challenges. Since, principals are in direct contact with the teachers on everyday basis, their words can incorporate positive results. So, this research aims to see how the motivating language of the principal can make the school climate favorable.

There is a need to replicate the motivating language results in non-US parts of the world (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2018; Sabir & Masood, 2018). Alhaqtani (2015) and Owens & Valesky (2014) suggest that further work be done on motivating language and school climate to expand its results from a specific region like Kuwait to more general terms. The phenomenon of school climate has been recently gaining much popularity in research because of its ability to drive in overall school improvement (White et al., 2014).

Based on these gaps in literature, the main objective of this paper is to elaborate, establish and compare the link between motivating language and school climate for private and public schools in Pakistan. Moreover, this paper aims to address the following research questions:

- What is the level of teachers' perceptions regarding the use of motivating language by their Head/ Principal?
- What is the level of teachers' perceptions regarding their school climate?
- Does a significant difference exist between the teachers' perceptions of motivating language in private and public schools?
- Does a significant difference exist between the teachers' perceptions of school climate in private and public schools?
- Does a significant relationship exist between school climate and motivating language in general?

Literature Review

Leader Motivating Language

The language is the main medium of communication between a leader and his follower (Louis, 2017; Raina & Roebuck, 2014). Professor Sullivan in 1988 gave a systematic and comprehensive framework of leader speech based on Speech Act theory given by philosophers Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). According to motivating Language theory, spoken words of a leader can instigate positive psychological responses in followers which gets translated into 'strategic motivational messages' and are evident through positive employee outcomes leading to organizational success (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2018).

The Motivating Language Theory divides leader language into three categories, each of which plays its own role towards better results (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2018). Later

Mayfield et al., (1995) developed a reliable and valid scale to measure the impact of leader's motivating language. This scale is widely in use since then.

Direction-Giving Language

This dimension is referred to as the Hand of leader language, which aims to reduce and clarify all task related ambiguities like goals, roles, procedures, rewards, feedback (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2018).

Empathetic Language

This dimension is referred to as the Heart of leader language, which aims to forge strong interpersonal bonds at workplace e.g., by praising or giving a compliment (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2018).

Meaning Making Language

This dimension is referred to as the spirit of leader language, which aims to articulate the organizational culture or norms, especially in the times of change or organizational transition. This language tends to give a meaning and identity to the work done (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2018).

Motivating language has been in interests of many researchers who empirically found it to be directly affecting key favorable employee and organizational outcomes. Mayfield & Mayfield (2018) found positive relation of motivating language with organizational commitment with median correlation $r=0.34$, Sabir & Masood (2018) found positive linkages with Teacher Commitment and organizational Climate, Louis (2017) with Job performance and organizational commitment, Refozar *et al.*, (2017) with Job satisfaction, Kunie *et al.*, (2017) with employee engagement, Sun, Pan & Ho (2016) with intrinsic motivation, supervisory effectiveness and organizational citizenship behavior, Haroon & Akbar, (2016) with job performance, Madlock & Sexton (2015) with work commitment, Alhaqtani (2015) with school climate, Mayfield & Mayfield (2015) with effective decision-making, Simmons & Sharbrough, (2013) with perceived leader effectiveness, employee communication satisfaction, and perceived supervisor communication competence, Mayfield & Mayfield (2012) with self-efficacy, Mayfield & Mayfield (2009) with employee absenteeism, Wang, Chang et al., (2009) with team creative performance, Mayfield & Mayfield (2007) with worker's intent to stay, Mayfield & Mayfield (2002) with employee commitment and Mayfield, Mayfield & Kopp (1998) with Job Satisfaction and Performance.

Motivating language is recognized as having similar effects across different cultural and national groups as shown by works of Sabir & Masood (2018) in Pakistan, Dr. Joanna Winska (2014) in Poland, Alhaqtani (2015) in Kuwait, Madlock & Sexton (2015) in Mexico and Kunie *et al.* (2017) in Japan.

School Climate

The pioneers in school climate were Halpin and Croft (1963), who named the distinct feel and image of the school as school climate. According to Andersen (1982), climate is to a school in same way as personality is to an individual.

School climate can be analyzed within two different yet overlapping frameworks: *Openness and Health*. A school with an open climate will be healthy and similarly a healthy school will have an open climate (Hoy et al., 2002). Openness is based on the

relationship of teachers with principal and other teachers, whereas health predicts the relationship of school with students and community (Hoy et al., 2002).

Halpin and Croft (1963) initially identified eight dimensions, which were later reduced to six to measure the openness of school climate using OCDQ. Three were related to teacher's behavior being collegial, intimate and disengaged and remaining to principal's behavior being supportive, directive and restrictive (Hoy et al., 2002).

Based on these, the four types of school climate are: *open climate*, *closed climate*, *disengaged climate*, and *engaged climate*. Open climate is one with open behavior of both teacher and principal i.e., "high on supportiveness, low on directiveness, low on restrictiveness, high on collegial, high on intimacy, and low on disengagement." Closed climate is one with close behavior of both i.e., "low on supportiveness, high on directiveness, high on restrictiveness, low on collegiality, low on intimacy, and high on disengagement." Engaged climate is one with closed behavior of principal and open behavior of teachers i.e., "high on supportiveness, low on directiveness, low on restrictiveness, low on collegiality, low on intimacy, and high on disengagement". Disengaged climate is one with closed behavior of teachers and open behavior of principal i.e., "low on supportiveness, high on directiveness, high on restrictiveness, high on collegiality, high on intimacy and high on engagement." (Hoy et al., 2002; p.33-34).

The other framework for measuring school climate is its health, using OHI (Organizational Health Index). The pioneer in school health, Miles (1965) defined a healthy school as one, which continuously grows no matter what challenges it, has to face and is able to cope successfully with the school dynamics. Initially, there were total 10 dimensions for evaluating the health of any school, which were later, reduced to five, based on the task, maintenance, and growth needs of an open social system. These dimensions *institutional integrity*, *collegial leadership*, *resource influence*, *Teacher affiliation and academic emphasis* are related to the *institutional*, *managerial*, and *technical* levels of authority within the school (Hoy et al., 2002).

Hoy, Smith, and Sweetland (2002) developed an instrument to measure school climate called Organizational Climate Index (OCI) by expanding work of Hoy et al., (1998) and combining OCDQ and OHI. According to them, school climate is measured in four dimensions namely *collegial leadership*, *teacher professionalism*, *academic press and institutional vulnerability* (Hoy et al., 2002).

The collegial leadership refers to the treatment of teachers by the principal as professional colleagues and expectation principal as per set standards for the teacher. The teacher professionalism refers to teacher-to-teacher collaboration. The academic press refers to relationship of the school with academic success of its students. The institutional vulnerability refers to the relationship of school with the community (Hoy et al., 2002).

Relationship between Motivating Language and School Climate

Principal or the educational leader plays an important role in determining teachers' perception of school climate. It is the entire responsibility of the principal to create a supportive school climate. There is an empirical direct link between motivating language and school climate of both public and private schools (Sabir & Masood, 2018; Alhaqtani, 2015). According to Alqahtani and Alajmi (2010), efficient school leaders create a positive climate in their schools using motivating language. The leaders shape up the school climate through their language

Research Methodology

This paper used comparative descriptive research design with cross-sectional data collected from sample respondents.

Target Population

According to the Research objective, the target population for this study is teachers from private and public schools.

Sampling

The sample was taken from public and private schools in Multan district using Convenience sampling technique and then randomly the questionnaire was distributed among teachers of the schools. As per a census conducted by Punjab Government in Pakistan, 65% of schools in Multan district are private (Datastories, 2018), so 65% of sample was teachers from private sector and remaining from public. The total number of items was 52 and multiplied by 5, as per Chou and Bentler formula (1986), it gave sample size of 260.

Survey Instrument

The two instruments used in this study were adopted from scales already developed, published and validated by early researchers. For leader motivating language, scale by Mayfield *et al.* (1998) was used with total 24 items. To measure school climate, School Climate Index (SCI) developed by Tschannen-Moran *et al.* (2006) was used. For reliability of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted in which 40 teachers from one private and one public school were asked to fill the questionnaire. The responses were coded and entered into SPSS to check the reliability through Cronbach's alpha. The values were .868 and .920 for motivating language and school climate respectively, which shows that the questionnaire was reliable. Results are shown in appendix A.

Data Collection and Analysis

Primary data was collected for the purpose of research using questionnaire after obtaining permission and seeking willingness from the sample respondents. Response rate was almost 80% and 241 questionnaires were returned back. Out of these, 230 questionnaires were found suitable to be fed into SPSS version 22 for further analysis.

Results and Analysis

The analysis was done according to the research questions, for which both descriptive Statistics and Inferential Statistics for hypothesis testing was used.

Descriptive Statistics

The first two research questions were answered with descriptive statistics. For this purpose, Mean & S.D was calculated with SPSS for interpretation which is: 1.00-2= low, 2.1-3= medium, 3.1-4.00= strong.

According to the mean scores in table 1, the teachers assessed the overall use of motivating language as average as the value falls in the medium range with Direction-giving language as being practiced the most followed by empathetic and then meaning-making language. Hence, the first research question is answered.

In the direction- giving language category, the highest rating was for item no. 1, 3 & 4 which meant that teachers believed that they were given sufficient instructions and directions regarding their work. The highest range is of item no. 5 which is connected to the reward- receiving process, which means that the principals were not efficiently addressing the professional development of the teachers.

In the empathetic language category, the highest rating was for item no. 11 & 12 which shows that teachers were being praised and encouraged for their accomplishments. However, as per items 13 & 14, their professional well-being and job satisfaction was not being addressed.

In the meaning-making language category, the highest rating was for was item no. 22 which is connected to the challenges of fitting –in the school. The highest range is with item no. 20 which means that teachers perceived that the hardworking gems of the school are not mentioned often.

Items	Mean	S.D.
Direction- giving language	3.08	0.46
1. Gives me useful explanations of what needs to be done in my work.	3.7	0.3
2. Offers me helpful directions on how to do my job	3.4	0.5
3. Provides me with easily understandable instructions about my work	3.8	0.3
4. Offers me helpful advice on how to improve my work	3.6	0.6
5. Gives me good definitions of what I must do in order to receive rewards	2.75	0.7
6. Gives me clear instructions about solving job-related problems	3.5	0.5
7. Offers me specific information on how I am evaluated.	2.3	0.4
8. Provides me with helpful information about forthcoming changes affecting my work.	2.55	0.4
9. Provides me with helpful information about past changes affecting my work.	1.9	0.7
10. Shares news with me about school achievements.	3.3	0.2
II. Empathetic Language	2.5	0.43
11. Gives me praise for my good work	3.5	0.1
12. Shows me encouragement for my work efforts	3.46	0.4
13. Shows concern about my job satisfaction	1.8	0.6
14. Expresses his/her support for my professional development	1.75	0.2
15. Asks me about my professional well-being	2	0.9
16. Shows trust in me.	2.5	0.4
III. Meaning-making Language	2.31	0.51
17. Tells me stories about key events in the school's past	2	0.3
18. Gives me useful information that I couldn't get through official channels	1.9	0.7
19. Tells me stories about people who are admired in my school	2	0.3
20. Tells me stories about people who have worked hard in this school	2.2	0.9
21. Offers me advice about how to behave at the school's social gatherings	2.6	0.4
22. Offers me advice about how to "fit in" with other members of this school	2.8	0.6
23. Tells me stories about people who have been rewarded by this school	2.65	0.3
24. Tells me stories about people who have left this school	2.4	0.6
School Principal Motivating Language (Overall score)	2.63	.47

Table 1: Perception of Motivating language used by principals

According to the mean scores in table 2, the teachers assessed the overall school climate as medium with Collegial leadership, Teacher professionalism and Academic press all being practiced in schools. Hence, the second research question is answered.

Items to Determine School Climate	Mean	S.D.
I. Collegial Leadership	2.8	0.4
1. The principal is friendly and approachable.	3.5	0.2

2. The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation.	2.3	0.4
3. The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.	2.5	0.5
4. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal.	2.2	0.7
5. The principal is willing to make changes.	3	0.2
6. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them.	3	0.4
7. The principal maintains definite standards of performance.	3.4	0.5
II. Teacher Professionalism	2.78	0.4
8. The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.	3.4	0.3
9. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.	2.7	0.6
10. Teachers help and support each other.	3.3	0.6
11. Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment.	2.2	0.3
12. Teachers are committed to helping students.	2.6	0.2
13. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.	3	0.3
14. Teachers “go the extra mile” with their students.	2	0.5
15. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.	3	0.4
III. Community Engagement	1.9	0.6
16. Our school makes an effort to inform the community about our goals & achievements.	1.8	0.7
17. Our school is able to marshal community support when needed.	1.4	0.4
18. Parents and other community members are included on planning committees.	2.1	0.6
19. Community members are responsive to requests for participation.	2	0.9
20. Community members attend meetings to stay informed about our school.	2	0.4
21. Organized community groups (e.g., PTA, PTO) meet regularly to discuss school issues.	2	0.5
22. School people are responsive to the needs and concerns expressed by community members.	2.3	0.4
IV. Academic Press	3.2	0.33
23. The school sets high standards for academic performance	3.6	0.2
24. Students respect others who get good grades.	3.2	0.3
25. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school	3.2	0.3
26. Students try hard to improve on previous work	3	0.7
27. The learning environment is orderly and serious	3	0.2
28. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades	3.1	0.3
School Climate (Overall score)	2.67	0.43

Table 2: School Climate Index (SCI) Questions

Inferential Statistics

The next three research questions were answered using Inferential Statistics because they seek analysis for difference or no difference in the level of motivating language and school climate as perceived by the teachers between private and public sector and relationship or no relationship between the two.

Null hypothesis was formulated for research question no. 3 as follows:

H₀₃: there is no significant difference in the level of motivating language used by school head between public and private schools.

This hypothesis was tested using independent sample t-test in order to determine if a difference exist between the two. As evident in table 3, teachers from private schools showed higher mean (M=2.78) for motivating language compared to teachers from public schools (M=2.42). As per table 4, the mean score difference is significant so we reject Ho3 and accept the alternate hypothesis which states that a significant difference exists in the motivating language used by principals in private and public schools. This means that leaders in private schools are practicing motivating language and benefitting from it more than those in public schools as believed by the teachers. The research question 3 is answered.

Leader motivating language	Type of school	N	Mean	S.D.
	Private	138	2.78	0.8
	Public	92	2.42	0.6

Table 3. Group Statistics for Leader Motivating Language

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Upper	Lower
Leader Motivating language	Equal variances assumed	21.967	.000	-3.522	228	.001	-.34524	.09804		-.53842	-.15207
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.707	225.9	.000	-.34524	.09313		-.52876	-.16172

Table 4. Independent sample T-test for Leader Motivating Language

Null hypothesis for research question no. 4 is as follows:

Ho4: there is no significant difference in the level of school climate between public and private schools.

This hypothesis was also tested using independent sample t-test. Table 5 indicates that teachers from private schools reported higher mean (M=2.99) for school climate as compared to the teachers from public schools (M=2.23). Table 6 shows that the mean score difference is significant so we reject Ho4 and accept alternate hypothesis for it which states that a significant difference exists in the perceptions of school climate by the teachers of private and public schools. This shows that private schools possessed relatively more positive and healthy climate than public schools as perceived by its teachers, hence answering the fourth research question.

School climate	Type of school	N	Mean	S.D.
	Private	138	2.99	0.53
	Public	92	2.23	0.8

Table 5. Group Statistics for School climate

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Upper	Lower
School climate	Equal variances assumed	56.157	.000	-	227	.000	-0.75246	.09709	-0.9437		-0.5611
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.247	221.5	.000	-0.75246	.09124	-.93228		-.57265

Table 6. Independent sample T-test for School climate

Null hypothesis for research question no. 5 is as follows:

H05: there is no positive relationship between leader motivating language and school climate

This null hypothesis was tested using Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient. Table 5 indicates that there is a moderate positive relationship between the two ($r=.378$). This means that as motivating language by the leader increases, the healthier the school climate gets. The null hypothesis can be rejected and it can be concluded that there exists a positive significant linkage between the two variables. Hence, the fifth research question is answered. This result is in accordance with the works of Sabir & Masood (2018) and Alhaqtani (2015).

		Leader motivating language	School climate
Leader Motivating language	Pearson Correlation	1	.378**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	230	230
School climate	Pearson Correlation	.378**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	230	230

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7. Correlation Matrix

Discussion

The results of the research indicate that a statistically significant positive relationship exists between the motivating language of the leader and the school climate. This result is in accordance with the earlier research of Sabir and Masood (2018) and Alhaqtani (2015) who demonstrated positive linkages between the two in private and public sector school respectively.

The results show that teachers perceived the use of motivating language by their school Head/ Principal as moderate with the Direction- giving language the widely used. Also, the result has shown that these teachers perceived the climate of their respective schools as moderate with the three sub-scales of Collegial leadership, Teacher professionalism and Academic press being practiced in schools at varying levels. However, the sub-scale Institutional Vulnerability did not seem to impact school climate, neither was affected by the use of motivating language by the school principal.

The current paper has also investigated the difference in the use of motivating language by the school leader and school climate between the private and public schools. It was shown that in private schools, principals are using higher levels of motivating language as

compared to the public schools. Hence, the public school principals need to focus on their motivating talk so that a more healthy school climate can be flourished. Also, this paper has shown that private schools have relatively healthier school climate than the public schools. This probably owes to the positive linkage between the use of motivating language and school climate, which has shown its encouraging effects in private schools relative to public schools.

This paper provides a synthesis of the theoretical and empirical literature on Leader Motivating Language and School climate along with the relationship between them. The prior works have highlighted the relationship between LML and school climate for private schools (Sabir and Masood, 2018) and for public schools (Alhaqtani, 2015) but this research goes beyond the existing and available studies by empirically drawing a comparison between the private and public schools to investigate the level and possible linkage of LML and school climate as perceived by the teachers of private or public schools. So, this research adds contribution to theory by providing an integration of prior works on these constructs and a comparison of the use of these variables in the private and public sector for institutions in Pakistan which was missing earlier and made a clear gap in literature. This study has attempted to fill these gaps.

This study has immense practical implications in academic settings as it highlights the importance of making appropriate language choices by the leaders whose words mean more than actions, at times, for the followers in order to establish a healthy school climate which is a vital facet for a successful educational institute.

Directions for Future Research

One limitation of this research is that the study used single method to collect data. Future research can use mixed methods using both qualitative and quantitative methods. A longitudinal study may also be conducted for further accuracy of results. Another limitation is that the responses by teachers could be biased may be personal or out of fear, however they were specifically informed and assured of the confidentiality and anonymity. One suggestion to overcome this biasness is by having the leaders fill up the survey to find out the real picture. Future research can compare these results.

Conclusions

The main agenda of this research is to understand how leader language impacts school climate. The results reinforce existing Motivating Language Theory empirically and found positive linkage with school climate, further confirming to previous works on this relationship. The results showed that teachers of the surveyed schools perceived both school climate and motivating language as moderate and that a significant relation existed between the two. The management of the schools need to take action regarding the accurately logical use of its heads/ leaders by conducting an analysis of the motivating language perceptions and rectifying any discrepancies. Accordingly, training sessions can be conducted for the school heads in order to promote their understanding and proper usage of motivating language.

References

- Ailan, A. (n.d.). Private govt. pdf. doi: <https://www.rnitee.edu.pk>
- Akhtar, M. (2013). A Comparative Study of Government and Private School Teachers to Explore the Causes of Absenteeism at Secondary Level in District Bahawalnagar, Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 4 (8), 225-229.
- Alqahtani A and Alajmi S (2010) Organizational change and anxiety: A proposed 5R's model. *International Review of Business Research Papers* 6: 93–105.
- Alqahtani, A., (2015). Teachers' perceptions of principals' motivating language and public school climates in Kuwait. *Management in Education*, 29(3), 125-131.
- Anderson, J.R., (1982). Acquisition of cognitive skill. *Psychological Review*, 89(4), 369-406.
- Awan, D. G., & Zia, A. (2015). Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Educational Institutions: A case study of District Vehari-Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (16).
- Awan, A.G. and Kashif Saeed (2014) "Intellectual Capital and Research Performance of Universities in Southern Punjab-Pakistan" *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, Vol.2 No.6 pp 21-39.
- Bentler, P. M., and C., P., Chou (1986). Practical issues in structural modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research* 16(1), 78-117.
- Duncan, A. (2018). How schools work: an inside account of failure and success from one of the nation's longest-serving secretaries of education
- Halpin, A., & Croft, D. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Haroon, M., & Akbar, D. A., (2016). Leader's Motivating Language and Job Performance: Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *NUML International Journal of Business & Management*, 11(1), 70-84.
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal*, 86, 38-49.
- Kunie, K., Kawakami, N., Shimazu, A., Yunekura, Y., & Miamoto, Y., (2017). The Relationship between work engagement and psychological distress of hospital nurses and the perceived communication behaviors of their nurse managers; a cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Nursing studies*, 71, 115-124. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.03.011>.
- Louis, J. S., (2017). *The Effect of Perceived Organisational Support and Motivating Language of Leaders on Job Performance, Satisfaction and Commitment of Employees*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Malaysia.
- Madlock, P. E., & Sexton, S., (2015). An Application of Motivating Language Theory in Mexican Organizations. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 52 (3), 255-272.

- Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M., & Kopf, J. (1995). Motivating language: Exploring theory with scale development. *Journal of Business Communication*, 32, 329–344. doi:10.1177/002194369503200402
- Mayfield, J. R., Mayfielf, M. R., & Kopf, J., (1998). The effects of Leader Motivating Language on Subordinate Performance and Satisfaction. *Human Resource management*, 37 (3&4), 235-248.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2002). Leader communication strategies: Critical paths to improving employee commitment. *American Business Review*, vol. 20, 89-94.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2007). The effects of leader communication on a worker's intent to stay: An investigation using structural equation modeling. *Human Performance*, vol. 20, pp 85-102.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M., (2009). The Role of Leader Motivating Language in Employee Absenteeism. *Journal of Business Communication*, 46(4), 455-479.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2012). The Relationship between Leader Motivating Language and Self-Efficacy A Partial Least Squares Model Analysis. *Journal of Business Communication*, 49(4), 357-376.
- Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M., & Sharbrough, W. C., (2015). Strategic Vision and Values in Top Leaders' Communications Motivating Language at a Higher Level. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 52(1), 97-121.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M., (2018). *Motivating Language Theory: Effective Leader Talk in Workplace*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66930-4>
- Miles, M. B. (1965). Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In *Change processes in the public schools* (pp. 11-34). Eugene: University of Oregon, The Centerfor the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.
- Murtedjo, & Suharningsih. (2018). The role of principal in optimizing school climate in primary schools. *IOP Conf. Series: Journal of Physics: Conf. Series* , 953 (012179), 1-7.
- Mushrooming of private schools in Punjab... numbers and more (2018). Data stories. Doi: <http://www.datastories.pk/>
- Owens R and Valesky T (2014) *Organizational Behavior in Education: Leadership and School Reform* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 79-96.
- Raina, R., & Roebuck, D. B. (2014). Exploring Cultural Influence on Managerial Communication in Relationship to Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and the Employees' Propensity to Leave in the Insurance Sector of India. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 53, 97-130.
- Refozar, R. F., Buenviaje, M. G., Perez, M. P., Manongsong, J. L., & Laguador, J. M., (2017). Extent of Leader Motivating Language on Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction from a Higher Education Institution. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences* , 4(3), 99-107.

- Sabir, S., & Masood, Z. (2018). Leader Motivating Language as predictor of Organizational Commitment: the mediating role of Organizational Climate. *NUML-IJBM*, 13 (1), 118-133.
- Sajjad SMN, Lee PH. Education in Pakistan: Current situation and development challenge. *Sci Insight Edu*. 2016; doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15354/sie.16.vi001>
- Sullivan, J. J. (1988). Three Roles of Language in Motivation Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1), 104-115.
- Sun, P. C., Pan, F. T., & Ho, C. W. (2016). Does Motivating Language matter in leader subordinate communication? *Chinese Journal of communication*, 9 (3), 264-282.
- Susan A. Simmons, William C. Sharbrough III, (2013) "An Analysis of Leader and Subordinate Perception of Motivating Language," *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, Vol. 10, Iss. 3, pp. 11 - 27
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola. M. F. (2006). School climate and state standards: How interpersonal relationships influence student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 386 - 415.
- Wang, C.-W., Hsieh, C.-T., Fan, K.-T., & Menifee, M. (2009). Impact of motivating language on team creativity performance. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 19, 133-140.
- White, Nick & Salle, Tamika & Ashby, Jeffrey & Meyers, Joel. (2014). A Brief Measure of Adolescent Perceptions of School Climate. *School Psychology Quarterly*. 29. 10.1037/spq0000075.

Appendix A: Reliability Analysis

Leader Motivating Language

Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
.920	28

Item-total statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Gives me useful explanations of what needs to be done in my work	42.9565	95.291	-.077	.877
Offers me helpful directions and advice on how to do my job or solving job related problems	43.0000	96.472	-.153	.879
Provides me with easily understandable instructions about my work	43.5391	94.782	-.029	.872
Offers me helpful advice on how to improve my work	43.6261	95.694	-.126	.874
Gives me good definitions of what I must do in order to receive rewards or recognition	43.9870	95.166	-.070	.873
Offers me specific information on how I am evaluated	42.6435	96.161	-.140	.878
Gives me clear instructions about solving job-related problems	42.8043	95.564	-.098	.876
Provides me with helpful information about forthcoming changes affecting my work	43.3565	90.431	.261	.868
Provides me with helpful information about past changes affecting my work	43.8130	88.642	.487	.862

Shares news with me about organizational achievements and financial status	43.7217	88.542	.493	.862
Gives me praise for my good work	43.5913	85.413	.563	.859
Shows me encouragement for my work efforts	43.6130	84.037	.619	.857
Shows concern about my job satisfaction	43.5783	85.503	.626	.858
Expresses his/her support for my professional development	43.2261	79.224	.755	.850
Asks me about my professional well-being	43.5000	82.312	.745	.853
Shows trust in me	43.4217	82.009	.716	.853
Tells me stories about key events in the organization's past	43.2391	81.598	.652	.855
Gives me useful information that I couldn't get through official channels	42.8609	85.675	.484	.861
Tells me stories about people who are admired in my organization	43.3870	77.889	.849	.847
Tells me stories about people who have worked hard in this organization	43.4130	85.414	.648	.857
Offers me advice about how to behave at the organization's social gatherings	43.2696	81.490	.650	.855
Offers me advice about how to "fit in" with other members of this organization	43.5652	84.701	.684	.856
Tells me stories about people who have been rewarded by this organization	43.1391	81.369	.632	.856
Tells me stories about people who have left this organization	43.5478	86.624	.473	.862

School Climate

Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
.868	24

Item-total statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist	56.6435	205.392	.343	.919
A few vocal parents can change school policy	56.6565	203.336	.318	.920
The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal	56.4217	195.136	.544	.917
The learning environment is orderly and serious	56.5304	198.687	.472	.918
The principal is friendly and approachable	56.5478	196.589	.536	.917
Select citizens groups are influential with the board	56.8261	193.812	.722	.914
The school sets high standards for academic performance	56.7565	192.552	.673	.914
Teachers help and support each other	56.4000	193.534	.565	.916
The principal responds to pressure from parents	57.0348	199.291	.548	.916
The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them	55.9913	197.572	.468	.918
Students respect others who get good grades	56.9826	199.118	.529	.917
Teachers feel pressure from the community	56.9696	198.877	.422	.919
The principal maintains definite standards of performance	57.2826	204.352	.400	.918
Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically	56.5870	202.706	.317	.920
Students seek extra work so they can get good grades	57.0739	204.112	.436	.918
Parents exert pressure to maintain high standards	57.2043	202.347	.463	.918

Students try hard to improve on previous work	56.8652	195.951	.631	.915
Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm	56.9826	197.563	.711	.914
Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school	56.8652	198.274	.650	.915
The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation	56.2696	196.774	.421	.920
Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues	57.0783	204.989	.370	.919
Parents press for school improvement	57.1261	200.678	.589	.916
The interactions between faculty members are cooperative	56.8652	197.742	.602	.916
Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them	56.8957	202.749	.401	.919
Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment	56.7870	195.566	.643	.915
The school is vulnerable to outside pressures	57.2913	200.653	.609	.916
The principal is willing to make changes	57.1783	198.689	.668	.915
Teachers “go the extra mile” with their students	57.1261	197.508	.789	.914