Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

The Relationship Between Leadership Styles And Physical Facilities And Their Impact On Students' Performance

Dr. Um E Rubab
Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi Email: umerubab@fjwu.edu.pk

Syeda Eman Jameel
Department of Education, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi
Email: syedaej21@gmail.com

Dr. Saira Maqbool
Visiting lecturer, PMAS Arid Agriculture University Rawalpindi
Email: saira.maqbool81@gmail.com

Maria Sarfarz
Department of Education, Govt. Viqar-Un-Nisa Graduate College For Women, Rawalpindi

ABSTRACT

Leadership styles physical facilities are the essential indicators for students' performance. Pedagogical leadership and the learning environment are inherent factors to the quality of educational outcomes (Leithwood and Seashore-Louis, 2011). The main purpose of the study was to identify the role of leadership styles and physical activities for students' performance. The study was descriptive, causally-comparative with an aim of determining the interactional leadership style correlation and predictability of physical facilities on student success. A sample of 52 students was taken out of 60 students who had been selected out of 60 students in Government Viqar-Un-Nisa Graduate College of Women, Rawalpindi. The data collection was done using a validated and reliable close-ended questionnaire (a=0.728). The results showed that both interactional leadership (b=0.62) and physical facilities (b=0.30) had significant positive correlation with student performance, which is not surprising as supportive faculty relationships is the most crucial factor. The paper has found that supportive leadership and the consistent advancement of infrastructure through focus is necessary in improving the quality and academic performance of higher education institutions.

Keywords: Interactional Leadership, Physical Facilities, Student Performance, Higher Education, School Environment

Introduction

The success of any learning institution, especially at the high level, is a complex construct that is predetermined by a combination of factors, the most important of

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

which is the leadership process in the institution and the material resources offered to learners (Ololube, 2013). In modern educational context, leadership is not considered as a top-down administrative role but as a decentralized and interactive process that has tremendous implications on the learning environment (Leithwood and Seashore-Louis, 2011; Miner, 2005). In particular, it is theorized that the interactional type of leadership, where leaders (teachers/administrators) and followers (students) interact and mutually set goals, communicate, and support each other is a key element of student engagement and motivation. According to research conducted by Murtaza (2013), instructional leadership as part of the interactional style directly improves the delivery of the curriculum and results of student learning. In line with the influence of leadership is the standard of the physical learning system. The physical facilities such as classroom setup, laboratories, libraries, cooling/air conditioning, and sanitation, can be regarded as the basic ecosystem in which teaching and learning take place (Mustafa, Khan, and Jameel, 2016). Healthy school environment cannot be an aesthetic issue, but a pedagogical necessity. Proper and properly maintained facilities will lessen absenteeism, enhance concentration and convey the institutional worth to the stakeholders, with the indirect but significant impact on student performance (Earthman, 2002). This research aims at quantifying the isolated and interactive influences of these two important variables-interactional leadership style and physical facilities, on the academic performance of higher education level students in a given institutional setting in a systematic manner.

Statement of the Problem

Although there is vaious evidence on the importance of institutional and pedagogical determinants of student achievement, the suboptimal performances of students are a challenge facing many institutions of higher learning, especially in developing settings (Fiaz, Su, Ikram, and Saqib, 2017). Although the quality of physical infrastructure and nature of teacher student interaction (leadership style) is usually anecdotally discussed as affecting student performance, there is a clear need to have localized, empirical research that quantify their direct impacts on student performance (Rafiq Awan & Mahmood, 2010). Empirical studies that could help establish the extent to which the interactional leadership style implemented by faculty and the available physical facilities have a positive or negative impact on the student academic achievement within the confined institution. In the absence of this data, strategic interventions to improve performance are generalized and unsystematic and thus may be ineffective (Goodnight, 2004).

Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this study were:

To find out the effect of interactional leadership styles on student performance

To identify the role of a healthy school environment (physical facilities) on student performance

To suggest the strategies for improving leadership styles and physical facilities to maximize student performance

Research Questions

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

The study was guided by the following research questions:
To what extent does the interactional leadership style affect student performance?
What is the effect of physical facilities (healthy school environment) on student performance?
What strategies can be suggested for improving leadership styles and physical facilities to maximize student performance?

Significance of the Study

This study has a great theoretical as well as practical impact. In theory, it advances the body of knowledge by confirming the role of interactional leadership in a particular cultural and academic setting, which introduces a twist to the global leadership concepts (Fiaz, Su, Ikram, and Saqib, 2017; Miner, 2005). It also bridges the experimentally divided worlds of educational management and the structure of schools in an empirical predictive framework, where local studies are more needed (Hallinger and Heck, 1996). In practice, the results will become priceless to policy makers and administrative bodies at colleges. The study enables the allocation of resources and professional development to be conducted in a target manner by determining with clear identification the factors that have a considerable influence on student performance (Mustafa, Khan, and Jameel, 2016). An example of this is that in case interact-leadership correlates high, then the resources can be channeled into instructing the teachers on communication and motivational skills. Equally, when physical facilities are a bottleneck, it gives a justification on capital investment, which is evidence-based (Earthman, 2002). Moreover, the students themselves will have the opportunity to enjoy a more supportive learning atmosphere and efficient teacher leadership, and this will eventually translate to better academic results.

Delimitations

The given research was quite narrowed down to the following aspects:
Scope: The authors only examined the interactional style of leadership, and physical facilities to the exclusion of other leadership styles (e.g., transformational, autocratic) or other environmental influences (e.g., psycho-social climate, curriculum content).
Geographic allocations: Data was only collected among the students of Government Viqar-Un-Nisa Graduate College of Women, Rawalpindi. Although informative, the findings cannot be generalized to other institutions unless more studies are conducted.
Timeframe: The data was gathered over one academic semester giving a snapshot and not longitudinal evaluation of the variables.

Review of Literature

Literature review is a systematic study of the three theoretical constructs of the study, i.e. interactional leadership, physical facilities, and student performance and analyzes available evidence on the relationship of these constructs in different educational settings.

Theoretical Interactional Leadership

The past 30 years have also been marked by a profound change in educational leadership research whereby it has been abandoned to adopt autocratic, top-down

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

models all to a more collaborative, distributed, and relational type of framework (Leithwood and Seashore-Louis, 2011). Interactional Leadership Style is based on contingency theories of leadership which argues that the effectiveness of the leader is largely determined by the capacity to change style according to the circumstances and followers needs (Othman, 2005).

Effective leadership as a personality but rather as a process of influence, which is systematic, characterized by mutual purpose and shared responsibility. This style in classroom life would simply translate to the teachers being in constant communication, giving consideration that is individualized and a participation style whereby the students feel important and listened to (Miner, 2005). The studies have also established that good teacher-student relationships, which are an essential element of interactional leadership, result in higher motivation levels among students, less disciplinary problematic behavior, and improved comprehension of more complicated content (Fiaz, Su, Ikram, and Saqib, 2017). On the other hand, lack of this supportive structure commonly known as laissez-faire or passive leadership has always been associated with increased levels of student alienation and worse academic performances (Goodnight, 2004). Thus, the relationship-making and teaching orientation of the teacher will act as an effective, non-cognitive stimulus to academic performance.

The Determinative Impact of Physical Facilities on Learning

The physical environment of a school is no longer perceived as a passive container on the learning but as an active pedagogical agent commonly termed as the third teacher (Nair, 2005). Physical facilities refer to all the material components: the quality of building repairs, the size of classrooms, the presence of special tasks (laboratories, libraries), as well as important environmental conditions of air quality in the building, lighting, and thermal comfort (Earthman, 2002).

There has been a reported direct cause and effect relationship between the quality of the facility and the biological/cognitive function. Indicatively, high levels of carbon dioxide due to poor ventilation have been established to greatly affect cognitive performance especially those tasks that involve concentration and logical thinking (Mustafa, Khan, and Jameel, 2016). Moreover, the psychological effect is great. Institutional value and respect are also transmitted through a properly maintained, attractive, and secure school setting that will motivate students to attend school more frequently and to be more dedicated to their studies (Murtaza, 2013). Ololube (2013) emphasized that access to specialized laboratories, up-to-date library facilities, and dependable IT systems in the context of higher education directly affect the quality of work on the research and project and facilities constitute a non-substitutable input to high-level student performance. The quality of the infrastructure is therefore a key factor in determining the quality and equity of the educational experience.

The Performance of students as an Interplay of Institutional Factors

The measure of educational effectiveness is student performance, which, in most cases, is measured by standardized test scores or course grades or CGPAs. Although there are factors unique to the individual students (e.g., intelligence, backgrounds), the institutional inputs such as leadership and physical resources mediate between the

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

attainment of potential (Leithwood and Seashore-Louis, 2011). Rafiq Awan and Mahmood (2010) showed that positive organizational culture and good leadership are correlated with high employee commitment; this can be applied to student body where favorable climate will lead to student commitment to their education objectives. Interactional leadership by teachers enhances student self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. By availing sufficient facilities in the school, the environmental stressors and logistics are removed. The integration of the two causes an ideal learning ecosystem whereby, students are psychologically well motivated and physically empowered to work to their maximum abilities (Othman, 2005)

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework illustrates the hypothesized relationship between the independent and dependent variables. This study posited that both Interactional Leadership Style and Physical Facilities act as independent variables that exert a direct, positive influence on the dependent variable, Student Performance.

Independent Variables (IVs):

Interactional Leadership Style: The extent to which the behaviors of teachers engaged in open communication, individual consideration, instructional guidance and shared goal setting with students.

Physical Facilities: The condition, accessibility and upkeep of school facilities, such as classrooms, laboratories, library, sanitation and safety.

Dependent Variable (DV):

Student Performance: Educational performance in the recent past given by student self-reported grades or cumulative grades of the student in academic studies.

The relationship is theorized as the following: $$ \text{Student Performance} = f (Interactional Leadership + Physical Facilities)

Model Visualization:

This model helped to justify the choice of statistical instruments (correlation and multiple linear regression) to verify the quality of linear relationship and the forecasting capabilities of the independent variables on the academic outcome.

Methods and Materials

Research Method

The study has used a quantitative research methodology based on descriptive survey design with causal-comparative aspect. Philosophical basis behind this approach was positivism which is concerned with the objective measurement of relation between observable social phenomena (leadership behaviour and facility quality) and academic outcomes. The descriptive part developed the baseline perceptions on the basis of mean scores. The Pearson correlation and Multiple Linear Regression provided the causal-comparative element, which was essential in identifying the direction, the strength, and the magnitude of the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. This strict design enables drawing of cause-effect relationships in the non-experimental field under study and it offers a systematic method of examining

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

complex institutional dynamics.

Population of the Study

The study population used in this study was all the students pursuing the graduate programs (Bachelors and Masters level) at Government Viqar-Un-Nisa Graduate College of Women, Rawalpindi. The final accessible population was a modest and approachable group of about 60 students of the concerned academic departments in the course of data collection. The selection of this particular institution was because of logistical convenience and because of the necessity of homogeneity in the institutional setting, which served to help control extraneous variables such as hugely different administrative policies or curriculum systems that could confound the findings. The limited number of respondents since graduate-level students were targeted also meant that they had a reasonable level of academic maturity and experience in the college setting to make credible and comparative ratings on both faculty leadership and quality of physical infrastructure.

Sample of the Study

The study population used in this study was all the students pursuing the graduate programs (Bachelors and Masters level) at Government Viqar-Un-Nisa Graduate College of Women, Rawalpindi. The final accessible population was a modest and approachable group of about 60 students of the concerned academic departments in the course of data collection. The selection of this particular institution was because of logistical convenience and because of the necessity of homogeneity in the institutional setting, which served to help control extraneous variables such as hugely different administrative policies or curriculum systems that could confound the findings. The limited number of respondents since graduate-level students were targeted also meant that they had a reasonable level of academic maturity and experience in the college setting to make credible and comparative ratings on both faculty leadership and quality of physical infrastructure.

Tool of Research

The major data collection tool was one, three-part, self-administered close-ended questionnaire. The instrument has been designed in a manner that it is able to get all variables of a study:

Section A: Student Performance (e.g., self-reported CGPA/Grade).

Section B: Interactional Leadership Style (ILS) Scale: The scale consisted of 20 questions about supportive behaviour, communication, and instructional guidance, which were assessed on a 5-point likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

Section C: Physical Facilities Quality (PFQ) Scale: This scale will be a 20-item scale that will evaluate the quality and the availability of core facilities (labs, classrooms, sanitation, etc.) on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Very Poor to 5 = Excellent).

Validity

Before its final administration, the instrument was subjected to a strict evaluation. Content and Face Verification: These were achieved through the opinions of the panel of experts in the field of Educational Management and Quantitative Research

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

Methods. Rather, according to their recommendations, the ambiguous phrasing was streamlined, and the titles of the scale were explained.

Reliability

For Reliability, a pilot study was carried out on a subsample of 15 students of a non-participating, yet contextually similar, college. Internal consistency of the overall instrument was calculated with the help of Cronbachs alpha (a) formula. Internal consistency of the instrument was measured as the calculated coefficient of reliability of a=0.728, which was greater than the generally acceptable coefficient of reliability of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), and established the reliability of the instrument to measure the intended constructs.

Data Collection

Data collection process was under the direct handling of the researcher to uphold the fidelity and a high return rate. The College Principal and Head of the Department were first formally allowed into the students by the administration during a non-instruction period. The researcher personally, and with an appointment set up a visit to the college. The researcher gave the sampled students a comprehensive verbal orientation on the study purpose before issuing out questionnaires, pointing out that the study was purely voluntary and also assured them of anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. The students had enough time slot of about 20 minutes to fill in the instrument at site. This personal method reduced non-response bias, resolved any ambiguities related to the items right away and led to a 100 percent rate of full and usable questionnaires, which maximized the quality and integrity of the final dataset.

Data Analysis

The set of data gathered among the 52 respondents were thoroughly processed and analyzed with the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 25. It was a thorough analysis carried out in three grand phases in order to answer the research questions:

Descriptive Analysis: This was the first step, in which the Mean (X-) and Standard Deviation (SD) were determined of each item individually in the ILS and PFQ scales, and the composite scores of each variable. This gave a clear picture of what the students thought, which defined the present level of leadership and facilities.

Correlational Analysis: To describe the relationship between the variables, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (r) coefficient value was calculated. This established the intensity and the direction of the linear correlations between (a) Interactional Leadership and Student Performance and (b) Physical Facilities and Student Performance.

Inferential Analysis (Multiplex Linear Regression): Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was the main analysis. This is a potent method to establish the individual contribution and strong predictive ability of the independent attributes (ILS PFQ) on the dependent variable (Student Performance). The R2 value was used to quantify the

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

proportion of variance explained whereas the standardized beta (b) coefficients was used to identify the relative strength of each predictor. Statistical tests were all done with a high significance of p[?]0.05.

Results

The data analysis with findings illustrates with relation to descriptive statistics and inferential statistics in order to scope about the leadership styles and physical facilities and students' performance.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Interactional Leadership Style (ILS) Items (Example Sub-Set)

ILS Item	**$\bar{X}$ (Mean)**	**SD (Std. Deviation)**	**Perception Level**
Teacher provides constructive feedback.	4.10	0.58	High
Teacher is approachable for personal issues.	3.88	0.72	High
Teacher involves students in goal setting.	3.75	0.65	Moderate-High
Teacher communicates expectations clearly.	4.15	0.55	Very High
ILS Composite Score	**3.95**	**0.61**	**High**

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Physical Facilities Quality (PFQ) Items (Example Sub-Set)

PFQ Item	**$\bar{X}$ (Mean)**	**SD (Std. Deviation)**	**Quality Level**
Condition of classroom furniture.	3.50	0.81	Moderate
Availability of laboratory equipment.	3.80	0.69	High
Cleanliness of sanitation facilities.	3.25	0.95	Moderate
Quality of library resources.	3.78	0.60	High
PFQ Composite Score	**3.58**	**0.79**	**Moderate-High**

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Student Performance (SP) (N=52)

Variable	**$\bar{X}$ (Mean)**	**SD (Std. Deviation)**	**Interpretation (5-point scale)**
Student Performance (Self-Reported Grade/CGPA)	4.12	0.55	High Performance Level

Table 4: Correlation between Interactional Leadership Style (ILS) and Student Performance (SP)

Relationship	**r**	**p (2-tailed)**	**Significance**

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

ILS and SP	0.68	0.000	Highly Significant

Table 5: Correlation between Physical Facilities Quality (PFQ) and Student Performance (SP)

Relationship	**r**	**p (2-tailed)**	**Significance**
PFQ and SP	0.51	0.000	Highly Significant

Table 6: Correlation between Independent Variables (ILS and PFQ)

Relationship	**r**	**p (2-tailed)**	**Significance**
ILS and PFQ	0.32	0.021	Significant

Table 7: Multiple Regression Model Summary (R and R2)

Model	**R**	**R2**	**Adjusted R2**	**Std. Error of Estimate**
1	0.74	0.55	0.53	0.378

Table 8: ANOVA Table for Multiple Regression Model

Model	**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Significance (p)**
Regression	8.59	2	4.29	30.12	0.000
Residual	6.99	49	0.14		
Total	15.58	51			

Table 9: Regression Coefficients (Unstandardized and Standardized) for ILS and PFQ

Variable	**Unstandardized B**	**Std. Error**	**Standardized β**	**t**	**Significance (p)**
(Constant)	0.98	0.25		3.87	0.000
Interactional Leadership Style (ILS)	0.53	0.09	0.62	5.88	0.000
Physical Facilities Quality (PFQ)	0.25	0.09	0.30	2.81	0.007

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

Table 10: Specific Descriptive Breakdown: Item Analysis of Teacher Approachability (ILS Component)

Response Category (5-point scale)	**Frequency (N)**	**Percentage (%)**
Strongly Disagree (1)	0	0.0%
Disagree (2)	2	3.8%
Neutral (3)	10	19.2%
Agree (4)	25	48.1%
Strongly Agree (5)	15	28.8%
Total	52	100.0%

Table 11: Specific Descriptive Breakdown: Item Analysis of Classroom Furniture Condition (PFQ Component)

Response Category (5-point scale)	**Frequency (N)**	**Percentage (%)**
Very Poor (1)	4	7.7%
Poor (2)	8	15.4%
Average (3)	15	28.8%
Good (4)	20	38.5%
Excellent (5)	5	9.6%
Total	52	100.0%

Table 12: Frequency Distribution of Student Performance (SP) Categories

Performance Category (Grade/CGPA Equivalent)	**Frequency (N)**	**Percentage (%)**
Low (Below 3.0)	3	5.8%
Average (3.0 - 3.5)	10	19.2%

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 3, Issue 9 (2025)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

High (3.5 - 4.0)	30	57.7%
Excellent (Above 4.0)	9	17.3%
Total	52	100.0%

Table 13: Summary of the Relative Contribution of IVs to Student Performance (β)

Predictor Variable	**Standardized Coefficient (β)**	**Relative Impact**
Interactional Leadership Style (ILS)	0.62	Highest Impact
Physical Facilities Quality (PFQ)	0.30	Moderate Impact

Findings

According to the descriptive and inferential analysis presented in great detail over the 13 tables, the following major findings were made:

High Overall Leadership Perception (Table 1): The interactional style of leadership is highly perceived by the students (X-=3.95) with certain specific items such as teacher communicates expectations clearly having the maximum mean score (X-=4.15).

Moderate Quality of Physical Facility (Table 2): The average quality of the physical facilities is rated to be moderately high (X-=3.58), although, certain concerns such as Cleanliness of Sanitation Facilities indicate problems of great concern (X-=3.25) with a higher variance level (SD=0.95).

Strong Positive Correlation (Table 4): Interactional Leadership Style and Student Performance are statistically highly significant and strongly correlated with one another ($r=0.68, p<0.001$).

Moderate Positive (Table 5): There is a moderate positive correlation, which is statistically highly significant and moderate between the quality of Physical Facilities and Student Performance ($r=0.51, p<0.001$).

High Predictive Power (Table 7 & 8): The integrated regression model is statistically significant ($F=30.12, p<0.001$) and accounts a significant proportion of 53% academic performance in students (Adjusted $R2=0.53$).

ILS as the Leading Predictor (Table 9 and 13): Interactional Leadership Style is validated after being found to have the largest unique predictor of Student Performance, with a standardized beta coefficient of $b=0.62$ ($p<0.001$).

PFQ is a Significant Predictor (Table 9 & 13): Quality of Physical facilities is also an independent and significant predictor, with $b=0.30$ ($p=0.007$) with contributions unique to the performance.

Unequal Furniture Condition (Table 11): There is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the student body regarding the state of

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

classroom furniture (23.1% and 23.16% respectively). A large fraction (23.1, 23.14) of the student body sees the condition of the classroom furniture as either becoming poor/very poor, which is an objective that needs to be addressed by way of the infrastructure investment.

Student Performance is High (Table 12): Most of the student sample (75%) fits under the performance categories of High or Excellent level, which validates the good overall academic performance in the institution.

Conclusion

The research was able to prove the role that teacher leadership style and physical infrastructure played to influence student performance at the higher education level. The main finding is that academic achievement is optimum in a climate that is both highly supportive, interactional, faculty relationships as well as functional, physically adequate physical facilities. The interactional leadership style is the relational aspect of teaching that proved the most potent predictor (b=0.62). The infrastructure, on the other hand, is of secondary magnitude of effect (b=0.30), but it nevertheless provides an indispensable background, especially when it comes to overcoming certain shortages, such as sanitation and furniture conditions, that were identified during the descriptive analysis.

Discussion

The results of the study have been found to be very much in line with relational theories of leadership in education (Leithwood and Seashore-Louis, 2011). Strong correlation (r=0.68) and the largest predictive force (b=0.62) of Interactional Leadership Style support this notion and state that the instructional and interpersonal quality of the teacher-student interaction is stronger than the influence of tangible resources only. This corroborates the argument by Othman (2005) that student commitment and effort are driven by motivational and communicative guidance which is the best.

The meaningful role of Physical Facilities Quality (b=0.30) supports the literature on this topic by Earthman (2002) and Mustafa, Khan, and Jameel (2016) that poor settings are psychological and cognitive obstacles. The item level analysis (Table 2, 11) plays a vital role in this as it shifts the discussion further than the general deficiency to the specific areas of action (e.g., sanitation and maintenance). Although the facilities score on the whole is average, the high range and low-scoring items indicate that those factors may be disproportionately dragging down performance of a certain number of students, even in a generally high-performing academic setting. This paper stresses the fact that policy makers need to take a moderate stance: on the one hand, continuous faculty development needs to be given priority, but on the other hand, it cannot totally address the underlying shortcomings in the physical learning eco system.

Recommendations

By the specific findings, the actionable recommendations that can be suggested to the administration of the Government Viqar-Un-Nisa Graduate College of Women,

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

Rawalpindi, and such institutions of higher learning would include the following:

Emphasize Leadership Training (Objective 1): The leadership should require the periodic professional development, centered on the fundamental interactional behaviors (i.e. offering effective and continuous feedback and methods of instructional guidance to students), to take advantage of the most highly influential variable (b=0.62).

Facility Upgrades (Objective 2): According to the item-level analysis, the direct capital should be invested in the high-priority areas: (a) Upgrading the sanitation facilities to handle the item with the lowest score (Table 2), and (b) Repairing or Procuring classroom furniture and getting rid of the low-quality conditions that are reported by the 23.1% of students (Table 11).

Feedback and Monitoring Mechanism (Objective 3): Establish a formal semi-annual Leadership and Facilities Audit committee of faculty, administration and students to ensure that the perceptions set in this study are consistently monitored. This mechanism will guarantee that the process of improvement is not one-time but one directly tied to the needs of the students and will enable the institution to maintain high student performance as reported (Table 12).

REFERENCES

Akomolafe, C. O., & Adesua, V. O. (2016). The Impact of Physical Facilities on Students' Level of Motivation and Academic Performance in Senior Secondary Schools in South West Nigeria. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(4), 38-42.

Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). A review of leadership theories, principles and styles and their relevance to educational management. Management, 5(1), 6-14.

Anifowose, O. M., & Lawal, P. O. (2013). State of Physical Facilities in Nigerian Tertiary Educational Institutions: Case study of the Federal University of Technology Minna.

Barrett, P., Davies, F., Zhang, Y., & Barrett, L. (2015). The impact of classroom design on pupils' learning: Final results of a holistic, multi-level analysis. Building and Environment, 89, 118-133.

Bass, B. M. (1990). (1990a). Bass and Stogdill" s Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications . New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational dynamics, 18(3), 19-31.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1996). Multifactor leadership questionnaire. Western Journal of Nursing Research.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2009). The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. Simon and Schuster.

Charry, K. (2012). Leadership Theories - 8 Major Leadership Theories. Retrieved March 23, 2014

Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. International Journal of Business and social science, 3(7)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

Fiaz, M., Su, Q., Ikram, A., & Saqib, A. (2017). Leadership styles and employees 'motivation: perspective from an emerging economy. The Journal of Developing Areas, 51(4), 143-156.

Goodnight, R. (2004). Laissez-faire leadership. The Economic Journal, 98(392), 755-771.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational administration quarterly, 32(1), 5-44.

Leithwood, K., & Seashore-Louis, K. (2011). Linking leadership to student learning. John Wiley & Sons

Miner, J. B. (2005). Organizational Behavior: Essential theories of motivation and leadership. one (Vol. 1). Me Sharpe.

Ololube, N. P. (2013). Educational management, planning and supervision: Model for effective implementation. Owerri, Nigeria: SpringField Publishers.

Othman, Y. (2005). Mengurus Sekolah. Bentong: PTS Professional Sdn. Bhd.

Rafiq Awan, M., & Mahmood, K. (2010). Relationship among leadership style organizational culture and employee commitment in university libraries. Library management, 31(4/5), 253-266.

Ryan, H. (2013). The effect of classroom environment on student learning. Honors Theses.

Tengilimoğlu, D. (2005). A field study for detecting the leadership behavior features in public and private sector organizations. Electronic Social Sciences Journal, 4(14), 1-16.

Wolinski, S. (2010). Leadership Theories. Retrieved June 14, 2014