Tatweer School Principals' Perceptions of New Authorities Granted in the Initial Steps of Decentralization

Salah Salih Meemar
Western Michigan University, salah.memar@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons, and the International and Comparative Education Commons

Recommended Citation

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.
TATWEER SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF NEW AUTHORITIES
GRANTED IN THE INITIAL STEPS OF DECENTRALIZATION

by

Salah S. Meemar

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Educational Leadership, Research and Technology
Western Michigan University
December 2014

Doctoral Committee:

Sue Poppink, Ph.D., Chair
Louann Bierlein Palmer, Ed.D.
Wafa Hassan, Ed.D.
In 2011, the Saudi Ministry of Education (MOE) conferred 21 new authorities in addition to the previous 31 to their school principals. A main goal in conferring these authorities was to facilitate decentralization of Saudi school districts. To further facilitate decentralization, 900 schools were selected as Tatweer schools. Tatweer, also known as the King Abdullah Public Education Development Project, is a pilot program designed to match Saudi standards of education to that of other nations. To date, few studies have explored principals’ perceptions of the new authorities. A review of literature revealed just three studies on the topic (see Allheani, 2012; Alhumaidhi, 2013; Alotaibi, 2013). The purpose of this study was to examine Tatweer school principals’ perceptions of the new administrative and technical authorities granted to them in the initial steps of decentralization. Specifically, this study explored: (a) the extent to which principals perceive they have the ability to implement the new authorities, (b) the level of support they perceive in implementing the new authorities, (c) their beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities at achieving MOE outcomes, and (d) additions they would like to their current authorities.

A total of 173 Tatweer school principals completed the online survey developed for this study. Overall, findings suggest Saudi principals perceived they have limited ability and low to moderate support in implementing the new authorities. Furthermore
participants only slightly agreed that the authorities were likely to achieve MOE outcomes. Multiple regression analysis revealed that beliefs on the effectiveness of the authorities at achieving MOE outcomes were predicted by perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, perceived support to implement technical authorities, and years of experience. Analysis of an open-ended question revealed suggestions for new authorities in five categories: (a) staff issues, (b) school budget, (c) power in decision-making, (d) operational issues, and (e) other. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that continued changes in Saudi Arabia’s educational structure are required as it relates to improving principals’ perceptions of their ability and support to implement the MOE’s new authorities. Recommendations are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Saudi schools have done much to provide students with traditional forms of education; however, increased globalization and competition among nations highlight a need for greater problem-solving and technical skills among Saudi students. In 2003, Saudi Arabia participated in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), a global comparison of mathematics and science achievement at the fourth and eighth-grade levels. Saudi scores were among the lowest of all 45 participating countries sampled in the study (TIMSS, 2006). These results were shocking to Saudi officials, and added to already existing challenges in the country due to population growth, increased cultural diversity, and an extensive geographical area, which contributed to difficulties operating the country’s centralized education system.

In response to its schools’ many challenges, the Saudi government has embarked on a journey to improve the quality and relevance of its education services. The $2.4 billion King Abdullah Public Education Development Project (or, Tatweer, as it is known in Arabic) was launched in 2007 with the aim of transforming education for its 4.5 million school students by introducing a more modern system of instruction (Tatweer Plan, 2010). Specifically, the Tatweer project was designed to match Saudi Arabia’s standard of education to that of other nations. The vision of the Tatweer project is that “the districts of the future will be mini-ministries of education that are fully empowered to develop district-wide development plans, and ensure that every boy and girl in the district has the opportunity to learn and succeed” (Tatweer Plan, 2010, p. 6). Accordingly, budgets have been allocated for the construction of new schools, extracurricular activities,
the training and professional development of teachers and principals, and curriculum development (Mathis, 2010).

Today, 900 out of 30,067 Saudi schools are Tatweer schools (Tatweer School, 2012). These 900 schools consist of those covered by the Tatweer project in its first and second stages. These 900 schools were selected because they met the following standards: (1) good building facilities and equipment; (2) the school is close to the administrative building of the school district; (3) the principal has experience and desires to develop and implement improvements; and (4) the school’s team of teachers is distinctive and stable (Tatweer Plan, 2010). The remaining schools will be covered in later stages of the project. The main goal for Tatweer is developing curriculum and learning materials to meet current and future skill needs. It also aims to promote learning and provide professional development for leaders, managers, and all school staff (Tatweer Plan, 2010).

Prior to Tatweer, in 2001, the Saudi Ministry of Education (MOE) transferred 31 authorities to school districts as a first step toward decentralization (decision number 1139/1). Decentralization is considered a way to achieve a number of Tatweer reforms and keep up with the developed world. Decentralized school districts have been implemented in a number of countries (Taneiji & McLeod, 2008), and Hanson (2000) found that “virtually every country in North, Central, and South America has some type of educational decentralization reform underway currently” (p. 1). Nearly all East Asian countries are introducing some form of educational decentralization as well (Leung, 2004).
According to Alghamdi and Abdullgawad (2002), “one of the most important problems of the Saudi education system is that it is centralized” (p. 81). A related problem in Saudi schools is the imbalance between principals’ responsibility to facilitate decentralization and their limited authority, which has created a sense of increased pressure and dissatisfaction among school principals (Alsalih, 2010). The MOE concedes that the school principals need more authority to implement the comprehensive reforms currently taking place. Therefore, in 2011, the MOE conferred a total of 52 authorities to school principals, comprising the initial 31 granted in 2001, plus an additional 21 new authorities.

School principals are one of the most significant participants in current Saudi school reforms, especially as it relates to decentralization. In order to assess the effectiveness of the initial steps of decentralization, it is important to explore school principals’ perceptions of the extent to which they believe (a) they have ability to implement the new authorities granted to them, (b) the level of support they have for implementing the new authorities, (c) the effectiveness of the new authorities at achieving MOE outcomes, and (d) the need for additional authorities. For the purpose of this study, ability is defined as the extent to which school principals possess the knowledge and skills necessary to implement the new authorities. Support is defined as the extent to which Saudi school principals believe they have the resources, training, and administrative level support to implement the new authorities. Effectiveness is the extent to which principals believe the new authorities will help to achieve the MOE’s intended outcomes.
Problem Statement

Consistent with global trends in decentralized educational authority, the MOE in Saudi Arabia recently decided to grant school principals more decision-making authority to reduce bureaucracy and facilitate school decentralization initiatives. Yet, a general strategy to support school principals in implementing necessary changes is lacking (Alghamdi, 2013). Astiz (2004) claimed school administrators are without the training and time to deal with matters associated with decentralization. Furthermore, according to Alderweesh (2003), "In Saudi Arabia, any teacher could apply to be a principal or principal's assistant after a few years of teaching experience" (p. 1). This suggests that many school principals may be novices, and may not understand: (a) current reforms, (b) the purpose of decentralization, and (c) how to initiate change (Scott & Jaffe, 2004).

As school principals are the educational leaders charged with overseeing education reform at the local level, it is important to consider their understanding about proposed or mandated changes. Yet, to date few studies have explored their perceptions of the new authorities conferred to them by the Saudi MOE, despite the fact that the MOE was to evaluate these authorities one year after the implementation. A review of literature revealed just three studies on the topic. Allheani (2012) conducted a general study of school principals’ attitudes regarding the new authorities and found that principals’ attitudes were high (i.e., more positive) on administrative authorities which help a school principal to manage programs and employees, and technical authorities that help a school principal to manage school building and equipment, but low (i.e., more negative) on financial authorities. Alotaibi (2013) focused on the degree to which principals were practicing the new authorities, and found that their actual practices
ranged from low to high, depending on the specific authority, and practicing their new technical authorities ranged from moderate to high. Alhumaidhi (2013) found significant barriers for school principals in practicing their new authorities, including: the new authorities were highly inflexible, poorly prepared school staff members were poorly prepared to assist school principals, and a general lack of funds to manage the school effectively.

While each study looked at the extent to which principals in Saudi Arabia are practicing the new authorities, none of them specifically addressed the principals’ perceptions of their ability to implement the new authorities, the level of support to implement the new authorities, their effectiveness at achieving MOE outcomes, and the school principals’ needs or desires for additional authorities. Without this perspective, Saudi officials have little to guide decisions concerning which authorities the school principals are able to implement, the support needed for implementing the new authorities, and which additional authorities they should grant school principals as the MOE continues to work toward decentralization of the country’s education system.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to describe Tatweer school principals’ perceptions regarding the new authorities granted to them in the initial steps of decentralization. Specifically, this study explored school principals’ perceptions of the extent to which they believe: (a) they have ability to implement the new authorities granted to them, (b) the level of support they have for implementing the new authorities, (c) the effectiveness of the new authorities at achieving Ministry of Education outcomes,
and (d) the needed for additional authorities they would like to add to the current authorities.

The research questions that guided this study are:

1. To what extent do Tatweer school principals believe,
   a. that they have the ability to implement the new authorities;
   b. that they have support for implementing the new authorities; and
   c. how effective the new authorities are at achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

2. When holding various demographic variables constant, to what extent do Tatweer school principals’ perceptions of their ability and support to implement the new authorities predict their perceptions regarding the effectiveness the new authorities in achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

3. What additional authorities do these school principals suggest be added to their current authorities?

**Conceptual Framework**

This study utilized a survey research approach to explore Saudi school principals’ perceptions of the new authorities conferred on them by the MOE for the purpose of decentralization. The conceptual framework shown in Figure 1 illustrates the many challenges faced by principals in the Saudi school system, and the response of the Saudi government toward improving the quality and relevance of its education services. As discussed, one of these changes was the granting of new authorities to assist school principals in leading the school.
The new Tatweer Saudi education system is based on organizational learning theory. According to Argyris and Schon (1996), organizational learning theory is a product of organizational inquiry. This means that whenever an expected outcome differs from actual outcome, an individual or group should engage in inquiry to understand, and if necessary, solve this inconsistency. The Tatweer reforms adopted organizational learning theory to engage school principals in the change process of its school system, which led to the MOE giving principals new authorities to help them better lead their schools, especially toward decentralization.

The conceptual framework depicts one way to explore Tatweer reform regarding these new authorities. This exploration includes explorer principals’ perceptions of their ability to implement their new authorities, their perceptions of the level of support they have to implement the new authorities, and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the new authorities, which as Figure 1 shows, may lead to a desire for new authorities.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework of the Study.
In my conceptual diagram (Figure 1), the first triangle illustrates the Tatweer project, which, as mentioned, was developed using the organizational learning theory. The circles represent the new authorities granted in the initial steps of decentralization. Next, the first square represents the principals’ perceptions of their ability to implement each of the 21 newest authorities granted in 2011 (see Appendix list of authorities). The second square represents principals’ perceptions of the level of support they receive in implementing the newest authorities. The third square represents the school principals’ beliefs concerning the effectiveness the new authorities in achieving MOE intended outcomes. Finally, the rectangle represents desired additional new authorities and identifies areas in which the current authorities may be insufficient.

After examining data obtained concerning the first, second, and third squares to answer research question 1, this study examined the relationship among these variables to answer research question 2. Data obtained concerning the variables in the rectangle further elucidated the answers to both research questions 1 and 2. This may give researchers and decision-makers reasons for MOE outcomes that have not materialized, and further insight into what may help school principals to better achieve these outcomes.

**Methods Overview**

This study was conducted utilizing descriptive quantitative survey research methods (Hale, 2011). I selected this approach because it allowed me to efficiently contact all 900 Tatweer school principals, and eliminated the potential for sampling bias.

Because few studies have examined principals’ perceptions of the new authorities conferred to them by the MOE in the initial steps of decentralization, a survey specifically addressing this issue was developed for the purpose of this study. Once the
initial survey was developed, a small group of experts was asked to review a draft for the purpose of providing feedback related to the survey’s content. After its reviewers and HSRIB approved the survey, all 900 Tatweer school principals were invited to participate in an online administration of the survey. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and linear regression.

**Significance of the Study**

Decentralization of the national education system and the new authorities granted to school principals in the initial steps of decentralization are important aspects of education reform in Saudi Arabia. However, Saudi education leaders must be prepared to face the challenges posed by these reforms. As Taneiji and McLeod (2008) noted, transition from a centralized to decentralized school system involves complex change, and such major change has its risks in the change process itself and then in the consequences of the types of changes made.

Therefore, Saudi MOE leadership will benefit from the knowledge gained through this study and then might be willing to work with the individuals implementing these reforms, and to create a shared vision for decentralization if the reforms are to be successful. As Kotter (1996) noted, "Leadership defines what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles" (p. 25). According to Bush (2003), “vision is increasingly regarded as an essential component of effective leadership” (p. 6). With a shared vision, greater leadership can take place from both Saudi government officials and school principals in order to overcome the challenges posed reforms.
Principals may need to learn new skills and competencies, including those connected with leadership and management (Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2004). They may also be required to introduce a number of improvement strategies to implement the authorities effectively in schools (Hess, 1999). Yet, prior to this study, little was known about what strategies or additional authorities Saudi school principals believe they need to facilitate decentralization.

This study enhances the current understanding of school principals’ perceptions of the new authorities conferred on them by the MOE. This enhanced understanding could help the MOE create training courses that enable school principals to implement their new authorities successfully. The results of this study could also influence the Saudi Ministry of Higher Education to develop undergraduate and graduate programs in educational leadership and school administration that focus on helping Saudi principals implement the new authorities. The results could also prompt the MOE to provide school principals with additional authorities as the national education system continues to transition toward decentralization. Further study of the issues raised by participants may help provide direction, suggestions, and recommendations for policymakers planning for the effective implementation of decentralization.

**Definition of Terms**

**Authorities**

The authorities in this study are only those new powers granted to school principals by Saudi Ministry of Education decision number 32155521/S in 2011, i.e., the 21 additional powers not granted by decision number 1139/1 in 2001.
Administrative Authorities

Those powers that help school principal to manage programs and employees.

Technical Authorities

Those powers that help school principal to manage school building and equipment.

Ability

The extent to which school principals possess the knowledge and skill to implement the new authorities.

Support

The extent to which Saudi school principals believe they have the resources, training, and administrative level support to implement the new authorities conferred upon them by the Ministry of Education.

Decentralization

The Saudi Ministry of Education’s new system of managing schools wherein school districts and school principals are given greater authority to lead their schools.

Effectiveness

The extent to which the new authorities achieved MOE outcomes included in decision number 32155521/S.

Tatweer

The King Abdullah Project for Development of Public Education in Saudi Arabia.
Tatweer Schools

The schools that implement the new public education sector strategies radically alter the Saudi education model bringing it in line with the highest international standards, according to a source at King Abdullah Bin Abdul Aziz Public Education Development Project (Tatweer), currently 900 Saudi schools are implementing the Tatweer project as a second stage of the project.

Chapter I Summary

The present research study focuses on recent education reforms in Saudi Arabia, specifically the granting of new authorities to local school principals by the MOE in the initial steps of decentralization. Prior to this study, there was little known about Saudi school principals’ perceptions of these new authorities in terms of their ability to use them, the level of support they have to use them, and the effectiveness of the authorities for achieving MOE outcomes for decentralization. The results of the study provide valuable information to further facilitate the process of decentralization in Saudi Arabia.

The remainder of this dissertation contains four additional chapters. Chapter II sets the study in context by outlining the history and structure of the Saudi education system, and provides a review of literature concerning Saudi school principals and decentralization. The methods used to conduct the study are explained in Chapter III. Chapter IV presents the results of the study, while Chapter V offers a summary of key findings and conclusions.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The primary aim of this quantitative research study was to explore how school principals in Saudi Arabia perceive the new authorities conferred to them by the Ministry of Education in the initial steps of decentralization. To achieve this aim, it was important to understand current education reforms in Saudi Arabia, the process of decentralizing the education system in Saudi Arabia, and the new authorities conferred to school principals as a part of national education reform. Due to the limited amount of research in this particular field in Saudi Arabia, this literature review also includes relevant literature from other countries and fields of study.

Education in Saudi Arabia

General education in Saudi Arabia consists of kindergarten, six years of primary school, three years of intermediate school, and three years of high school. There are currently over 2,323 kindergartens, 13,845 elementary schools, 8,241 intermediate schools, and 5,658 high schools in 13 regions around Saudi Arabia. Approximately 5,187,498 students attend these schools where they are served by 501,111 academic staff (MOE, 2012). In most cases, meals and transportation are not substantially subsidized; however, transportation is made available free of charge to female students.

In grades 1 through 12, the school year is divided into two semesters. At the end of each semester, there is an examination that covers one-half of the required subjects material. Students’ marks for two semesters are added together to make the students' grade for the full year. If the final mark is below 50%, the student fails in that subject and
sits for another test at the end of the summer recess. If the student fails again, he will repeat the whole year (Badawood, 2003).

Two main agencies, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education, set the goals and guidelines for all educational services in Saudi Arabia. The Ministry of Education (MOE) sets overall standards for the country's educational system (Alsofyan, 2002). The primary objectives of Saudi educational policy are: (a) to ensure that education becomes more aptitude to meet the religious, economic, and social needs of the country, and (b) to eradicate illiteracy among Saudi adults. While there are other governmental agencies that have some educational responsibilities, these two are the main service providers (Oyaid, 2009). All education policies in Saudi Arabia are subject to government control, despite the country’s large number of schools and expansive geographical distance.

Direct school administration in Saudi Arabia occurs at three levels: building, school district, and national. At the building level, school principals manage the day-to-day operation of the school. At the district level, all schools in a particular area belong to a district directorate, which constitutes the link between individual schools and the MOE. At the national level, the MOE, located in Riyadh, the country's capital, is responsible for the hiring of staff, setting educational policies and curricula, allocating financial resources, selecting textbooks, and the overall supervision and administration of the educational effort (Badawood, 2003).

Despite the large geographic area and number of students served by the Saudi Arabia school system, even the fundamental decisions are issued from the MOE. Thus, the school principals are working as managers of their schools rather than school leaders.
Education Reform in Saudi Arabia

Recent education reform in Saudi Arabia has largely consisted of reforms associated with the country’s Tatweer project. The sections below discuss Tatweer and the schools associated with the reform.

Tatweer Reform

A number of reforms have been passed in Saudi Arabia, the largest and most important being the King Abdullah Project for the Development of Education (also known as Tatweer). Increased globalization and competition among nations highlight a need for greater problem-solving and technical skills among Saudi students. The $2.4 billion Tatweer project was launched in 2007 with the aim of transforming the Saudi school system into a more modern model of education. To help accomplish this aim, the MOE chose organizational learning theory to serve as the framework for its newly developing school system. Argrys and Schon (1996) identified three levels of learning that may be present in an organization: (a) single loop learning, which consists of one feedback loop wherein a strategy is modified in response to an unexpected result; (b) double loop learning, which occurs when the values, strategies, and assumptions that govern performance are changed to create a more efficient environment; and (c) deutero-learning, or learning about improving the learning system itself, which is composed of structural and behavioral components that determine how learning takes place.

Thus, it appears the MOE is trying to integrate self-learning into the Saudi school system in order to build the capacity of its schools to lead their own development. Accordingly, aspects of the Tatweer reform focus on self-evaluation, self-learning, self-reliance, the formation of think-tanks to address constraints in achieving quality, and
building an integrated system of educational standards, evaluation, and accountability (Tatweer Plan, 2010). To translate its vision for a new system of education into solid, tangible lines of actions, the MOE through its Tatweer project identified 10 strategic objectives, which it calls enablers. These enablers include: (1) empowering districts and schools to manage and lead change; (2) improving curriculum, instruction, and assessment to improve student success; (3) providing equitable learning opportunities and support systems for all students; (4) providing early childhood education for all; (5) providing a world-class environment conducive to student learning; (6) promoting student health, character, discipline, and welfare; (7) engaging families and community partners to support a culture of learning; (8) developing a system to professionalize teaching practice; (9) leveraging technology to improve school and student performance, and (10) improving governance, leadership, and policies to sustain change (Tatweer Plan, 2010).

The MOE is focused primarily on developing administrative policies, plans, and regulations to empower school districts and their school principals to lead development in their own regions. This approach also links institutions and individuals into networks of collective action (Tatweer Plan, 2010). The current study focused on school principals and the new authorities granted to them in the initial steps of decentralization. One of the ways the Tatweer program seeks to transform Saudi schools is by creating school districts that cultivate innovation, and promote excellence and distinction. These school districts will be responsible for creating lateral networks among schools to enable improved sharing of knowledge and experience. Accordingly, effective knowledge management will be a defining characteristic of the districts of the future (Tatweer Plan, 2010).
**Tatweer School**

The Tatweer project has three stages. The first stage was designed to start from 2011 to 2012. In this stage, the MOE built a module for change, developed standards, set criteria for selection of Tatweer schools, and trained staff. The second stage focused on implementation and lasted from 2012 to 2014. During this time, 210 schools were selected as the first schools to implement the Tatweer project. In these initial schools, the MOE focused on improving its model for change and supporting the units who supervised the schools. The third stage started in 2014 and will last until 2017. In this stage, all schools in Saudi Arabia will be covered by the Tatweer project (Tatweer Plan, 2010).

Currently, 900 schools participate in the Tatweer project. These schools should meet the following standards: (1) good building facilities and equipment; (2) the school is close to the administrative building of the school district; (3) the principal has experience and desires to develop and implement improvements; and (4) the school’s team of teachers is distinctive and stable (Tatweer Plan, 2010). In addition to meeting these standards, Tatweer schools also focus on self-evaluation, which enables schools to evaluate themselves on nine axes: (1) school leadership; (2) school environment; (3) school curriculum; (4) teaching; (5) extracurricular activities; (6) school counseling; (7) professional development; (8) evaluation; and (9) school community (Tatweer Plan, 2010). Ideally, these schools will reach a stage of building efficiency before publication and dissemination of the Tatweer project for all schools.
The sections below discuss changes that occurred in Saudi school system during the initial steps of decentralization, and cover decentralization in terms of the types, effectiveness, and global trends.

**Decentralization of Saudi School Systems**

Schools in developing countries such as Saudi Arabia are described as having a highly centralized system where the decision-making is from the top to bottom and there is a lack of school autonomy (Alzaidi, 2008). However, in recent years, the Saudi education system has witnessed a number of reforms toward decentralization that give principals more authority. Research on the study of decentralization in school, in Saudi Arabia is a somewhat difficult task, given that the term *decentralization* is new in Arabian culture. In Saudi Arabia, the business community has embraced the decentralization concept for a longer period when compared with the country’s educational system. Accordingly, some of the literature in the following sections is referenced from the business sector. Additionally, there is a thorough discussion of global trends in decentralization, as many of the Saudi governments’ current efforts are modeled after countries that have already engaged in the decentralization process.

**Global Trends in Decentralization**

Globalization and the evolution of a knowledge-based economy have caused radical changes in the function of education systems in most countries around the world. Comprehensive reforms typically focus on improving countries in the global market place by strengthening the education training of their workforce. Realizing the importance of allowing more autonomy for schools in charting their own courses of development, many countries have introduced decentralization policies that provide
schools with more of the decision-making freedom and flexibility necessary to develop their school (Mok, 2003).

Over the past few decades, decentralization has become one of the most debated policy issues throughout both developing and developed worlds. It is seen as central to the development efforts of countries as far afield as Chile, China, Guatemala, Nepal, Singapore, Indonesia, Bolivia and Colombia. It is also squarely in the foreground of policy discourse in the European Union, United Kingdom, and United States (Faguet & Sanchez, 2008).

Decentralized education systems have become a trend in many developing countries; however, decentralization is not a total solution to the many problems in education faced by these countries (Toi, 2010; Turner & Hulme, 1997). One of the adverse effects of decentralization is disparity between regions in terms of educational achievement. As Sigerson et al. (2011) noted, “Principals must feel a level of autonomy but must not be left to make all decisions alone” (p. 7). Additionally, those who are assigned to implement decentralization policies may feel overwhelmed if not provided with the proper training. Thus, there is a need to explore Saudi school principals’ perceptions of the support they have to implement mandated changes toward decentralization.

Types and Effectiveness of Decentralization

Decentralized school systems promote inclusiveness in school culture and honor diversity of thought within each school community by giving educators at the local level real power to make more decisions (Alalaq, 2000; Osorio, Anthony, & Fasih 2009). Alharbi (1900), Abdulqader (1984), and Mustafa (2002) identified a number of other
decentralization benefits such as autonomy, speed in decision-making, and elimination of some ineffective aspects of bureaucracy. Decentralization also facilitates political openness, participation, tolerance, and is seen as “a way of increasing the capacity of local governments by delivering public sector modernization” (Grindle, 2007, p. 66).

There are some researchers, however, who have identified a number of disadvantages with decentralization. According to Allheaniy (2012), in his study of the attitudes of principals in Makkah about the new authorities, stated that one disadvantage of decentralization is a “Lack of equitable distribution among employees, increased fiscal spending, duplication of work, and lack of confidence in the selection of staff” (p. 30). Given this disadvantage, it may be important to find a balance between centralized and decentralized school systems (Alagbari, 2006). Waters and Marzano’s (2006) study of the effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement discovered new boundaries for autonomy. Rather than allowing administrators complete control, they found that when superintendents provided specific autonomic parameters, the district administration had a positive effect on student success.

Given research indicating the importance of balance in decentralization, the Saudi MOE is attempting to implement what it calls disciplined decentralization. The MOE in Saudi Arabia made the decision to take a balanced approach between a centralized and decentralized education system by conferring specific authorities to principals that would bring necessary changes to the education system’s authorities and responsibility structure, while maintaining some of the advantages of a centralized system. By empowering school principals with new authorities, the Saudi MOE believes school principals can
assist in making necessary improvements in the country’s school structure, leading to greater development (International Labor Office, 2008).

Forms of decentralization vary depending on the rationale with which the government approaches the reform (Lauglo, 1995). Lauglo (1995) categorized different forms of decentralization based on what they are design to accomplish: (1) a politically legitimate dispersal of authority, (2) improvements in the quality of services rendered, and (3) the efficient use of resources. Decentralization is also commonly characterized by how power and centralized functions are transferred to sub-national governments and their constituencies (Daba, 2010, p. 123). In their most recent work, Cheema and Rondinelli (2007) studied the decentralizing governance and emerging concepts and practices, and categorized decentralization based on the kind of authority that is transferred. Darmawan (2008) classified decentralization based on the degree of authority that is transferred, and to whom the authority is transferred. He divided decentralization into at least four types: (1) de-concentration of responsibilities from central government ministries and departments to subnational and local levels; (2) delegation, or the transfer of responsibility from central government to semiautonomous organizations not wholly controlled by the central government but ultimately accountable to it; (3) devolution, which happens when the central government transfers full authority for decision making, finance, and management to quasi-autonomous units of local government; and (4) transfer of responsibilities to nongovernmental organizations.

Considering the focus of this study, the latter type of decentralization will not be elaborated on further, as it falls beyond the study’s focus of attention. However, in practice, all countries have a combination of these types of decentralization, ranging from
a focus on de-concentration and delegation with limited power devolution to a stronger focus on the devolution of political, financial, and administrative authority given directly to elected local governments (Darmawan, 2008). In general, the new authorities that have been conferred to Saudi principals in the initial steps of decentralization represent the delegation type of decentralization more than any other type.

In general, the literature points to four factors that could lead to the success or failure of decentralization in education. These factors include: (a) the cultural context in which devolution of education takes place, (b) political support from national leaders and local elites, (c) adequate planning management, and (d) local empowerment (Khan, 2011). However, decentralization across the globe operates differently according to the country’s unique circumstances; therefore, the aims and outcomes of decentralization are unpredictable. Whenever there is no clear-cut criterion for distribution of powers between federal governments and executives of subnational governments, the whole system appears locked (Mustafa, 2009).

**The Principalship in Saudi Arabia**

Educational reform in Saudi Arabia has been greatly influenced by the leadership of local schools. Yet, according to the Saudi MOE, school principals receive little or no leadership training before assuming their posts as educational leaders (Aldarweesh, 2003). Effective educational reform would require principals who are prepared to lead change, and understanding the individuals’ responsible for leading that change would be vital to the success of the reforms.

Saudi school principals are often unable to solve problems in their schools due to several factors that include limited decision-making power, a lack of resources, and lack
of training. Alsufyan (2002) confirmed this through interviews with 50 principals of Saudi high schools in Riyadh, in which he identified problems their schools face, initiatives that would address the problems, and barriers to the identification of problems and implementation of solutions. Many leadership studies strongly recommend that problem-solving and decision-making are important skills for leaders to learn. There are other factors affecting the implementation of education initiatives as well, most of them derived from the role principals are assigned inside a centralized educational system and the way in which the school governance system is structured. As Alsufyan (2002) noted, “most principal failure in student relations is an inevitable outcome of the broadly structural bureaucratic policy and process, which encourages problems that otherwise would be considered intolerable and would be resolved, rather than leaving Saudi school principals to face administrative quagmires” (p. 74).

As Saudi Arabia looks to reform its educational system in a way that follows global trend practices, “educators need to examine the leadership role and the perspective of that role of those individuals who will be responsible for leading the changes - the school principals” (Mathis, 2010, p. 3). Fullan (2001) concurred stating that, “Principals should have no problem claiming their fair share of frustration, since the role of the principal has in fact become dramatically more complex, overloaded, and unclear” (p. 137).

During the transition toward decimalization, Saudi principals must be leaders of change. Demers (2007) described "real" change as "a period of discontinuity, of disruption; it is talked about in terms of transformation and revolution" (p. 43). Saudi principals will be required to sustain these periods of disruption and discontinuity in
order for the reforms to be realized as change. Principals as leaders of change must understand necessary types of change. However, Shakhis (1984) in his study of the empirical investigation into educational leadership styles, attitudes, and needs in Saudi Arabia, found that Saudi school principals often do not serve as leaders because of the bureaucratic and centralized system. And, Alsufyan (2002) found that principals who are trapped in traditional centralized systems are often relegated to the position of managers and lack the power to influence change. Saudi educational leaders such as school principals are needed as the facilitators to smoothly integrate modern and traditional ideas during the current period of change.

Research in the United States has found that the principal has a major effect on the school's climate (Norton, 1984; Ubben & Hughes, 1992). Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980) noted that, "the behavior of the principal is crucial in determining school success" (p. 468). Wong and Evers (2001) supported this view when they observed that the leadership role of the principal is one of the main elements of a school's effectiveness.

Principals who provide effective leadership help their schools reach their major goals (Wong & Colin, 2001). Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005) in their report, “The School Leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals,” conducted in-depth case analyses of eight highly developed in-service program models in five states focused on the roles of the principal and the associated array of professional tasks and competencies. They described the expectations of principals as people who must be “visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations/communication experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special program administrators, as well as guardians of
various legal, contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives” (Davis et al., 2005, p. 1). With these characteristics, principals are able to lead schools in accomplishing their educational goals and improve the lives of their students and families.

On the other hand, leadership as a theoretical construct is very limited in developing countries. Badawood (2003) in his study of the development of leadership skills of private high school principals in Jeddah pointed out “in Saudi Arabia, leadership is a term that is used almost exclusively in the military or for high-ranking government people” (p. 10). Instead, words such as head, manager, organizer, boss, director, supervisor, and administrator are used to name people who serve as leaders. In addition, necessary knowledge and insight for educational leadership are considered to be at "injuriously low levels" (Alkherb, 1996). Research has called for reforms to develop educational leaders who will be able to carry out change. The problems of educational change are viewed as being counteracted primarily by the individual educational leader who is unwilling to give up on his vision for educational improvement.

Principals respond to the current reform in a wide variety of ways, from hegemonic and accommodating, to critical and resistant (Stewart, 2009). Alkherb (1996) called for research studies to help determine how best to facilitate "positive and productive leadership dispositions and approaches." However, a program to develop better leaders may be difficult to establish in Saudi culture because Saudi Arabia is following a centralized monarchy system. Disposition of authorities is a difficult task in Saudi Arabia and requires the involvement of higher authorities. Nevertheless, Badawood (2003) found the majority of principals of private high schools in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
had positive attitudes toward leadership. These results clearly indicated that principals value leadership and believe that leadership is essential to their role.

Decentralization can assist with modifying the priorities and responsibilities of principals and other educational authorities, and provide a set of competencies necessary for effective school leadership. The research provides an understanding about the importance of competencies in enhancing skills of school principals that could lead to proper management of the educational curriculum, formulation of effective communication, and office administration (Osorio et al., 2009). Similar to competencies, the new authorities conferred by the Saudi MOE describe certain behaviors schools principals are expected to enact during the Saudi decentralization process. The authorities are discussed below.

**Principals’ New Authorities**

In response to new demands, many of which come in the form of educational reforms pursued by national governments, school leaders in many countries throughout the world “have to take on new roles, which are expected to be instructional and transformational in nature, with the purpose of changing schools into effective educational organizations to meet the changing societal needs” (Cheung, 2004, p. 81).

In recent years, much of the principal’s time has been spent maintaining the organization. The demands of the week, day, or a moment have left too little time for leadership activities. Organizational theorists have long argued, organizational efficiency may be enhanced by augmenting employees’ professional autonomy by affording them greater decision-making power over their daily activities (Waters & Marzano).
Currently, various leaders are responsible for making decisions regarding education programs in Saudi schools, including department chairpersons, directors, deans, program coordinators, and other teaching staff. The Saudi government believes that it crucial for schools to decentralize authorities; so that it can provide best solutions for students, institutions and faculties (World Bank, 2005). And one of the best ways to achieve that transition to decentralization is conferring more authority to school principals.

The need for principals to have administrative and technical authorities is supported within the literature. Several studies discuss the administrative roles of principals. Kelechukwu (2011) in his study of administrative roles of principals in private secondary schools in the Aba education zone of Abia, stated that there are several categories of administrative task areas in the school system. There are pupil personnel, staff personnel, instruction and curriculum development, school plant and other general tasks. Gumede (1999), in his study of the evaluation of the administrative process by secondary school principals in the Durban south region, viewed the principal’s role as providing vision building and policy formulation, as well as teaching and curriculum management.

Lipham and Hoeh (1990) outlined five functions of school administration: (1) staff personnel administration, (2) student personnel administration, (3) financial resources, (4) physical resources, and (5) community relationship management. Goldt (2006) in his study of Kansas principals’ perceptions of competence in common administrative roles added that school administrators are involved with curriculum and program development, and identifying areas for teacher of practicum and mentoring
programs. Additionally, Dixson (2005) in his study of the administrative roles of school principals and how they may adversely affect a principal's role as a successful instructional leader noted, “principals must make sure current educational policies are carried out, and must be knowledgeable of federal and state policies that will effect changes in the social and economic environments impacting schools” (p. 21). In essence, the works of these scholars indicate that many essential functions in Saudi schools will be neglected if principals are not given the authority to carry out their administrative tasks.

As it relates to technical authorities, McBeath (2001), in his study of the decentralized dollars and decisions within the Edmonton Public Schools system, noted that many of the principal’s responsibilities concern the logistical operation of the school building; therefore, the technical powers given to school principals should be expanded. This includes increasing the authority needed for the management of the school building and full evaluation of teachers, as well as providing the authority needed to assist teachers in their own professional development (Allheaniy, 2012). Al Sharija (2006), in his study of the administrative and technical needs assessment for secondary school principals in the State of Kuwait as perceived by the principals themselves, added that principals should also be given the authority necessary for helping students to solve their problems, developing teachers’ skills, and involving parents and community in school activities. The technical authority given under a centralized school district is “mainly that of a lower-level manager and instructional leader implementing district policies and decisions for the localized school” (Povich, 2008, p. 10). This authority is not sufficient for implementing the novel changes in the school environment needed to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse general population.
When the Saudi MOE conferred the new authorities for principals in the initial steps of decentralization, they intended specific outcomes. The MOE expected that after dispensing the new authorities, schools would be able to: (a) align with the future direction of MOE; (b) shift toward disciplined decentralization; (c) promote self-development of the school; (d) increase their flexibility to manage the school; (e) improve performance ideally; (f) facilitate roles and procedures; (g) increase focus on learning and teaching; and (h) enable the principal to be a leader. There is currently no study that examines principals’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the new authorities, or investigates the extent to which principals believe the authorities help achieve the above intended outcomes. The new authorities can be divided into two categories: administrative authorities and technical authorities. The categories and associated authorities are listed below.

**Administrative Authorities**

Originally, in 2001, the Saudi MOE conferred principals with 22 administrative authorities. In 2011, the MOE granted more 12 additional administrative authorities encompassing the following:

1. Choose an assistant principal from the list of names provided by the Department of Education.
2. Deduct pay from the employees’ salaries when they are absent or late, and then inform the Department of Education to implement the decision.
3. Specify teachers who are to be transferred from one school to another school. These teachers should be those whose performance has decreased 85% in function over the last two years.
4. Transfer any employees in administrative jobs to other schools if their performance has decreased from “excellent” in the last two years.

5. Evaluate bus drivers.

6. Apply models that support the proficiency of teaching and solve school problems.

7. Arrange studies to solve school issues.

8. Nominate not more than five employees for professional development in the school year.

9. Sign contracts with specialized parties accredited by governmental sectors related to operating the school cafeteria.

10. Adopt the naming of teachers who deserve a financial reward for teaching classes in which they substitute for an absent teacher in addition to working their own 24 credits hours.

11. Sign contracts with laborers for cleaning the school in the case contracts were impossible with the cleaning officers, or in the case the labor was contracted but not performed.

12. Contract with competent institutions to perform urgent maintenance for the school according to the specialized budget.

**Technical Authorities**

There were nine original technical authorities conferred to school principals by the Saudi MOE in 2001. In 2011, the MOE granted principals nine more technical authorities encompassing the following:

1. Make temporary modifications in the duration of classes and recess to realize educational needs.
2. Increase the duration of study for groups of students to approximately one hour at maximum per day.

3. Close the school in emergency cases for one day at maximum, and officially inform the Department of Education.

4. Communicate directly with the governmental organizations in emergency cases.

5. Accept students who are out of the school district.

6. Determine when a student’s behavior represents a danger against any school employee, and transfer the student to another school.

7. Add programs that address some of the school problems.

8. Execute specified school activities outside the school, for durations of no more than three days.

9. Contact the private sector to sponsor school programs that match school goals.

Studies on Saudi Principals’ New Authorities

Overall, the theoretical benefits of providing school principals with administrative and technical are clear. Yet, Alzaidi (2008) in his study of the factors that affect job satisfaction among secondary school principals in Jeddah found that school principals are strongly dissatisfied with the original authorities conferred by the MOE. Few studies exist that examine Saudi principals’ current authorities. A review of literature revealed only three relevant studies. The first study conducted by Allheaniy (2012), explored principals’ attitudes toward their new administrative, technical, and financial authorities. Participants of the study included 320 school principals from Makkah city. The results showed that principals’ attitudes were high on administrative and technical authorities,
but low on financial authorities. The primary conclusion of the study was that school principals need more financial authorities.

The second relevant study, conducted by Alhumaidhi (2013), examined barriers secondary school principals have in practicing their authorities. Specifically, the objectives of his study were to identify the administrative and technical barriers that deter school principals from practicing the authorities given to them. Participants included 122 secondary school principals and 33 supervisors in the city of Riyadh. Results of the study revealed several important findings. Overall, the principals reported that their authorities were highly inflexible that they were faced with a large number of administrative tasks, but had an inadequate administrative staff, and poorly prepared school committee members. Moreover, the principals reported having poor facilities and equipment but a general lack of funds, with within to make improvement and no financial incentives for principals. Improvements that the principals suggested included updating school facilities, providing more technical equipment for schools, increasing the financial resources of the schools, and adding a financial allowance for school principals to improve school needs.

The third study, which was conducted by Alotaibi (2013), examined the degree to which principals practiced their new administrative and technical authorities, and the role of these authorities in improving school administration performance. Participants of the study included 110 secondary school principals from the city of Taif. Results showed that the degree to which the principals reported practicing their administrative authorities was ranged from low to high, depending on the specific authority. Principals reported practicing the authority of providing sick leave for employees to a high degree. They
reported practicing the authority to prepare contingency plans to a moderate degree. Authorities such as working with the private sector to sponsor school programs and implementing to authority to select assistant principals were practiced to a low degree. Principals reported practicing their technical authorities to a degree that ranged from high to moderate. An example of a technical authority that was practiced to a high degree was accepting students from outside of the school district. Adopting programs to solve school problems was practiced to a moderate degree. The overall conclusion of this study was that the new authorities did assist school principals in improving the operation and maintenance of their schools.

The studies described above provide a baseline understanding of principals’ perceptions of their new authorities. This proposed study provides greater insight into principals’ needs by exploring their perceptions of (a) their ability to implement the authorities, (b) their perceptions of the level of support they have to implement the authorities (c) their beliefs on the effectiveness of the authorities, and (d) any additional new authorities’ principals’ desire. Furthermore, this study also differs from previous studies, in that it sampled all of the principals from Tatweer schools.

**Chapter II Summary**

This chapter has reviewed relevant literature on the topics of education in Saudi Arabia, Saudi education reform, decentralization, principalship in Saudi Arabia, and school principals’ authorities. The review of the previous studies points to the need for new research as a matter of urgency. Such new research should benefit from an awareness of the drawbacks of the previous studies. Accordingly, this study gathered and analyzed views and perspectives of school principals to recommend new and effective
manners of implementing the new authorities to achieve changes in the education system to achieve a balance between centralization and decentralization (Mali, 2004).

The outcomes of this study provide principals and other school leaders with useful information on the skills needed to help them update their personal leadership skills and improve their personal leadership competence, which could help reduce the incidence of low job dissatisfaction and poor job performance among teachers. The findings of the study also provide information the Saudi MOE can use to improve training, or develop job requirements to hire new principals into the new decentralized school system.

Pursuing research in this field provides an excellent opportunity to explore, understand, and examine how school principals perceive their new authorities in the initial steps of decentralization. The results could increase attention to decentralization, as the results of previous studies have done in many education institutions and schools around the world. Chapter III presents the research methods that were used to conduct this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter III describes the methods that were used to conduct this study. First, the purpose of the study and its research questions are briefly restated. The sections following this restatement of the study’s purpose and research questions discuss the study’s research design, population, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis procedures, delimitations, and limitations.

Overview of Purpose and Research Questions

As mentioned in Chapter I, the purpose of this research study was to explore Saudi school principals’ perceptions regarding the new authorities conferred upon them in the initial steps of decentralization. Specifically, this study explored school principals’ perceptions on the extent to which they believe: (a) they have ability to implement the new authorities granted to them, (b) the level of support they have for implementing the new authorities, (c) the effectiveness of the new authorities at achieving MOE outcomes, and (d) the need for additional authorities they would like to add to the current authorities.

The research questions guiding this study include:

1. To what extent do Tatweer school principals believe,
   a. that they have the ability to implement the new authorities;
   b. that they have support for implementing the new authorities; and
   c. how effective the new authorities are at achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

2. When holding various demographic variables constant, to what extent do Tatweer school principals’ perceptions of their ability and support to implement the new
authorities predict their perceptions regarding the effectiveness the new authorities in achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

3. What additional authorities do these school principals suggest be added to their current authorities?

**Research Design**

According to Kerlinger and Lee (2000), selecting an appropriate research design, data collection method, and data analysis procedure should be influenced by a study’s research questions. Given this study’s research questions, a quantitative survey research design was utilized. Survey research provides one with the ability to obtain a variety of information about a population (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). Further, a survey research design is suitable when collecting data involving attitudes, beliefs, or perceptions (Creswell, 2003; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Survey research design is non-experimental research that collects information at one point in time (Sproull, 2002). In a quantitative survey research design, the researcher chooses participants and administers a questionnaire for collection of data. In this study, the survey was administered to principals at Tatweer schools in Saudi Arabia. This population is discussed further in the section below.

**Population**

My study used a single-stage sampling procedure access all members of the population could be reached directly (Creswell, 2009). The population for this study consists of principals of Tatweer schools in Saudi Arabia, specifically the 900 Saudi schools currently implementing the King Abdullah Project for the Development of Public Education. The purpose of the Tatweer project is to match Saudi Arabia’s standard of
education to that of other nations by introducing a more modern system of instruction (Tatweer, 2010). This includes facilitating the decentralization process for Saudi school. Accordingly, all Tatweer school principals are expected to implement the new authorities conferred by the MOE in the initial steps of decentralization. All 900 Tatweer school principals were contacted to eliminate the potential for sampling bias.

**Instrumentation**

An original survey was developed to answer this study’s research questions (Appendix A). The intent of the survey was to gather data to provide an accurate view of Saudi school principals’ perceptions of the new authorities granted in 2011.

**Survey Development**

The survey for this research was developed after a thorough review of relevant literature, and a review of the official documents principals received from the Saudi MOE regarding their new authorities. This instrument contains five parts.

**Part 1.** The first part of the instrument lists the principals’ 21 new authorities (i.e., 12 administrative authorities, nine technical authorities). Respondents were given the following prompt, and then asked to rate their ability to implement each authority on a scale that ranges from 1 to 6: *Think about your extent ability to implement each of the new authorities given by the Saudi Ministry of Education for the purpose of decentralization. Ability includes having the knowledge and skills to implement the new authorities. Indicate your ability to implement the new authorities using the following scale: 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very Low Extent; 3 = Low Extent; 4 = Medium Extent; 5 = Great Extent; 6 = Very Great Extent.*
Part 2. The second part of the instrument lists the principals’ 21 new authorities (i.e., 12 administrative authorities, nine technical authorities). Respondents were given the following prompt, and then asked to rate the level of support to implement each authority on a scale that ranges from 1 to 6: Think about the support that you have to implement each of the new authorities given by the Saudi Ministry of Education for the purpose of decentralization. Support includes having resources, training, and administrative level support necessary to implement the new authorities. Indicate the support you have to implement the new authorities using the following scale: 1 = No Support At All; 2 = Almost No Support; 3 = A Little Support; 4 = A Moderate Amount of Support; 5 = A Good Deal of Support; 6 = A Great Deal of Support.

Part 3. The third part of the survey asked principals about their beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing the outcomes identified by the Saudi MOE. Respondents were given the following prompt, and then asked to rate the degree to which they agree the new authorities help achieve each of the MOE’s intended outcomes in their schools: Please use the following scale to rate the degree to which you agree the new authorities help achieve each of the intended outcomes in your school: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly Disagree; 4 = Slightly Agree; 5 = Agree; 6 = Strongly Agree.

Part 4. Part 4 of the survey is an open-ended question that asked respondents to indicate one to three additional authorities they would like to add to their current authorities in order of importance to them.
Part 5. Part 5 of the instrument collects demographic information about the principals surveyed. The respondents were asked to identify their gender, level of school qualification, and years of experience.

Survey Validity

Creswell (2009) identified three traditional forms of validity to consider when examining a survey instrument: (a) content validity, (b) predictive validity, and (c) construct validity. Content validity addresses the degree to which the survey questions measure the relevant aspects of the topic of the survey. Predictive validity, along with criterion measure, which assesses whether a test accurately measures a certain set of abilities. Construct validity refers to a survey’s ability to accurately measure the attribute or concept under study. Construct validity is similar to predictive validity in that construct validity is typically assessed with correlations to tests that measure similar concepts.

Because this study was the first to measure Saudi school principals’ perceptions of their new authorities in the initial steps of decentralization, no previous measures of this construct exist. Therefore, predictive and construct validity cannot be assessed in this study. Content validity of the survey was established in two ways. First, members of the dissertation committee reviewed the survey for thoroughness and readability. Second, I translated the survey into Arabic, and a small group of Saudi education leaders reviewed a draft of the survey for the purpose of providing feedback related to the survey’s content and clarity. This group also assisted in verifying that the survey accurately depicts the new authorities conferred by the MOE. The questionnaire was adjusted as needed based on the responses of these experts.
Data Collection

Data collection for this study consisted of an online administration of the study’s survey. Studies show that web surveys have a higher response rate than hard copy questionnaires when both are preceded by an advanced notification (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2006). eSurveyCreator was used as the survey administrator. eSurveyCreator is a secure online data collection service. The rationale for choosing eSurveyCreator includes its widespread use, its familiarity within the education community, and its ability to serve as a warehouse for responses prior to data analysis. This commercial survey tool is capable of generating results and reporting descriptive statistics back to the researcher. It is also designed to prevent principals from taking the survey more than once. Data are anonymous, password protected, and accessible only by the researcher.

Prior to distributing the survey, I received permission from the WMU Human Subject Institutional Review Board (HISRB). Once the survey was adequately developed and uploaded to eSurveyCreator, I contacted the Tatweer department at the MOE via email to obtain consent to administer the survey to its 900 school principals (Appendix B). This email contained a letter of consent and a short memo describing the purpose of the research. It also requested that the Tatweer department grant permission for their principals to participate in this study. Once the Tatweer department granted permission to conduct the study in its schools, a second email containing consent information, information about the study, and a link to access the survey was sent to all of the principals representing the 900 Tatweer schools in Saudi Arabia (Appendix C). A follow-up email was sent to the principals two weeks after the initial email, thanking those who
had participated and asking for responses from those who had not yet responded (Appendix D, E).

Data Analysis

After the time frame for administration of the survey expired, I exported the survey data from eSurveyCreator into Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 20.0) computer software. SPSS is a statistical analysis tool that allowed the researcher to analyze descriptive and inferential statistics necessary to answer this study’s research questions, and data relevant to the development of the survey. The following sections first present the data analysis techniques. Next, the research questions and the techniques used to analyze the data obtained for each question are presented.

Internal Consistency

SPSS was used to determine Cronbach’s alphas at each items of the survey. Cronbach’s alphas above 0.7 are considered acceptable, and values above 0.8 are preferable (Pallant, 2007).

Research Question 1

Research question 1 was: To what extent do Tatweer school principals believe:

a. that they have the ability to implement the new authorities;

b. that they have support for implementing the new authorities; and

c. how effective the new authorities are at achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

Descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to describe and compare the distribution of the responses given in
answer to research question 1a through 1c. Relevant tables, histograms, and figures are presented as needed in Chapter IV.

**Research Question 2**

Research question 2 was: When holding various demographic variables constant, to what extent do Tatweer school principals’ perceptions of their ability and support to implement the new authorities predict their perceptions regarding the effectiveness the new authorities in achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

A standard multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if school principals’ perceptions of their ability and support to implement the new authorities predict their perceptions of the effectiveness the new authorities in achieving MOE intended outcomes. According to Cronk (2004), “multiple regression analysis allows the prediction of one variable from several other variables” (p. 46). Specifically, multiple regression analysis can be used to determine: (a) how well a set of variables predicts another variable, and (b) which variable in a set of variables is the best predictor of another variable (Pallant, 2007, p. 147).

To conduct a standard multiple regression analysis, one must have a set of independent variables, and a dependent variable that are all continuous in nature, on an interval or ratio scale (Pallant, 2007). According to Pallant (2007), “Each independent variable is evaluated in terms of its predictive power over and above that offered by all the other independent variables” (p. 147). This allows one to determine how much unique variance in the dependent variable can be explained by each of the independent variables. The dependent variable represents a particular outcome. In this study, there are eight independent variables: (a) Total Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities;
(b) Total Ability to Implement Technical Authorities; (c) Total Support to Implement Administrative Authorities; (d) Total Support to Implement Technical Authorities; (e) Principals Gender; (f) Principals Level of School; (g) Principals Qualification, and (h) Principals Years of Experience. The dependent variable is Total Effectiveness to Achieve Intended Outcomes. The independent variables are scores obtained from Parts 1, 2 and 5 of the survey, while the dependent variable represents scores obtained from Part 3 of the survey.

Beyond continuous independent and dependent variables, adequate sample size is also necessary to conduct a standard regression analysis (Pallant, 2007). According to Pallant (2007), a common formula used to calculate sample size requirements is $N > 50 + 8m$ (where $m =$ number of independent variables. Accordingly, the minimum sample size necessary for this study was 82.

**Research Question 3**

Research question 3 was: What additional authorities do these school principals suggest be add to their current authorities?

Participants were asked to list any suggestions they had regarding additional authorities. The data collected from this question will be summarized and categorized according to their specific suggestions. Relevant tables will be presented as needed.

**Crosswalk Table**

The following table (Table 1) illustrates how each of the questions in the survey instrument aligned with the specific research questions as discussed in Chapter I, and the type of data analysis performed for each research question.
### Table 1

**Crosswalk Presentation of Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Part from the Questionnaire</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do Tatweer school principals believe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a: they have ability to implement the new authorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b: they have support for implementing the new authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c: the effectiveness the new authorities in achieving MOE intended outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When holding various demographic variables constant, to what extent Tatweer</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5</td>
<td>Multiple regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school principals’ perceptions of their ability and support to implement the new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities predict their perceptions of the effectiveness the new authorities in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving MOE intended outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the additional authorities principals would like to add to their current</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Qualitative review for themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delimitations

The delimitations of a study are those characteristics that arise from limitations in the scope of the study or those elements the researcher can control. A delimitation of this study is that the population consists of the principals in Tatweer schools for the 2013-2014 academic year only. These principals were selected because they are mandated with the task of implementing the new authorities conferred on them by the Saudi MOE in the initial steps for decentralization.
Limitations

The limitations of this study relies on self-reported information, which may be affected by social desirability. Social desirability refers to a phenomenon that occurs when participants respond to attitudinal questions in a way that they believe others will approve (Johnson & Fendrich, 2002). Participants in this study may have felt pressure to answer questions in certain ways due to fear of reprisal for responses that are not in agreement with the new authorities. Efforts were be made to remind participants of the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses throughout the consent documents and survey.

Chapter III Summary

This chapter presented the methodology that was used to conduct this study. This study utilized a quantitative survey research design to answer its research questions. After a survey questionnaire was developed for the purpose of the study, all 900 Tatweer school principals in Saudi Arabia were invited to participate in an online administration of the survey. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistic and linear multiple regression. The results of this analysis are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter provides an analysis of the data for each of the study’s research questions, as well as demographic data on the respondents. Specifically, the sections below provide: (a) respondent data and demographic information, (b) a review of instrumentation, (c) reliability of the instrument, (d) preliminary data analysis, and (e) analysis of the data for each research question.

Respondent Data and Demographic Information

After obtaining HSIRB approval, the survey invitation email was sent to the 900 principals of Tatweer schools in Saudi Arabia via the Tatweer department at the Ministry of Education. A reminder email was sent two times. From these invitations, 338 principals initiated the survey: 173 principals completed the entire survey, 159 principals responded “yes” to the consent screen, but completed none of the questions, and four principals responded “no” to the consent screen. Thus, the sample size for this project is 173. This means that the final response rate was 19.3% (173 out of 900).

The average years of school principals experience for respondents who completed the survey was 10.84 ($SD = 6.13$). The minimum and maximum years of experiences are 1 and 33, respectively. Table 2 presents the remaining respondent demographic data. As shown, 81 (46.8%) respondents were female, and 92 (53.2%) were male. Forty-six (26.6%) were elementary school principals, 71 (41.0%) were intermediate school principals, and 56 (32.4%) were high school principals. Eleven (6.4%) had just a diploma, 124 (71.7%) had a bachelor’s degree, 37 (21.4%) had a master’s degree, and one (0.6%) had a PhD.
Table 2

Respondent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of Instrumentation

As mentioned in Chapter III, a survey consisting of five parts was developed for the purpose of this research. Part 1 of the survey explored principals’ perceived ability to implement the 21 new authorities. Questions 1 through 12 in Part 1 listed the administrative authorities, while questions 13 through 21 listed the technical authorities. Respondents were given the following prompt, and then asked to rate their ability to implement each authority on a scale that ranged from 1 to 6: Think about your extent ability to implement each of the new authorities given by the Saudi Ministry of Education for the purpose of decentralization. Ability includes having the knowledge and skills to implement the new authorities. Indicate your ability to implement the new authorities
using the following scale: 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very Low Extent; 3 = Low Extent; 4 = Medium Extent; 5 = Great Extent; 6 = Very Great Extent.

For each type of authority (i.e., administrative authorities and technical authorities), the researcher created a composite score by summing the responses of the corresponding questions. The composite scores for perceived ability to implement administrative authorities ranged from 12 to 72. The composite scores for perceived ability to implement technical authorities ranged from 9 to 54. The greater the composite scores, the greater perceived ability to implement administrative/technical authorities.

Part 2 explored principals’ perceptions of the support they have in implementing the 21 authorities. Questions 1 through 12 in Part 2 listed the administrative authorities, while questions 13 through 21 listed the technical authorities. Respondents were given the following prompt, and then asked to rate the level of support to implement each authority on a scale that ranged from 1 to 6: Think about the support that you have to implement each of the new authorities given by the Saudi Ministry of Education for the purpose of decentralization. Support includes having resources, training, and administrative level support necessary to implement the new authorities. Indicate the support you have to implement the new authorities using the following scale: 1 = No Support At All; 2 = Almost No Support; 3 = A Little Support; 4 = A Moderate Amount of Support; 5 = A Good Deal of Support; 6 = A Great Deal of Support. Again, composite scores for perceived support in implementing administrative authorities ranged from 12 to 72, while the composite scores for perceived support in implementing technical authorities ranged from 9 to 54.
Part 3 of the survey consisted of eight questions, and explored principals’ beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing the outcomes identified by the Saudi MOE. Respondents were given the following prompt and then asked to rate the degree to which they agree the new authorities help achieve each of the MOE’s intended outcomes in their schools: Please use the following scale to rate the degree to which you agree the new authorities help achieve each of the intended outcomes in your school: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly Disagree; 4 = Slightly Agree; 5 = Agree; 6 = Strongly Agree. Composite scores for beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes ranged from 8 to 48.

Part 4 of the survey was an open-ended question that asked respondents to indicate one to three additional authorities they would like to add to their current authorities in order of importance to them. The data collected from this part of the survey summarized and categorized according to their specific suggestions.

Part 5 of the survey collected respondent demographic information. The respondents were asked: (a) What level is your school building? (high school, intermediate school, elementary school), (b) What is your highest level of education? (PhD, master’s degree, bachelor’s degree, diploma), (c) How many years of experience do you have as a school principal? and (d) What is your gender? (Male, Female).

**Reliability of the Instrument**

Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used to determine the internal consistency (how closely related a set of items are) of the five quantitative scores derived from the survey. These scores are: (a) Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities (12 questions); (b) Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities (9 questions); (c)
Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities (12 questions); (d) Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities (9 questions); and (e) Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes (8 questions).

A high alpha value can be regarded as evidence that the items measure an underlying construct. The general guidelines for alpha values: 0.90 to 1.0 are excellent, 0.80 to 0.89 are good, 0.70 to 0.79 are acceptable, 0.60 to 0.69 are questionable, 0.50 to 0.59 are poor, and below .50 are unacceptable (Cronbach, 1951).

As shown in Table 3, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities, Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities, Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities, and Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities are all above 0.8. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes is 0.95.

Table 3

*Reliability Coefficients of the Survey Instrument*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to describe and compare the distribution of the responses given in answer to research question 1. Therefore, preliminary data analysis was not required for this result. Similarly, responses to research question 3 were qualitative in nature, and also did not require preliminary data analysis.

Research question 2, however, was analyzed using general linear multiple regression, and therefore required examination of three assumptions prior to conducting the analysis. Specifically, independence of observations (examined using Levene’s test of equality), normality (examined through skewness, kurtosis, the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, and the quantile-quantile plot), and homoscedasticity were all examined prior to running the regression analysis.

As stated in Chapter III, multiple linear regression was proposed to investigate if there was a relationship between school principals’ beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes, and school principals’ perceptions of their ability and support to implement the new authorities, after controlling for demographics, such as principals gender, school building level, level of education, and years of experience. Therefore, in this study, the dependent variable is Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes. The independent variables are: Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities; Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities; Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities; Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities; gender; school building level; level of education; and years of experience.
Independence of Observations

As mentioned, there are three assumptions of multiple regression that need to be satisfied prior to conducting the analysis: (a) independence of observation, (b) normality, and (c) homoscedasticity. The independence of observations looks to see if the residuals are independent. Levene’s test and the residual plot (residuals versus the fitted values) were used to investigate if the variance is constant/equal. Plotting residuals versus the value of a fitted response should produce a distribution of points scattered randomly about 0, regardless of the size of the fitted value. The residuals should be (a) unbiased, meaning that the average value of residuals in any vertical strip should be zero, and (b) homoscedastic, meaning that the spread of the residuals should be the same in any vertical strip (George & Mallery, 2003).

Levene’s test did not reject the null hypothesis that the error variance is equal \( (p = 0.79) \). In addition, the plot of residuals and fitted values (Figure 2) also suggests the variance is homogeneous.

![Figure 2. Plot of Residuals and Fitted Values.](image-url)
Normality

Normality refers to the assumption that the distribution of the residuals is normal. Normality was examined though skewness, kurtosis, and the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality.

Skewness. The sample skewness measures the tendency of the deviations to be larger in one direction than in the other. Skewness is a measure of symmetry. Observations that are normally distributed should have a skewness near zero (as normal distribution is symmetric). A negative skew indicates that the tail on the left side of the probability density function is longer than the right side and the bulk of the values lie to the right of the mean (skewed to the left). A positive skew indicates that the tail on the right side is longer than the left side and the bulk of the values lie to the left of the mean (skewed to the right). The skewness of the residuals from the fitted model was 0.09 indicating that the sampling distribution of the residuals was slightly positively skewed (Neter et al., 1990).

Kurtosis. The sample kurtosis measures the peakedness of the distribution and the heaviness of its tail (relative to a normal distribution). Observations that are normally distributed should have a kurtosis near zero. A high kurtosis distribution has a sharper peak and fatter tails, while a low kurtosis distribution has a more rounded peak and thinner tails. The kurtosis of the residuals from the fitted model was 0.423, indicating that the peakedness of the sampling distribution for the residuals was slightly higher than the normal distribution (Neter et al., 1990).

The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. The Shapiro-Wilk test procedure is a goodness-of-fit test for the null hypothesis that the values of the analysis variable are a
random sample from the normal distribution. A $p$-value less than 0.05 of the Shapiro-Wilk test leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis of normality. The Shapiro-Wilk test did not reject the null hypothesis that the residuals were from a normal distribution ($p = 0.50$), indicating that the residuals were from a normal distribution and hence the normality assumption of the model was satisfied (Neter et al., 1990).

**The quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plot.** Q-Q plots compare ordered variable values with quantiles of a specified theoretical distribution (in our case, normal distribution). If the data distribution matches the theoretical distribution, the points on the plot form a linear pattern following the 45-degree straight line. The QQ plot below (Figure 3) suggests that the residuals seem to follow a normal distribution.

![Normal Q-Q Plot of Residual](image)

*Figure 3. QQ Plot.*

**Homoscedasticity**

Homoscedasticity refers to the assumption that the residuals have constant, or equal, variance. As mentioned in the Independence of observations section, the plot of residuals and fitted values (Figure 3) suggests that the variance is homogeneous. Thus, it
is concluded that all three of the assumptions of linear regression were satisfied, and hence the fitted model was adequate.

**The F Test**

Finally, the *F* test was used to determine statistical significance of the independent variable. The *F* test, based on the Type III estimable functions for each effect, was used to test if the effect of the independent variable was statistically significant, under the assumption that the sampled populations are normally distributed. In general, the null and alternative hypotheses for testing each effect are:

- **H₀**: There was no relationship between the dependent and independent variables.
- **Hₐ**: There was a relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

Without further specification, a *p*-value less than 0.05 indicates that the null hypothesis was rejected and the effect was statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. The results of the *F* tests are presented in the Research Question Results section below.

**Research Question Results**

This study explored three research questions, which are presented in the sections that follow. Descriptive statistics were used to answer research question 1, inferential statistics in the form of general linear multiple regression analysis was used to answer research question 2, and the identification of categories was used to answer question 3.

**Research Question 1**

Research question 1 stated: To what extent do Tatweer school principals believe,

a. that they have the ability to implement the new authorities;

b. that they have support for implementing the new authorities; and
c. how effective the new authorities are at achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

Tables 4 through 6 show the frequency counts and percentages of responses for the questions in Part 1 through Part 3 of the survey questionnaire. Means and standard deviations (SD) are also displayed.

Table 4 presents the frequency counts and percentages of responses for perceived ability to implement the 12 administrative and nine technical authorities. Response alternatives ranged from 1 (Not at all) to 6 (Very great extent). As shown in Table 4, the lowest rated Administrative Authorities in terms of perceived ability were Transfer administrative employees (M = 2.27, SD = 1.70), Specify teachers for transfer (M = 2.32, SD = 1.75), and Choose an assistant principal (M = 2.84, SD = 1.80). The highest rated Administrative Authorities were Deduct pay and inform DOE (M = 4.76, SD = 1.70), Sign cleaning contracts (M = 4.23, SD = 1.84), and Apply teaching models (M = 4.02, SD = 1.57). The lowest rated Technical Authorities were Execute out of school activities (M = 2.47, SD = 1.70), Increase duration of study groups (M = 2.87, SD = 1.87), and Determine dangerous student behavior and transfer (M = 3.14, SD = 1.85). The highest rated Technical Authorities were Add programs to address school problems (M = 4.62, SD = 1.46), Accept out of district students (M = 4.50, SD = 1.61), and Communicate with government in emergencies (M = 4.28, SD = 1.70).
### Administrative Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Authorities</th>
<th>Frequency Counts and (% of Responses)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer administrative employees</td>
<td>88 (50.9) 28 (16.2) 20 (11.6) 12 (6.9) 9 (5.2) 16 (9.2)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify teachers for transfer</td>
<td>90 (52.0) 26 (15.0) 17 (9.8) 9 (5.2) 14 (8.1) 17 (9.8)</td>
<td>2.32 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose an assistant principal</td>
<td>55 (31.8) 41 (23.7) 20 (11.6) 14 (8.1) 19 (11.0) 24 (13.9)</td>
<td>2.84 (1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name substitute teachers for financial reward</td>
<td>71 (41.0) 18 (10.4) 27 (15.6) 9 (5.2) 21 (12.1) 27 (15.6)</td>
<td>3.08 (1.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign contracts to operate school cafeteria</td>
<td>65 (37.6) 17 (9.8) 16 (9.2) 22 (12.7) 20 (11.6) 33 (19.1)</td>
<td>3.32 (1.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominate employees for professional development</td>
<td>39 (22.5) 31 (17.9) 28 (16.2) 21 (12.1) 19 (11.0) 35 (20.2)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate bus drivers</td>
<td>40 (23.1) 20 (11.6) 28 (16.2) 31 (17.9) 23 (13.3) 31 (17.9)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract with maintenance institutions</td>
<td>36 (20.8) 33 (19.1) 15 (8.7) 18 (10.4) 21 (12.1) 50 (28.9)</td>
<td>3.61 (1.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange studies to solve school issues</td>
<td>15 (8.7) 26 (15.0) 28 (16.2) 39 (22.5) 35 (20.2) 30 (17.3)</td>
<td>3.83 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply teaching models</td>
<td>10 (5.8) 26 (15.0) 32 (18.5) 27 (15.6) 22 (12.0) 40 (23.1)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign cleaning contracts</td>
<td>21 (12.1) 23 (13.3) 16 (9.2) 13 (7.5) 35 (20.2) 65 (37.6)</td>
<td>4.23 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct pay and inform DOE</td>
<td>10 (5.8) 18 (10.4) 19 (11.0) 9 (5.2) 18 (10.4) 99 (57.2)</td>
<td>4.76 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technical Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Authorities</th>
<th>Frequency Counts and (% of Responses)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Execute out of school activities</td>
<td>77 (44.5) 29 (16.8) 18 (10.4) 21 (12.1) 13 (7.5) 15 (8.7)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase duration of study groups</td>
<td>68 (39.3) 20 (11.6) 16 (9.2) 27 (15.6) 19 (11.0) 23 (13.3)</td>
<td>2.87 (1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine dangerous student behavior and transfer</td>
<td>48 (27.7) 31 (17.9) 21 (12.1) 22 (12.7) 23 (13.3) 28 (16.2)</td>
<td>3.14 (1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close school in emergency cases</td>
<td>59 (34.1) 15 (8.7) 19 (11.0) 24 (13.9) 21 (12.1) 35 (20.2)</td>
<td>3.22 (1.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact the private sector to meet school goals</td>
<td>30 (17.3) 22 (12.7) 32 (18.5) 27 (15.6) 32 (18.5) 30 (17.3)</td>
<td>3.57 (1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with government in emergencies</td>
<td>12 (6.9) 33 (19.1) 45 (26.0) 31 (17.9) 23 (13.3) 29 (16.8)</td>
<td>3.62 (1.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make temporary modifications in class duration</td>
<td>25 (14.5) 22 (12.7) 20 (11.6) 20 (11.6) 37 (21.4) 49 (28.3)</td>
<td>3.98 (1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept out of district students</td>
<td>10 (5.8) 17 (9.8) 21 (12.1) 23 (13.3) 32 (18.5) 70 (40.5)</td>
<td>4.50 (1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add programs to address school problems</td>
<td>9 (5.2) 10 (5.8) 17 (9.8) 29 (16.8) 45 (26.0) 63 (36.4)</td>
<td>4.62 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** All 21 questions were rated on a 6-point Likert scale with 1 = Not at all, 2 = Very low extent, 3 = Low extent, 4 = Medium extent, 5 = Great extent, and 6 = Very great extent.
Table 5 presents the frequency counts and percentages of responses for perceived support to implement the 12 administrative and 9 technical authorities. Response alternatives ranged from 1 (No support at all) to 6 (A great deal of support). As shown in Table 5, the lowest rated Administrative Authorities in terms of perceived support were Transfer administrative employees \( (M = 2.47, SD = 1.43) \), Specify teachers for transfer \( (M = 2.56, SD = 1.50) \), and Choose an assistant principal \( (M = 2.65, SD = 1.50) \). The highest rated Administrative Authorities were Deduct pay and inform DOE \( (M = 4.03, SD = 1.57) \), Applying teaching models \( (M = 3.64, SD = 1.41) \), and Sign cleaning contracts \( (M = 3.56, SD = 1.56) \). The lowest rated Technical Authorities were Execute out of school activities \( (M = 2.63, SD = 1.34) \), Determine dangerous student behavior and transfer \( (M = 2.77, SD = 1.40) \), and Increase duration of study groups \( (M = 2.85, SD = 1.46) \). The highest rated Technical Authorities were Accept out of district students \( (M = 3.90, SD = 1.48) \), Add programs to address school problems \( (M = 3.64, SD = 1.47) \), and Communicate with government in emergencies \( (M = 3.62, SD = 1.52) \).

As shown in Tables 4 and 5, neither the Administrative Authorities nor the Technical Authorities were rated on average at the higher ends of the scales, which ranged from 1 to 6. As it relates to perceived ability, the highest rated Administrative Authority (Deduct pay and inform DOE, \( M = 4.76, SD = 1.70 \)) Technical Authority (Add programs to address school problems, \( M = 4.62, SD = 1.46 \)) were only in the low to medium extent range, although close to Great extent. The highest rated Administrative (Deduct pay and inform DOE, \( M = 4.03, SD = 1.57 \)) and Technical Authority (Accept out of district students, \( M = 3.90, SD = 1.48 \)) in terms of support on average were only in the little to moderate amount of support range.
Table 5

Frequency Counts and Percentages of Responses for Perceived Support to Implement Administrative and Technical Authorities (N = 173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Authorities</th>
<th>Frequency Counts and (%) of Responses</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer administrative employees</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify teachers for transfer</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose an assistant principal</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name substitute teachers for financial reward</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign contracts to operate school cafetera</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominate employees for professional development</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate bus drivers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract with maintenance institutions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange studies to solve school issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign cleaning contracts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply teaching models</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct pay and inform DOE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execute out of school activities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine dangerous student behavior and transfer</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase duration of study groups</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close school in emergency cases</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact the private sector to meet school goals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make temporary modifications in class duration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with government in emergencies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add programs to address school problems</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept out of district students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All 21 questions were rated on a 6-point Likert scale with 1 = No support at all, 2 = Almost no support, 3 = A little support, 4 = A moderate amount of support, 5 = A good deal of support, and 6 = A great deal of support.
Table 6 presents the frequency counts and percentage of responses for the eight questions in Part 3, which explored beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes. As shown, each of the outcomes was rated in the 3-point range. The lowest rated outcomes were Enable the leadership role of the principal ($M = 3.79, SD = 1.36$), Increase a focus on learning and teaching ($M = 3.76, SD = 1.25$), and Assist the school to conduct self-development ($M = 3.76, SD = 1.26$). The lowest rated outcome was Shift the school toward disciplined decentralization ($M = 3.56, SD = 1.21$).

Table 6

*Frequency Counts and Percentages of Responses for Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplicishing MOE Outcomes ($N = 173$)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOE Outcome</th>
<th>Frequency Counts and (%) of Responses</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift the school toward disciplined decentralization</td>
<td>7 (4.0) 22 (12.7) 62 (35.8) 42 (24.3) 29 (16.8) 11 (6.4)</td>
<td>3.56 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide increased flexibility to manage the school</td>
<td>10 (5.8) 18 (10.4) 58 (33.5) 40 (23.1) 29 (16.8) 18 (10.4)</td>
<td>3.66 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align school with the future direction of MOE</td>
<td>4 (2.3) 28 (16.2) 50 (28.9) 49 (28.3) 21 (12.1) 21 (12.1)</td>
<td>3.68 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the schools’ roles and procedures</td>
<td>8 (4.6) 14 (8.1) 66 (38.2) 40 (23.1) 21 (12.1) 24 (13.9)</td>
<td>3.72 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the schools’ performance</td>
<td>3 (1.7) 16 (9.2) 71 (41.0) 39 (22.5) 19 (11.0) 25 (14.5)</td>
<td>3.75 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the school to conduct self-development</td>
<td>4 (2.3) 19 (11.0) 60 (34.7) 43 (24.9) 26 (15.0) 21 (12.1)</td>
<td>3.76 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase a focus on learning and teaching</td>
<td>8 (4.6) 11 (6.4) 62 (35.8) 44 (25.4) 30 (17.3) 18 (10.4)</td>
<td>3.76 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable the leadership role of the principal</td>
<td>8 (4.6) 12 (6.9) 69 (39.9) 31 (17.9) 25 (14.5) 28 (16.2)</td>
<td>3.79 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All 8 questions were rated on a 6-point Likert scale with 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly disagree, 4 = Slightly agree, 5 = Agree, and 6 = Strongly agree.

As mentioned, composite scores were created from the items in Parts 1 through 3, resulting in five subscales: (1) Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities; (2) Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities; (3) Perceived
Support to Implement Administrative Authorities; (4) Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities; and (5) Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes. Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics for these subscales.

Table 7

*Descriptive Statistics for Survey Subscales (N = 173)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities</td>
<td>37.72</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7, on average, the Administrative Authorities were rated higher than the Technical Authorities. The highest rated subscale was Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities ($M = 40.52$, $SD = 12.63$), followed by Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities ($M = 32.66$, $SD = 9.98$). The lowest rated subscale was Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities ($M = 29.05$, $SD = 8.95$).

**Research Question 2**

Research question 2 stated: When holding various demographic variables constant, to what extent do Tatweer school principals’ perceptions of their ability and
support to implement the new authorities predict their perceptions regarding the effectiveness the new authorities in achieving Ministry of Education intended outcomes?

The dependent variable in research question 2 is scores from beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes. The independent variables are: (a) Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities; (b) Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities; (c) Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities; (d) Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities; (e) gender; (f) school building level; (g) level of education; and (h) years of experience. Note that for level of education, there was only one subject with PhD degree, so master’s degree and PhD degree were combined into one category.

Using multiple linear regression, the fitted model can be written as follows:

Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes = 8.52 + 0.19 * ability1 + 0.03 * ability2 – 0.03 * support1 + 0.34 * support2 + 0.23 * I(level of school1) - 0.26 * I(level of school2) + 0.71 * I(qualification1) -0.74 * I(qualification2) + 0.28*years of experience +1.64 * I(gender)

Where:

- ability1 = perceived ability to implement administrative authorities
- ability2 = perceived ability to implement technical authorities
- support1 = perceived support to implement administrative authorities
- support2 = perceived support to implement technical authorities
- I(level of school1) is an indicator variable. I(level of school1) = 1 if elementary school principal; I(level of school1) = 0, otherwise.
- $I(\text{level of school2})$ is an indicator variable. $I(\text{level of school2}) = 1$ if high school principal; $I(\text{level of school2}) = 0$, otherwise.

- $I(\text{qualification1})$ is an indicator variable. $I(\text{qualification1}) = 1$ if highest education = Diploma; $I(\text{level of qualification1}) = 0$, otherwise.

- $I(\text{qualification2})$ is an indicator variable. $I(\text{qualification2}) = 1$ if highest education = Bachelor’s degree; $I(\text{level of qualification2}) = 0$, otherwise.

- $I(\text{gender})$ is an indicator variable. $I(\text{gender}) = 1$ if female; $I(\text{gender}) = 0$, otherwise.

Table 8 is the ANOVA table of the regression model. According to the $F$-test, the overall model is significant ($F(10, 162) = 7.876, p = 0.000$). The $R^2 = 0.327$, which indicates that 33% of the variation in the dependent variable can be accounted for by the model. The results of the $F$-test, which tested if there was a relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables indicate that there was a statistically significant relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities at the 0.05 level of significance ($F(1, 162) = 7.120, p = 0.008$). According to the equation, for every unit increase of the composite score for Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities, the composite score for Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes will increase by 0.19. Thus, there was a positive relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities, i.e., the greater the perceived ability to implement
administrative authorities, the greater beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes.

There was no statistically significant relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities at the 0.05 level of significance ($F(1, 162) = 0.110, p = 0.740$).

There was no statistically significant relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities at the 0.05 level of significance ($F(1, 162) = 0.078, p = 0.780$).

There was a statistically significant relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities at the 0.05 level of significance ($F(1, 162) = 7.493, p = 0.007$). According to the equation, for every unit increase of the composite score for Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities, the composite score for Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes will increase by 0.34. Thus, there was a positive relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities, i.e., the greater the perceived support to implement technical authorities, the greater beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes.
There was no statistically significant relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and principals’ school building level at the 0.05 level of significance \( F(1, 162) = 0.045, p = 0.956 \).

There was no statistically significant relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and principals’ level of education at the 0.05 level of significance \( F(1, 162) = 0.263, p = 0.769 \).

There was a statistically significant relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and principals’ years of experience at the 0.05 level of significance \( F(1, 162) = 9.311, p = 0.004 \).

According to the equation, for every unit increase of years of experience, the composite score for Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes will increase by 0.28. Thus, there was a positive relationship between Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes and years of experience, i.e., the longer the principals’ years of experience, the greater beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes.

There was no statistically significant relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the view authorities in accomplishing MOE Outcomes and gender at the 0.05 level of significance \( F(1, 162) = 1.920, p = 0.168 \).
Table 8

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>4491.000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>449.100</td>
<td>7.876</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>621.224</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>621.224</td>
<td>10.895</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities</td>
<td>405.959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>405.959</td>
<td>7.120</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities</td>
<td>6.277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.277</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities</td>
<td>4.460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.460</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities</td>
<td>427.212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>427.212</td>
<td>7.493</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of school</td>
<td>5.110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30.048</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.024</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>473.854</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>473.854</td>
<td>8.311</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>109.472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.472</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>9236.873</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>57.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166086.000</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>13727.873</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. DF = degrees of freedom. F = F statistic. p = p-value. * indicates significance at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Question 3

Research question 3 stated: What additional authorities do these school principals suggest be added to their current authorities?
Part 5 of the survey was used to answer research question 3. There were 173 responses, with at least one suggestion to the question. The responses were summarized and categorized according to their specific suggestions. The suggestions were then reviewed to determine common themes among the various comments, and five themes emerged from the review. Table 9 shows each of the themes, the number of responses, and the percentage of responses that contained the theme.

Table 9

*Categories for New Authorities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Suggestions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff issues</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School budget</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in decision-making</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation issues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff issues.** As shown in Table 9, there were 96 (40%) suggestions for new authorities regarding staff issues. The majority of these staff issues concerned the following: (a) involve the principal in recruiting teachers and staff who work in the school, (b) grant authority for school principal to transfer weak teachers and staff to other school, (c) give the principal the authority to hire outstanding teachers with distinct advantages over, (d) enable the school principal to suspend the inefficient teachers and staff, and (e) confer the authority for the school principal to evaluate their educational supervisors.
School budget. There were 48 (28%) suggestions regarding new authorities regarding the school budget. These suggestions concerned the following: (a) provide even greater financial independent and empowerment to principals, (b) give the principal opportunity to develop the financial action plan in order to manage the school without intervene from MOE, (c) allow the principal to increase the sources of the school budget, (d) grant authority for school principal to increase teacher’s salary based on their performance, and (e) permitted the school principal to increase the contracts with sponsors in order to support the school programs.

Power in decision-making. There were 26 (15%) suggestions regarding power in decision-making. Power in decision-making includes the following: (a) give the principal the authority in decision-making without referring to MOE, (b) allow principals to host the exports and speakers without witting MOE approval, (c) give the principal the right to develop their school system and curriculum, (d) grant authority to school principal to expel the negligent teachers or staff, and (e) restrict the supervisors from interfering in the extracurricular programs.

Operation issues. There were 19 (11%) suggestions regarding new authorities to manage operational issues. Operation issue include the following: (a) give full authority for principal to be independent in school activities, such as running the cafeteria entirely by school, (b) give the principal the right to develop the school strategic plan rather than operational plan, (c) increase the number of the principal assistant who work in the school, (d) conceder the principal approval before implementing any program that come from the MOE, and (e) permitting school principal to determine the school’s needs such as traveling to make contracts with agencies to improve the school.
Other. Finally, there were 13 (6%) suggestions for new authorities that were categorized as Other. These suggestions concerned the following: (a) give the principal authority to increase the community involvement in the school programs, (b) grant authority for principal to expulse students who have major behavioral problems, (c) give the principal more freedom for to maintainence the school building, (d) expend the school authority to work directly with government agencies, and (e) enable the principal to activate some existing authorities by reducing the process of the permissions needed from MOE.

Chapter IV Summary

This chapter detailed the results of the web-based questionnaire. The frequencies and descriptive statistics for each set of questions were provided, along with the results of the multiple regression analysis performed on the data. The chapter also included an analysis of the responses to the open-ended question and the explanation of the themes revealed within the responses. The next chapter examines how these results relate to each of the research questions. Significant findings for each question will be discussed.
KEY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of this study are discussed against the literature reviewed in earlier chapters. The main purpose of the research study was to explore Saudi school principals’ perceptions of the administrative and technical authorities granted for the purpose of decentralization, as well as the principals’ beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in achieving the Saudi Ministry of Education’s intended outcomes. In the current research study, data was collected from 173 Saudi principals from Tatweer schools who completed an online questionnaire surveying their perceptions of their ability to implement the new authorities, support for implementing the new authorities, and beliefs concerning the effectiveness of the new authorities in achieving MOE outcomes. Overall, findings suggest that Saudi principals perceived they have limited ability and low to moderate support for implementing the new authorities. Furthermore, participants only slightly agreed that the authorities were likely to achieve MOE outcomes. Beliefs were predicted by perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, perceived support to implement technical authorities, and years of experience as a principal. These findings and their implications are discussed in this chapter.

Findings From Participant Demographic Information

The average years of school principals experience for respondents who completed the survey was 10.84 (SD = 6.13). Figure 2 presents a histogram showing the distribution of respondents’ years of experience. The minimum and maximum years of experiences as a school principal are 1 and 33, respectively. From Figure 4, it can be concluded that the frequency distribution of years of experience held by principals of the Tatweer schools is not symmetric in pattern.
Thus, it can be concluded that level of experience observed in the participating principals is low, which is also reflected in the views of authors reviewed in the literature (Alderweesh, 2003; Argrys & Schon, 1996; Mustafa, 2002). This can affect the deployment of the authorities. This finding also supports assertions made by Mustafa (2002) who argued that experienced schools’ principals would be able to implement the suggestions in a better and more effective manner. Indeed, as discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, the results of this study’s multiple regression analysis indicate that years of experience was the only demographic variable to be a statistically significant predictor of belief in the effectiveness of the new authorities in achieving MOE outcomes.

**Perceptions of the Ability to Implement the New Authorities**

As discussed in Chapters I and II, Saudi school principals are charged with overseeing education reform at the local level; yet, to date few studies have explored their perceptions of the new authorities conferred to them by the Saudi MOE. Specifically, no study have explored school principals’ perceptions of their ability to implement the
authorities. Without this information, Saudi officials have little information from which to guide training initiatives and the disbursement of future authorities.

**Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities**

Part 1 of the current study’s survey explored principals’ perceptions of their ability to implement the 12 new administrative authorities. Table 4 (see chapter 4) shows the descriptive statistics for these scores. The statistics in that table provide evidence indicating that Tatweer schools perceive themselves as having a low to medium level of ability to implement the administrative authorities, as average scores obtained for most of the administrative authorities were between 3 and 4 out of a possible 6.

In addition to examining perceptions concerning each administrative authority at the individual level, a composite score was also created by obtaining an average score for the 12 administrative authorities as a whole. The possible total for these composite scores ranged from 12 to 72. The greater the composite score, the greater the perceived ability to implement administrative authorities.

As shown in the histogram depicted in Figure 5, the distribution of the composite scores obtained from the respondents’ results in relation to the ability to implement the new administrative authorities was slightly positively skewed. The majority of the respondents had composite scores between 30 and 50. The mean composite score was 40.52, which like the individual scores, suggests a low to moderate perceived ability to implement administrative authorities.
Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities

Figure 6 presents results concerning perceived ability to implement the new technical authorities. As shown, the school principals in this study perceived themselves as having low to medium ability to implement technical authorities. On average, scores for majority of the technical authorities were between 3 and 4 out of a possible 6. The composite scores for perceived ability to implement technical authorities range from nine to 54. The greater the composite scores, the greater perceived ability to implement technical authorities. The average composite score was 32.66. A normal distribution can be observed in the histogram, which indicates that responses were concentrated around the mean of the distribution. In this instance, the composite scores of the respondents show that the school principals have a low to moderate perceptions of their ability to implement the technical authorities.
Overall, the findings concerning principals’ perceptions of their ability to implement the new administrative and technical authorities provide new insight into the existing literature. Some researchers have supported the idea that principals in Saudi Arabia have the required ability to manage the adoption of new authorities given by Ministry of Education. From Figures 5 and 6, however, it can be concluded that there is a certain level of variation in perceptions of ability to implement the authorities among the principals themselves. In particular, principals in the Tatweer region had especially low perceptions of their ability to implement the technical authorities given by the Ministry of Education, which contrasts findings from previous literature. Alotaibi (2013) found that Makkah principals practice of the technical authorities ranged from moderate to high. However, it may be that perceived inability to implement the authorities does not necessarily translate into actual inability. Thus, further research is needed to examine the differences between perceived and actual ability.
Perceived Support to Implement the New Authorities

Part 2 of this study’s survey explored participants’ perceptions of the support they have in implementing the new authorities. Support in this study was defined as the extent to which Saudi school principals believe they have the resources, training, and administrative level support to implement the new authorities conferred upon them by the Ministry of Education. Again, support was explored for implementation of administrative and technical authorities.

Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities

Figures 7 and 8 depict the average scores rated by Tatweer school principals regarding support in implementing the administrative and technical authorities. Descriptive statistics reveal that according to the principals, they have little support in implementing the administrative authorities, as average scores were between 3 and 4 out of a possible 6.

Figure 7. Histogram of Scores on Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities.
Figure 7 shows the distribution of the composite scores for support to implement the administrative authorities. These composite scores ranged from 12 to 72. The greater the composite scores, the greater perceived support to implement the administrative authorities. The histogram in Figure 7 shows that the majority of scores fell between 30 and 50. The average composite scores for perceived support from MOE to implement administrative authorities was 37.72.

**Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities**

Descriptive statistics shown in Table 5 (see chapter 4) for support to implement technical authorities provide the same evidences that school principals have little to moderate support in implementing the authorities, as average scores were between 3 and 4 out of a possible 6. Figure 8 shows that scores in relation to the support to implement the technical authorities are normally distributed. The composite scores for perceived support to implement technical authorities range from 9 to 54. The greater the composite scores, the greater perceived support to implement technical authorities. The mean observed for this variable was 29.05.
Overall, it can be concluded from these results that Tatweer school principals have a low to moderate level of support to implement the new authorities. Alhumaidhi (2013) suggested that effective change management requires coordination and cooperation from staff members, and that lack of support is one of the obstacles in the practice of the new authorities. Implementation of technical authorities in particular demands more interest and experience in comparison to the regular authorities that are bestowed on the principals in the region by the Ministry of Education. In order to achieve the ideal implementation of the new authorities the support must be parallel with the high level of support given to the Makkah principals, which was found in the study conducted by Allheaniy (2012). This would create a more positive attitude toward the implementation of the new authorities. Overall, the results from Parts 1 and 2 of this study’s survey is summary in Table 10.

Table 10

Frequency Counts and Percentages of Responses for Perceived Ability to Implement the Authorities and Support to Implement them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorities</th>
<th>Ability to Implement</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Transfer administrative employees</td>
<td>2.27 (1.70)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Specify teachers for transfer</td>
<td>2.32 (1.75)</td>
<td>2.56 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Execute out of school activities</td>
<td>2.47 (1.70)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Choose an assistant principal</td>
<td>2.84 (1.80)</td>
<td>2.65 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Name substitute teachers for financial reward</td>
<td>2.84 (1.92)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Determine dangerous student behavior and transfer</td>
<td>2.87 (1.87)</td>
<td>2.77 (1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Sign contracts to operate school cafeteria</td>
<td>3.08 (1.98)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Increase duration of study groups</td>
<td>3.14 (1.85)</td>
<td>2.85 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Close school in emergency cases</td>
<td>3.22 (1.97)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorities</th>
<th>Ability to Implement</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Nominate employees for professional development</td>
<td>3.32 (1.84)</td>
<td>3.10 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Evaluate bus drivers</td>
<td>3.40 (1.8)</td>
<td>3.21 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Contact the private sector to meet school goals</td>
<td>3.57 (1.72)</td>
<td>3.24 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Contract with maintenance institutions</td>
<td>3.61 (1.97)</td>
<td>3.28 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Make temporary modifications in class duration</td>
<td>3.62 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.48 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Arrange studies to solve school issues</td>
<td>3.83 (1.56)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Communicate with government in emergencies</td>
<td>3.98 (1.81)</td>
<td>3.62 (1.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Sign cleaning contracts</td>
<td>4.02 (1.57)</td>
<td>3.56 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Apply teaching models</td>
<td>4.23 (1.84)</td>
<td>3.64 (1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Add programs to address school problems</td>
<td>4.50 (1.61)</td>
<td>3.64 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tech) Accept out of district students</td>
<td>4.62 (1.46)</td>
<td>3.90 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Admin) Deduct pay and inform DOE</td>
<td>4.76 (1.70)</td>
<td>4.03 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the Authorities in Achieving MOE Outcomes

The third part of this study’s survey explored Tatweer school principals’ beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in helping to achieve the Saudi Ministry of Education’s intended outcomes. The study explored a total of eight outcomes.

Table 6 (see chapter 4) presents the results from the individual scores on beliefs about the effectiveness of new authorities in accomplishing the Ministry of Education’s intended outcomes. The average scores rated by the principals were between 3.50 and 4 out of a possible 6.

Figure 9 depicts the composite scores for beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes, which ranged from 8 to 48. The greater the
composite scores, the more positive the beliefs were toward the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes. The average composite score for the perceived effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing the outcomes of the MOE was 29.68. The composite figure reiterates the idea that principals only slightly agree that the new authorities are effective for decentralization of the school system.

![Histogram of Scores on Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes](image)

*Figure 9.* Histogram of Scores on Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes.

Providing a fair amount of authorities to school administrators allows countries to make occur changes that are essential in managing the overall development of the educational system. The Saudi Ministry of Education has realized the shortcomings that are present in its current educational system, and has been trying to implement reforms to manage these shortcomings (Ramady, 2010). Alhumadhi (2013) recommended more authorities be given to school principals to help them manage their schools. Delegating autonomous authority to the school principals can be helpful in managing the changes and changing requirements. A number of countries have introduced decentralization of educational powers, and have been able to resolve different issues and improve
educational environment in the school (Cordesman, 2009). Nevertheless, the principals in this study believe that the granted new authorities are only slightly effective in the initial steps of decentralization. Again, more research is needed to determine if this perception is accurate.

Overall, the results from Parts 1 through 3 of this study’s survey show that in the present condition, school principals have low to moderate level of ability to implement the authorities, support to implement the authorities, and belief that the new authorities will help to achieve the MOE outcomes. These results are somewhat compatible with those from an Alhumaidhi (2013) study, which found that one of the obstacles the principal faced in implementing the new authorities is that the authorities are inflexible. This inflexibility of authorities may lead to the difficulty to implement the authorities, the lack of support will increase the inflexible structure of the authorities, and thus it will be difficult to achieve the MOE outcomes. The next part of the study’s data analysis explored the relationship among perceptions of ability, support, demographic characteristics, and beliefs in the effectiveness of the authorities.

**The Relationship Among Ability, Support, Demographics, and Effectiveness**

Multiple regression analysis was used to predict beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in achieving the objectives of the Ministry of the Education in Saudi Arabia. The predictor variables were: (a) Perceived Ability to Implement Administrative Authorities; (b) Perceived Ability to Implement Technical Authorities; (c) Perceived Support to Implement Administrative Authorities; (d) Perceived Support to Implement Technical Authorities; (e) gender; (f) school building level; (g) level of education; and (h) years of experience.
The results of multiple regression analysis yielded three significant findings. First, there was a statistically significant relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and perceived ability to implement administrative authorities at the 0.05 level of significance. According to the regression equation, for every unit increase of the composite score for perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, the composite score for beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes increased by 0.19. Thus, there was a positive relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, i.e., the greater the perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, the greater beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes.

Second, there was a statistically significant relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and level of perceived support available to implement technical authorities at the 0.05 level of significance. According to the regression equation, for every unit increase of the composite score for perceived support to implement technical authorities, the composite score for beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes will increase by 0.34. Thus, there was a positive relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and perceived level of current support available to implement technical authorities, i.e., the greater the perceived level of support to implement technical authorities, the greater the beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes.
Third, there was a statistically significant relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and principals’ years of experience at the 0.05 level of significance. According to the regression equation, for every unit increase of years of experience, the composite score for beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes will increase by 0.28. Thus, there was a positive relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and years of experience, i.e., the longer the principals’ years of experience, the greater beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes.

**Figure 10.** The Regression Model for The Relationship Among Ability, Support, Demographics, and Effectiveness.

Overall, the results of the multiple regression analysis show that school principals’ perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, perceived support to implement technical authorities, and years of experience have a statistically significant impact on beliefs concerning the effectiveness of new authorities in achieving the MOE’s
objectives. Specifically, the analysis results suggest that there is a positive relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, i.e., the greater the perceived ability to implement administrative authorities, the greater beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes. This means that decentralization of the school systems in Saudi Arabia may be possible if the schools have an ability to implement administrative authorities. Researchers who suggest that decentralization of school systems can occur when more decisive power is given to principals have supported this idea (Alalaq, 2000; Darmawan, 2008; Dixson, 2005; Goldt, 2006; Gumede, 1999; Kelechukwu, 2011; Osorio, Anthony, & Fasih 2009). Thus, it can be said that decentralization of the school system becomes easier if the schools have a good level of ability to implement the administrative authorities.

Results from the regression analysis also shows that the level of support in implementing the technical authorizes also has a statistically significant impact on beliefs on the effectiveness of new authorities in achieving MOE objectives. Specifically, there was a positive relationship between beliefs and support, i.e., the greater the perceived support to implement technical authorities, the greater beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes. This suggests that decentralization of the school system may be possible in the Saudi Arabia if the schools have sufficient support to implement the technical authorities, which is also reflective in the discussions made in the literature review chapter (see Khan, 2011).

Finally, as discussed earlier, beliefs on the effectiveness of new authorities is also affected by the years of experience held by the principals. The results of this study
suggest that there is a positive relationship between beliefs and years of experience. The analysis provides suggests that if the principals are highly experienced, then the objectives of the Ministry of the Education may more easily be achieved. As Astiz (2004) noted, many school administrators are without the training and time to deal with matters associated with decentralization, which in part, may be due to a lack of experience. Furthermore, in general, this lack of experience may affect school principals’ understanding of: (a) current reforms, (b) the purpose of decentralization, and (c) how to initiate change (Scott & Jaffe, 2004). It may be beneficial therefore, for Saudi officials to make greater efforts to obtain more experienced principals. It can be concluded that there is an increased demand of educated, as well as skilled human resources for the achievement of organizational goals. Successful educational planning in a country should be aligned with other significant plans of the government (Alagbari, 2006).

**Suggestions for New Authorities**

The final aspect of this study explored Tatweer school principals’ suggestions for additional new authorities. Data was obtained from an open-ended question. From the analysis results of the open-end question, it appears the Tatweer principals are looking for additional authorities that emphasize in the following five categories: (a) staff issues, (b) school budget, (c) power in decision-making, (d) operational issues, and (e) other.

Table 11 shows each of the categories, the percentage of responses additional authorities for each categories, and affirms with key findings for previous research in my literature review.
Table 11

**Additional new Authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category / Percent</th>
<th>Additional Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff issues</strong></td>
<td>(a) Involve the principal in recruiting teachers and staff who work in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Grant authority for school principal to transfer weak teachers and staff to other school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Give the principal the authority to hire outstanding teachers with distinct advantages over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Enable the school principal to suspend the inefficient teachers and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Confer the authority for the school principal to evaluate their educational supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were 40% suggestions for new authorities regarding staff issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Budget</strong></td>
<td>(a) Provide even greater financial independent and empowerment to principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Give the principal opportunity to develop the financial action plan in order to manage the school without intervene from MOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Allow the principal to increase the sources of the school budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Grant authority for school principal to increase teacher’s salary based on their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Permitted the school principal to increase the contracts with sponsors in order to support the school programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were 28% suggestions for new authorities regarding school budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power in Decision-Making</strong></td>
<td>(a) Give the principal the authority in decision-making without referring to MOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Allow principals to host the exports and speakers without witting MOE approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Give the principal the right to develop their school system and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Grant authority to school principal to expel the negligent teachers or staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Restrict the supervisors from interfering in the extracurricular programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were 15% suggestions for new authorities regarding power in decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation Issues</strong></td>
<td>(a) Give full authority for principal to be independent in school activities, such as running the cafeteria entirely by school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Give the principal the right to develop the school strategic plan rather than operational plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Increase the number of the principal assistant who work in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Conceder the principal approval before implementing any program that come from the MOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Permitting school principal to determine the school’s needs such as traveling to make contracts with agencies to improve the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were 11% suggestions for new authorities regarding to manage operation issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other issues</strong></td>
<td>(a)Give the principal authority to increase the community involvement in the school programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Grant authority for principal to expulse students who have major behavioral problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Give the principal more freedom for to maintenance the school building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Expend the school authority to work directly with government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Enable the principal to activate some existing authorities by reducing the process of the permissions needed from MOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were 13% suggestions for new authorities that were categorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The qualitative data enhances and agrees with the quantitative data. Through additional authorities that proposed by the school principals, which is considered the most important support they need to achieve the outcomes of the MOE towards the decentralization. Decentralization of the power is the main concern of the research-based decisions that have been made by the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia. Moreover, across the two types of data found that there is a need to increase the powers of administrative and technical authority, but there is an urgent need for financial authorities because they are very few compared to the rest of other type of authority.

Overall findings from my study add new findings, affirms, and disputes with key findings for previous research in my literature review and that described in Table 12 and will be outlined in the pages that follow.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meemar (2014) Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Implement the new Authorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Principals perceive themselves as having a low to medium level of ability to implement the administrative authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Principals perceive themselves as having a low to medium level of ability to implement the technical authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support to Implement the New Authorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Principals have little support in implementing the administrative authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Principals have little to moderate support in implementing the technical authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affirms:

▪ Allheaniy (2012) who found in order to achieve the ideal implementation of the new authorities the support must be parallel with the high level of support given to the principals.
▪ Allheaniy (2012) who found there is a need to support principals in ways to implement the new authorities.
▪ Alhumaaidhi (2013) who found that effective change management requires coordination and cooperation from staff members, and that lack of support is one of the obstacles in the practice of the new authorities.
Table 12- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meemar (2014) Findings</th>
<th>Pervious Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the Authorities in Achieving MOE Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Principals have low to moderate level of belief that the new authorities will help to achieve the MOE outcomes which are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shift the school toward disciplined decentralization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide increased flexibility to manage the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Align school with the future direction of MOE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitate the schools’ roles and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve the schools’ performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assist the school to conduct self-development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase a focus on learning and teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enable the leadership role of the principal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relationship Among Ability, Support, Demographics, and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There was a positive relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and perceived ability to implement administrative authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There was a positive relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and perceived support to implement technical authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There was a positive relationship between beliefs on the effectiveness of the new authorities in accomplishing MOE outcomes and years of experience, i.e., the longer the principals’ years of experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adds to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alhumaidhi (2013) who found a lack of incentives for school principals that support them to implement the new authorities. In addition, there is lack of support in providing distinctive buildings and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alhumaidhi (2013) who found one of the obstacles the principal faced in implementing the new authorities is that the authorities are inflexible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alhumaidhi (2013) who found there is number of obstacles are facing the principals if not addressed, will decrease the effectiveness of the new authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alheaniy (2012) who found the principals have high positive attitudes toward administrative and technical authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alotaibi (2013) who found the new authorities helped to improve their performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adds to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alhumaidhi (2013) who found giving principals financial incentives would help the school principals improve their performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alotaibi (2013) who found there is some of the new administrative authorities they do not have a role in improving the principals performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All the previous research in my literature review, which are Alheaniy (2012); Alhumaidhi (2013); and Alotaibi (2013), found that there is no significant relation found between their variables and the demographics of their studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meemar (2014) Findings</th>
<th>Pervious Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions for New Authorities</strong></td>
<td>Affirms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is need for more authorities regarding to the staff issues.</td>
<td>▪ Alhumaidhi (2013) who found one of the obstacles school principals face in implementing the new authorities is the lack of qualified administrative and teaching staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is need for more authorities regarding to the school budget</td>
<td>▪ Allheaniy (2012) who found school principals need more financial authorities. In addition, Alhumaidhi (2013) confirmed that a major obstacle principals face implement the new authorities is lack in the school budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is need for more authorities regarding to power in decision-making.</td>
<td>▪ Alhumadhi (2013) recommended more authorities be given to school principals to help them manage their schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is need for more authorities regarding to operational issues</td>
<td>Adds to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Alhumaidhi (2013) who found that giving principals privileged material and moral incentives was beneficial in improving the culture of the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations and suggestions can be offered. In particular, recommendations can be made for effective implementation of the new authorities (both administrative and technical), as well as training and programmatic recommendations to further support the implementation of new authorities.

**Implementation Recommendations**

Based on the results of this study, it is clear that Saudi officials must make greater efforts to increase principals’ perceptions of their ability and the level of available support to implement the new administrative and technical authorities. Providing principals with a clear understanding of available resources may help to do this. Specifically, principals in the region should be assisted in developing a clear understanding of the resources that are available to implement the new authorities in the school administration. As Adegbemile (2011) noted, a clear knowledge of resources can be helpful in managing the implementation of authorities that have already been provided by the Ministry of Education.
Implementation of the new administrative and technical authorities may also be facilitated by support from other staff members such as the assistant principal and heads of school committees. Principals should be given more space to make decisions without deference to the MOE in their more toward decentralization, and support from other members in the school administration is critical for successful implementation of the authorities provided by the Ministry of Education. Greater involvement of principals in the implementation of the authorities can be more effective in managing the overall change process. The experience of school principals can be used to develop a better working environment, which will successfully develop a platform for decentralization of powers. Yet, as Mustafa (2009) argued, lack of a supportive staff can be a major obstacle in implementing the changes in the school administration. Principals cannot do it alone.

Along with supportive staff, greater cooperation and coordination among all branches of education in Saudi Arabia would help to facilitate the implementation of the new authorities. As the core aim of the Ministry of Education is the decentralization of school districts and empowering principals, effective communication is needed to ensure responsibilities and goals are understood. Greater decision-making powers can also be supportive in managing the overall development and sustainability of the schools (Smith & Abouammoh, 2013). As suggested by the participants of this study, the decision-making powers should provide more authorities for principals to transfer selected teachers, recruit teachers and staff, suspend weak staff, and make more financial decisions.
**Recommendations for MoreAuthorities**

Based on the results of this study the Tatweer principals are looking for additional authorities that emphasize in the five categories. The most common authorities the school principals ask through each of the five categories are the following: a) involve the principal in recruiting teachers and staff who work in the school, in the same time enable them to suspend the inefficient teachers and staff, b) provide even greater financial independent and empowerment to principals and allow them to find different sources for the school budget, c) give the principal the authority in decision-making without referring to MOE, and restrict the supervisors from interfering in the extracurricular programs, d) give full authority for principal to be independent in school activities, such as running the cafeteria entirely by school, and e) give the principal authority to increase the community involvement in the school programs, and expend the school authority to work directly with government agencies.

**Training Recommendations**

Previous literature indicates that principals who are equipped with better leadership skills have the ability to move their schools toward sustainable growth in the future (Osorio et al., 2009). With this in mind, it can be argued that better leadership skills can be helpful in managing the changes occurring due to the new authorities in Saudi Arabia. This idea has been supported by the responses collected from the 173 participants in this study. Training has an important role in developing and supporting the adaptation of reform strategies. Educational reforms in Saudi Arabia have been used to develop the educational environment required for effective learning and levels of...
teaching. In the process of implementing the strategies proposed in the reforms, schools’ principals are required to undergo certain training sessions. Organizing leadership training sessions focused on the implementation of the new authorities would benefit the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia.

The Ministry has been trying to develop several competencies to assist principals in leading their schools in the required manner (Smith & Abouammoh, 2013). Training sessions for principals that are highly structured and motivating would be especially useful in this pursuit. Specifically, this type of training session would help principals develop a clear understanding of the administrative and technical authorities that have been provided by the Ministry of Education. Training sessions by the Ministry of Education can also be used to help principals understand more about suggestions that have been made to improve the educational environment (Osorio et al., 2009). Furthermore, less experienced principals can be supported by training programs that emphasize mentorship by more experienced principals. This too would help implementation of the new authorities, because as it is now, many school administrators are without the training and time to deal with matters associated with decentralization (Astiz, 2004).

**Recommendations for Future Research**

In the findings of this study, I identified various areas where further research will needed. The areas of further research include the following:

- Extending the pool of survey participants to all K-12 principals.
- Sending the survey at a different time of the year.
- Having more frequent email reminders.
- Using a qualitative approach.

- There is need for study focus on the most important reasons that prevented the principals to implement the new authorities granted to them.

- There is need for study focus on the most important support the principals need to implement the new authorities.

- There is need for study focus on the most important reasons that contributed to the failure of achieve some of the MOE outcomes.

**Chapter V Summary**

Based on the results of this research study, it can be concluded that the school principals need more authorities and support to achieve the goals of the MOE, and impact the overall performance of students. The role of teachers has changed, as they have a more specific role of supporting the overall development of students. Because of decentralization, the role in the school principal is changing too. Yet, the results of this study show that principals perceived thy only have low to moderate abilities to implement the new authorities, and only low to moderate levels of support. In this way, the current research has been successful in understanding some of what is required for the education system in Saudi Arabia to move forward with decentralization. Namely, greater efforts must be taken by the Ministry to give principals the resources and support they need to implement their newly granted authorities.
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Appendix A

Survey
Please read this consent information before you begin the survey.

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Tatweer School Principals' Perceptions of New Authorities Granted in the Initial Steps of Decentralization" designed to explore Tatweer school principals’ perceptions regarding the new authorities granted to them in the initial steps of decentralization.

The study is being conducted by Dr. Sue Poppink and Salah Meemar from Western Michigan University, Department of Education Leadership, Research, and Technology. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Salah Meemar.

This questionnaire is comprised of 50 multiple choice and one open ended question and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Your replies will be completely anonymous. When you begin the survey, you are consenting to participate in the study. If you do not agree to participate in this research project simply exit now. If, after beginning the survey, you decide that you do not wish to continue, you may stop at any time. You may choose to not answer any question for any reason. If you have any questions prior to or during the study, you may contact Dr. Sue Poppink at (269) 387-3569, Salah Meemar at (055)435-9414, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269) 387-8293 or the vice president for research (269) 387-8298.

This study was approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional review Board (HSIRB) on (date). Please do not participate in this study after (one year after approval). Participating in this survey online indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

Do you consent to participate in this survey?

☐ Yes

☐ No
Survey of Principals’ Perceptions of Their New Authorities for Decentralization

**Directions:** The purpose of this survey is to learn what you think about your authorities as a school principal. Please read and answer each question carefully. Remember, all of your responses will remain anonymous and confidential. Your name will not be associated with any of your answers.

**Part 1: Perceived Ability to Implement Authorities**

Indicate the extent of your ability to implement each of the 21 new authorities using the following scale: 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very Low Extent; 3 = Low Extent; 4 = Medium Extent; 5 = Great Extent; 6 = Very Great Extent.

**Administrative Authorities:**

1. Choose an assistant principal from the list of names provided by the Department of Education.

2. Deduct pay from the employees’ salaries when they are absent or late, and then inform the Department of Education to implement the decision.

3. Specify teachers who are to be transferred from one school to another school. These teachers should be those whose performance has decreased 85% in function over the last two years.

4. Transfer any employees in administrative jobs to other schools if their performance has decreased from “excellent” in the last two years.

5. Evaluate bus drivers.

6. Apply models that support the proficiency of teaching and education.

7. Arrange studies to solve school issues.

8. Nominate not more than five employees for professional development in the school year.

9. Sign contracts with specialized parties accredited by governmental sectors related to operating the school cafeteria.

10. Adopt the naming of teachers who deserve a financial reward for teaching classes in which they substitute for an absent teacher in
addition to working their own 24 credits hours.

11. Sign contracts with laborers for cleaning the school in the case contracts were impossible with the cleaning officers, or in the case the labor was contracted but not performed. 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. Contract with competent institutions to perform urgent maintenance for the school according to the specialized budget. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Technical Authorities:

13. Make temporary modifications in the duration of classes and recess to realize educational needs. 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. Increase the duration of study for groups of students to approximately one hour at maximum per day. 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. Close the school in emergency cases for one day at maximum, and officially inform the Department of Education. 1 2 3 4 5 6

16. Communicate directly with the governmental organizations in emergency cases. 1 2 3 4 5 6

17. Accept students who are out of the school district. 1 2 3 4 5 6

18. Determine when a student’s behavior represents a danger against any school employee, and transfer the student to another school. 1 2 3 4 5 6

19. Add programs that address some of the school problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6

20. Execute specified school activities outside the school, for durations of no more than three days. 1 2 3 4 5 6

21. Contact the private sector to sponsor school programs that match school goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Part 2: Perceived Support to Implement Authorities

Think about the support that you have to implement each of the new authorities given by the Saudi Ministry of Education for the purpose of decentralization. Support includes having the resources, training, and administrative level support necessary to implement the new authorities. Indicate the support you have to implement the new authorities using the following scale:

1 = No Support At All; 2 = Almost No Support; 3 = A Little Support; 4 = A Moderate
Amount of Support; 5 = A Good Deal of Support; 6 = A Great Deal of Support.

**Administrative Authorities:**

1. Choose an assistant principal from the list of names provided by the Department of Education.

2. Deduct pay from the employees’ salaries when they are absent or late, and then inform the Department of Education to implement the decision.

3. Specify teachers who are to be transferred from one school to another school. These teachers should be those whose performance has decreased 85% in function over the last two years.

4. Transfer any employees in administrative jobs to other schools if their performance has decreased from “excellent” in the last two years.

5. Evaluate bus drivers.

6. Apply models that support the proficiency of teaching and solve school problems.

7. Arrange studies to solve school issues.

8. Nominate not more than five employees for professional development in the school year.

9. Sign contracts with specialized parties accredited by governmental sectors related to operating the school cafeteria.

10. Adopt the naming of teachers who deserve a financial reward for teaching classes in which they substitute for an absent teacher in addition to working their own 24 credits hours.

11. Sign contracts with laborers for cleaning the school in the case contracts were impossible with the cleaning officers, or in the case the labor was contracted but not performed.

12. Contract with competent institutions to perform urgent maintenance for the school according to the specialized budget.
Technical Authorities:

13. Make temporary modifications in the duration of classes and recess to realize educational needs.

14. Increase the duration of study for groups of students to approximately one hour at maximum per day.

15. Close the school in emergency cases for one day at maximum, and officially inform the Department of Education.

16. Communicate directly with the governmental organizations in emergency cases.

17. Accept students who are out of the school district.

18. Determine when a student’s behavior represents a danger against any school employee, and transfer the student to another school.

19. Add programs that address some of the school problems.

20. Execute specified school activities outside the school, for durations of no more than three days.

21. Contact the private sector to sponsor school programs that match school goals.

Part 3: Beliefs on the Effectiveness of the New Authorities in Accomplishing MOE Outcomes

Please use the following scale to rate the degree to which you agree the new authorities are helping to achieve each of the intended outcomes in your school:

1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly disagree; 4 = Slightly agree; 5 = Agree; 6 = Strongly agree.

The new authorities are helping to:

1. Align the school with the future direction of MOE.

2. Shift the school toward disciplined decentralization.

3. Assist the school to conduct self-development.
4. Provide increased flexibility to manage the school. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Improve the schools’ performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Facilitate the schools’ roles and procedures. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Increase a focus on learning and teaching. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Enable the leadership role of the principal. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Part 4: Desired Additional Authorities

What are the three additional authorities you would like to add to your current authorities to increase the effectiveness of your school?

1.
2.
3.

Part 5: Background Information

1. What level is your school building?
   - □ High school  □ Intermediate school  □ Elementary school
2. What is your highest level of education?
   - □ PhD  □ Master’s degree  □ Bachelor’s degree  □ Diploma
3. How many years of experience do you have as a school principal?
4. What is your gender? □ Male  □ Female
Appendix B

Letter to the Tatweer Department
Dear Tatweer Department,

I am doing my Ph.D. dissertation about Tatweer principals’ perceptions of their new authorities in the initial steps of decentralization. This study try to explore school principals’ perceptions of (a) the extent to which they believe they have the ability to implement the new authorities granted to them, (b) the level of support they have for implementing the new authorities, (c) the effectiveness of the new authorities at achieving MOE outcomes, and (d) any other authorities they would like to add to the current authorities.

I am looking for your support by sending my survey to all Tatweer principals via email and encouraging them to participate. I know that you are and the principals extremely busy, but I hope the results of this study add value to your department. Please ask the principals to provide their input by taking the survey by June 15, 2014.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via email at salah@meemar.com or by telephone at 0554359414.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Please click on the link to the online survey below:
https://www.esurveycreator.com/s/meemar

Sincerely,

Salah Meemar
Western Michigan University
Doctoral Candidate
Salah@meemar.com
0554359414
Appendix C

Letter to Principals
Dear Principal,

I am inviting you to participate in a study on principals’ perceptions of their new authorities in the initial steps of decentralization. This study try to explore school principals’ perceptions of (a) the extent to which they believe they have ability to implement the new authorities granted to them, (b) the level of support they have for implementing the new authorities, (c) the effectiveness of the new authorities at achieving MOE outcomes, and (d) any other authorities they would like to add to the current authorities.

I know that you are extremely busy, but I hope you will take the time to participate in this study. The survey is user-friendly and you should be able to complete it in 10 minutes or less. Your responses will be kept completely confidential. Please provide your input by taking the survey by June 15, 2014.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via email at salah@meemar.com or by telephone at 0554359414.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

To begin, please click on the link to the online survey below:
https://www.esurveycreator.com/s/meemar

Sincerely,

Salah Meemar
Western Michigan University
Doctoral Candidate
Salah@meemar.com
0554359414
Appendix D

Reminder Letter to Principals
Dear Principal,

Thank you for considering participating in my survey. This letter is a reminder that I am inviting you to participate in a study on principals’ perceptions of their new authorities in the initial steps of decentralization. If you have already completed the survey, thank you. If not this is friendly reminder.

I know that you are extremely busy, but I hope you will take the time to participate in this study. The survey is user-friendly and you should be able to complete it in 10 minutes or less. Your responses will be kept completely confidential. Please provide your input by taking the survey by June 15, 2014.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via email at salah@meemar.com or by telephone at 0554359414.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

To begin, please click on the link to the online survey below:

https://www.esurveycreator.com/s/meemar

Sincerely,

Salah Meemar
Western Michigan University
Doctoral Candidate
Salah@meemar.com
0554359414
Appendix E

Second Reminder Letter to Principals
Dear Principal,

Thank you for considering participating in my survey. This letter is a reminder that I am inviting you to participate in a study on principals’ perceptions of their new authorities in the initial steps of decentralization. If you have already completed the survey, thank you. If not this is last friendly reminder.

I know that you are extremely busy, but I hope you will take the time to participate in this study. The survey is user-friendly and you should be able to complete it in 10 minutes or less. Your responses will be kept completely confidential. Please provide your input by taking the survey by June 15, 2014.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via email at salah@meemar.com or by telephone at 0554359414.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

To begin, please click on the link to the online survey below:

https://www.esurveycreator.com/s/meemar

Sincerely,

Salah Meemar
Western Michigan University
Doctoral Candidate
Salah@meemar.com
0554359414
Appendix F

Arabic Translation of Survey and Email Letters
الرجاء قراءة المعلومات التالية قبل البدء في تعبيئة الاستبيان

أنت مدعو للمشاركة في بحثي والذي عنوانه هو "تصورات مدراء مدارس تطوير نحو الصلاحيات الجديدة التي منحت لهم كخطوة أولى للتحول نحو اللامركزية". وهذه الدراسة تحاول الكشف عن آراء مدراء مدارس تطوير نحو الصلاحيات الممنوحة لجميع مدراء المدارس من قبل وزارة التربية والتعليم للتحول نحو اللامركزية.

وهذا البحث تجريه الدكتورة سو بابنك وصلاح معمار من جامعة غرب متشجن بأمريكا من قسم القيادة التربوية وهذا البحث متطلب على صلاح معمار لدراجة الدكتوراه.

ويتألف هذا الاستبيان من 51 فقرة على شكل اختيار من متعدد وسول واحد مفتوح، وسوف تستغرق هذه الاستبانة حوالي 15 دقيقة كحد أقصى. مع العلم أن بياناتكم لن تكون ظاهرة ولن يتم التعرف على صاحب الإجابات. وللإجابة في المشاركة في الاستبيان أو الانسحاب في أي وقت لاحق ولأي سبب من الأسباب.

إن كان لديك أي استفسار في أي وقت يمكنك الاتصال على الدكتور سو بابنك على الرقم 9968282962 أو الاتصال على صلاح معمار على الرقم 4550856050 أو على مجلس البحث العلمي بجامعة غرب متشجن على الرقم 2693878298.

أخيرا، هذه الدراسة تم الموافقة عليها من قبل مجلس البحث العلمي في جامعة غرب متشجن ويرجى عدم المشاركة في الاستبان بعد مرور عام من تاريخ اعتماد الاستبان.

هل توافق على المشاركة في هذه الاستبانة؟

نعم ☐
لا ☐
ملاحظة: الهدف من الدراسة هو التعرف على تصوراتك حول أحدث الصلاحيات الجديدة الممنوحة لمدراء المدارس، لهذا نحن الإجابة على جميع الأسئلة التالية بعناية وشكا للك مقدماً.

الجزء الأول: مدى إمكانية تطبيق الصلاحيات الجديدة

إلى أي مدى يمكن تطبيق الصلاحيات الجديدة التالية، مع العلم أن (1) لا يمكن التطبيق، (2) إمكانية التطبيق منخفضة جداً (3) إمكانية التطبيق متوسطة، (4) إمكانية التطبيق عالية (5) إمكانية التطبيق عالية جداً.

الأول: الصلاحيات الإدارية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>اقتصاء وكيل المدرسة من قائمة الأسماء المقدمة من إدارة التعليم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>إصدار قرارات الحسم على المتقين والمت acompaña من مسؤولي المدرسة لإبلاغ المدرسة بقرار الحسم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>تحديد المعلم المراد نقله من المدرسة والذي يقل أداؤه عن 85 درجة لمدة عامين.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>التوجيه بتقديم أي موظف إذا قل أداؤه عن تقدير ممتاز في آخر عامين.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>تكوين فئة متعهدين نقل الطلاب.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>اعتبار برامج التدريب على التشغيل المدرسي لكفاءة أداء التعليم والتعلم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>القيام بإجراء الدراسات التربوية على مبنية المدرسة لحل المشكلات المدرسية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>اعتماد برامج تستهدف رفع كفاءة أداء التعليم والتعلم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>اعتماد برامج تستهدف رفع كفاءة أداء التعليم والتعلم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>الاتفاق مع جهات متخصصة ومعتمدة من القطاعات الحكومية لتشغيل المقصف المدرسي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>اعتماد قبول الطلاب خارج نطاق المدرسة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>تحديد الطالب الذي يمثل سلوكه خطر على منسوبي المدرسة ونقله لمدرسة أخرى.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

الثاني: الصلاحيات الفنية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>التغيير المؤقت على زمن الحضور والفسح والجدول المدرسي عند الحاجة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>زيادة زمن اليوم الدراسي لمجموعة من الطلاب بما لا يزيد عن ساعة واحدة يومياً لبرنامج تعليمي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>إبلاغ إدارة التعليم بإلغاء اليوم الدراسي في الحالات الطارئة بما لا يزيد عن يوم معادية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>لتوصل المباحث مع الجهات الحكومية في حالات الطوارئ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>اعتماد قبول الطلاب من هم خارج نطاق المدرسة الجغرافية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>تحديد الطلاب الذين يمثلون سلوك خطر على منسوبي المدرسة ونقلهم لمدرسة أخرى.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. إضافة برامج تساعد على معالجة بعض المشكلات المدرسية.
20. اعتماد تنفيذ الأنشطة خارج وقت دوام المدرسة لمدة لا تزيد عن 3 أيام.
21. الاتفاق مع القطاع الخاص لرعاية برامج المدرسة وفق أهداف المدرسة.

الجزء الثاني: مستوى الدعم المتوفر لتطبيق الصلاحيات الجديدة
فكر بمدى توفر الدعم من قبل وزارة التربية والتعليم لتطبيق الصلاحيات سواء دعم إداري أو تدريبي أو أي دعم ضروري تحتاجه لتطبيق الصلاحيات الجديدة مع العلم أن (1) لا يوجد دعم تماماً، (2) تقريباً لا يوجد دعم، (3) دعم بسيط، (4) دعم متوسط، (5) دعم جيد، (6) دعم عالي.

أولا: الصلاحيات الإدارية

1. اختيار وكيل المدرسة من قائمة الأسماء المقدمة من إدارة التعليم.
2. إصدار قرارات الحسم على المتغيبين والمتأخرین من منسوبي المدرسة وإبلاغ الإدارة بقرار الحسم.
3. تحديد المعلم المراد نقله من المدرسة والذي يقل أداءه عن 85 درجة لمدة عامين.
4. التوجيه بنقل أي موظف إذا قل أداءه عن تقييم ممتاز في آخر عامين.
5. تقوم أداء معهد نقل الطلاب.
6. اعتماد برامج تشجيع الطلاب للمشاركة في مسابقات تعليمية.
7. القيام بإجراء الدراسات التربوية على منسوبي المدرسة لحل المشكلات المدرسية.
8. رشح ما لا يزيد عن 5 من منسوبي المدرسة لانتقالهم لفرص التنمية المهنية.
9. الاتفاق مع جهات متخصصة ومعتمدة من القطاعات الحكومية لتفعيل المخصصات المدرسية.
10. استخدام مساعدة المعلمن المستضاف لمكافحة تدريس حضور الطلاب بالصورة.
11. تأمين العمالة لنظافة المدرسة في حالة تعذر التعاقد مع متعهد أو عدم قيام العمالة بالعمل المطلوب.
12. التعاون مع المؤسسات المختصة لإجراء عمليات الصيانة الطارئة وفق ميزانية المدرسة.

ثانيا: الصلاحيات الفنية

13. التحويل المؤقت على زمن الحصص والفسح والجدول المدرسي عند الحاجة.
14. زيادة زمن اليوم الدراسي لمجموعة من الطلاب بما لا يزيد عن ساعة واحدة يومياً.
15. التعاقد مع معلمين في الحالات الطارئة بما لا يزيد عن يوم مع إبلاغ إدارة التعليم.
16. التواصل المباشر مع الجهات الحكومية في حالة الطوارئ.
17. اعتماد قبول الطلاب من طلبات خارج نطاق المدرسة الأخرى.
18. تحديد الطلاب الذين يثيرون مشكلة خطر على منسوبي المدرسة ونقله لمدرسة أخرى.
19. اعتماد برامج تشغيل معاملة بعض المشكلات المدرسية.
20. اعتماد تنفيذ الأنشطة خارج وقت دوام المدرسة لمدة لا تزيد عن 3 أيام.
21. الاتفاق مع القطاع الخاص لرعاية برامج المدرسة وفق أهداف المدرسة.
الجزء الثالث: مدى اعتقادك بفعالية الصلاحيات الجديدة في تحقيق أهداف الوزارة 
ما مدى موافقتك على أن الصلاحيات الجديدة ساعدت على تحقيق أهداف الوزارة التي وضعتها عند تعميم الصلاحيات، مع العلم أن (1) لا أتفق تماما، (2) لا أتفق، (3) إلى حد ما لا أتفق، (4) إلى حد ما أتفق، (5) أتفق، (6) أتفق تماما.

الصلاحيات الجديدة ساعدت على:
1. موازنة توجيهات المدرسة مع توجيهات الوزارة الجديدة.
2. تحول المدرسة إلى نظام اللامركزية المنضبطة.
3. مساعدة المدرسة للوصول إلى التطوير الذاتي.
4. توفير المزيد من المرونة لإدارة المدرسة.
5. زيادة فاعلية أداء المدرسة.
6. تسهيل الإجراءات والأدوار في المدرسة.
7. زيادة التركيز على التدريس والتعليم.
8. تفعيل الأدوار القيادية لمدير المدرسة.

الجزء الرابع: مدى الرغبة في إضافة صلاحيات جديدة
ماهي أهم ثلاث صلاحيات جديدة تود إضافتها لصلاحياتك الحالية لزيادة فاعلية المدرسة؟
1. 
2. 
3. 

الجزء الخامس: معلومات عامة عنك
1. ما هي المرحلة الدراسية التي تعمل بها الآن؟ □ المرحلة الابتدائية □ المرحلة المتوسطة □ الثانوية العامة
2. ما هو أعلى مؤهل حصلت عليه؟ □ بكالوريوس □ ماجستير □ دكتوراه
3. ما هو جنسك؟ □ ذكر □ أنثى
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Appendix I

English Translation of All 52 Authorities
Ministry for Education
General Direction of pedagogical Supervision
New authorities for School Principals
Decision number 32155521/S at 2011

Based on the powers of the head of Ministry of Education, and from the new trend for education reform in MOE toward the decentralization, and from the consideration of that the school is the central of the development and by given their principals more powers, and more flexibility to operate the school that helps to achieve the school goals, facilitate the schools’ roles and procedures, assist the principals to do their work easily and exemplary, increase the opportunity to focus on education, and Enable the leadership role of the principal

The Directors of Schools are granted the following authorities, and they can delegate some of their authorities to the supervisor unless he was accepted from the delegation. The directors of the school exercise these authorities and render necessary decisions to perform it upon the execution’s procedures which considered as an integral part of these authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Execution’s procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the formation of councils and committees in school and activate its role as well as determine the date and place of meeting</td>
<td>This power is invested to the council of school: 1. The school’s council adopts by majority the needed permanently councils, committees in addition to what was mentioned in the regulatory rules for the official school 2. Choose members 3. Determine tasks and responsibilities 4. Prepare appointments schedule and the meeting places. 5. Render Decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Join the councils and committees of school- if necessary- mentioned in the regulatory rules for the official schools- except the school’s council and guidance committee in way doesn’t effect on their tasks, and is related to the schools in which the numbers of teacher is less than 15 teachers.</td>
<td>This power is invested to the council of school: 1. The mechanism of study and preparing tasks and responsibilities according the new formation. 2. Approve the school’s council on the study by majority. 3. Render decisions and prepare appointments schedule and the meeting places. 4. Send a copy of the decision to the administration of school in the directorate of Education and Teaching as well as sent a copy to the office of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adopt the operational plan for the program, school and student’ activities and choose the supervisors and</td>
<td>This power is invested to the director of school: 1. Compose the team of school planning 2. Prepare the school’s plan including all scholar’ fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>participants.</strong> and activities pursuant to the school’s possibilities and on the light of sectors’ plans sent to the schools 3. Render the necessary decisions 4. Complete the execution of plans 5. Evaluate plans, programs, activities and prepare the required reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase the classes in schools or decrease it when necessary during the first two weeks from the beginning of school semester upon the equation decided by the ministry- number of students with the numbers of classes with its surface- without need to any increase in the numbers of teachers.</strong> This power is invested by guidance and counseling committee: 1. The committee discuss the justification of increase and decrease in the number of classes in the school, in the beginning of school upon the equation decided by the ministry and the decision is taken by majority. 2. Render the decision and notify officially the competent authority in the directorate of Education and the office of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay or stop the program of morning lineup the bad weather.</strong> This power is invested solely to the director of school: 1. Render an immediate decision by the director of school. 2. Notify officially the Directorate of Education about that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary modification in the duration of course and the duration of recesses in the scholar schedule to realize the educative interest</strong> The director of school execute solely these powers: 1. Determine the requirements to execute the adopted program. 2. Put the scholar program compatible with the program’s necessity, without prejudice to the completion of courses, in condition that the modification be more than twice in the semester and for 15 days maximum every time. 3. Render decisions and notify the competent authority in the directorate of Education and Teaching and the office of Education and Teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase the duration of study for some students about one hour at maximum per day for a teaching or educational program</strong> The director of school execute solely these powers: 1. Take officially the approval of parents before execution. 2. Take the approval of participants in the program (employees in the school) 3. Render decisions and notify the competent authority in the directorate of Education and Teaching and the office of Education and Teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopt the program of trips and educational students’ visit which not exceed one teaching day within the geographic field of the directorate of Education and Teaching and concerned the schools of more than 500 students.</strong> The school’s council execute these powers: 1. The council acknowledges by majority the trip or the educational visit, its programs, as well as the supervisors upon the special organizations. 2. Notify the competent department in the directorate of Education and Teaching and the office of Education and Teaching. 3. Take officially the approval of parents before execution 4. Present a report about the execution of program for competent section in the directorate of Education during a week at maximum from the execution of program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choose a supervisor from the list of names existed in the committee of directors and supervisors in the directorate of Education</strong> The director of school execute solely these powers: 1. View the list of names who satisfied the permissions and mechanisms of delegation existed in the committee of directors and supervisors in the directorate of Education 2. Choose the candidate- if he desires- from the list of names to be delegate by the committee of directors and supervisors in the directorate of Education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **10** | Determine and change the place of classes, library, administrative and teaching offices | The school’s council execute these powers:  
1. This power includes all sites in the school except that prepared for an aim can’t be movable to other place.  
2. The director of school presents before the council a plan to operate the school.  
3. The approval of the majority of council to the plan to operate the classes.  
4. Render decisions. |
| **11** | Grant the employees in the school the compelling vacations in order to achieve the educational interest. | The director of school execute this power:  
1. The concerned person presents a demand to take a compelling vacation according to the adopted sample.  
2. Confirm the legitimacy of the concerned person to take a vacation.  
3. Adopt the decision of granting vacation and inform the concerned person. |
| **12** | Grant the employees the sick leave according to the list of granting sick leave and to send a report about that to the directorate of Education and Teaching to complete the necessary. | The director of school execute this power:  
1. The medical report shall be compatible with the list of granting sick leave.  
2. Render a decision to grant a leave  
3. Send the decision to the competent authority in the directorate of Education and Teaching and kept a copy of it. |
| **13** | Stop the scholar schedule in the emergency cases for one day at maximum, and to inform officially the directorate of Education and Teaching about the procedure, in condition that doesn’t cause harm to students, and to inform the parents upon the organized regulations | The director of school execute solely this power:  
1. The director of school is authorized to stop the study in the determined day and its justifications.  
2. Assure the safety of students and inform officially the parents about the taken decision.  
3. Send the decision to the competent authority in the directorate of Education and Teaching and kept a copy of it. |
| **14** | Do written questioning with any of employees and to give notice to the delinquents, or to commit him to the directorate of Education and Teaching, if it was necessary. | The director of school execute solely this power:  
1. Questioning the delinquent according to the case and the data system, lists and instructions.  
2. Take the necessary procedure upon the response of questioner |
| **15** | Do not allow the employees who are suspected to be suffering a serious or contagious illness to continue work or teach in the school. | The director of school execute this power:  
1. Isolate the person who is suspected of suffering from any employees and to send it to the sanitary unit in the school, if any, or any governmental or civil sanitary authority.  
2. Inform timely the parent of suspected to be suffering a serious illness.  
3. Prevent the person suspected to be suffering a serious or contagious illness to come in school unless if he present a medical report confirm his health and that not cause risk to himself and on the employees and he didn’t suffer from any illness and can continue his study or work. |
| **16** | Render the decisive decisions on the absents or belated employees upon the systems and instructions as well as inform officially the directorate of education about the decision to apply it in the nearest salary- salary for work- | This power is invested to the director:  
1. Questioning the absent or belated upon the adopted samples.  
2. Render the decisive decision and inform the employees affairs department in the directorate of education as well as to give the concerned person a copy of it.  
3. The employees affairs department in the directorate of |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Represent the school in the committee of lease the school that appointed to manage it.</td>
<td>This power is invested to the director: 1. Mention the name and the signature of the director in the minutes of the committee of the lease the school. 2. The director of school has the right to reserve by written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Represent the school in the committee of preparing the comparison to restore the school that appointed to manage it.</td>
<td>This power is invested to the director: 1. Mention the name and the signature of the director in the minutes of the committee of the restoration’s comparison of school. 2. The director of school has the right to reserve by written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Represent the school in the committee of receiving the school after ending the maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation works</td>
<td>This power is invested to the director: 1. Mention the name and the signature of the director in the minutes of the committee of the receiving the school. 2. The director of school has the right to reserve by written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Communicate directly with the governmental authorities in the emergency cases.</td>
<td>This power is invested to the director: 1. Prepare a minutes of emergency case 2. Notify quickly the concerned person about the emergency case. 3. Send officially a copy of procedure to the directorate of education and the office of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Assign the workers in the school to perform activities related to the educational nature during the academic year upon the systems, lists and instructions with respect to the principal job of the assigned.</td>
<td>This power is invested solely to the director of school: 1. Determine the number of workers 2. Inform the employees about the systems, lists and instructions that determine their rights and obligations 3. Render the commissioning decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Communicate directly with the director of education concerning the matters against the religion, the policy and the security of country or any matters related to behavior and drugs.</td>
<td>This power is invested solely to the director of school: 1. Verify the case and prepare minutes about it. 2. Send a letter to the director of education and send a copy of it to the office of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Evaluate the drivers</td>
<td>This power is invested solely to the director of school: 1. Activate the adopted evaluation’s tools and inform the drivers about it. 2. Send the letter to the director of education as well as to send a copy of it to the office of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Accept the student who meets the conditions of accepting and registration of new students</td>
<td>This power is invested to the guidance and counseling committee: 1. Accept all Saudi students registered in the school before the beginning of the academic year. 2. The committee commences to accept the new students at the beginning of the academic year, in condition that not affect in the priority of whose accepting by school, and in condition that increase the budget of school or the numbers of students in classes upon its surfaces according to the percentage officially determined. 3. Render the decisions of acceptance of students approved by the committee and to continue the official procedures of registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Adopt the distribution of students in the classes according the equation of education send a copy of the execution of decisive decision.</td>
<td>This power is invested to the guidance and counseling committee:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | classes and student and redistribute them to achieve the educative interest | 1. Discuss the justifications of distributing students in classes by the guidance and counseling committee in the school before the beginning of every year.  
2. Determine the opinion of committee by majority.  
3. Render the decision. |
|---|---|---|
| 26 | Adopt the organization of fixed courses for teachers and moved students during the performance of scholar schedule. | This power is invested to the director of school:  
1. Study the possibility to execute the organization.  
2. Prepare an integral organization comply with the school’s environment.  
3. Obtain the approval of the majority of teachers. |
| 27 | Allow the students who repeated their classes for the third year or the aged to continue their study in the school, or to send the boys to the evening school and send the girls to schools specify to teach the aged upon the instructions and lists | This power is invested to the guidance and counseling committee:  
1. Limit the students who repeated their classes for the third year or the aged.  
2. Study their cases by the guidance and counseling committee in the school.  
3. Render a decision allow to the person approved by the committee to continue their study.  
4. Send the students who were not allowed to continue their study to schools to teach aged person  
5. Inform the concerned authority in the directorate of education and the office of education about that. |
| 28 | Grant motives to the students, with respect to the systems, lists and instructions | This power is invested to the guidance and counseling committee:  
1. The committee prepares the standards of granting motives to student and by the approval of the majority  
2. Specialize the budgets of motives from the school’s resources  
3. Compose the necessary subsidiaries committees.  
4. Limit the students merit the motives and to decide its kind  
5. Render the necessary decisions. |
| 29 | Adding therapy curses for some study material in the study plan | This power is invested in the guidance and counseling committee of the school:  
1. The committee determines the school subjects which need to solve the school delay in the learning skills for talented ad skilled students  
2. The committee adopts the additional courses with majority  
3. The plan of teaching these courses is prepared through investing the vacancies in the teachers’ schedules in a what that completes their credits, and doesn’t violate the plan of the study applications at school, in condition that it is included in the school plan.  
4. Inform the parents of the student participating in the program with the program plan.  
5. Designate the teachers and everyone related to executing the program  
6. Document the program from its beginning until the end of application, and the education department is given a copy of it. |
| 30 | Open educative services center for students at school according to the terms and school capabilities | This power is invested in the guidance and counseling committee of school:  
1. Study the need of the school to open an education services center for students by the school committee according to the official regulations and the approval for |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Executive a specified school activity outside the school duration, no more than three days according to the official instructions, in condition that executing the activity doesn’t subject any financial commitments for the education department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>This power is invested in the school board:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1. All the school activities exist within the school plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2. The school director is a direct supervisor for the activity and no one else is permitted to be assigned, and he is responsible for all the executed activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4. Assignment for those who work in the activity from school teachers who excel in their good behavior and no person outside the school is permitted to be designated to perform this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5. Prepare a list with the names of students participating in the school activity and take the approval of their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6. Afford the competent side at the education department and education office officially with the work plan for that activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>7. Afford the education department with the necessary periodical reports according to the official regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Determine the student whose behavior represents a danger against any school employees to be transferred to another school, and it is restricted to the directors of the intermediate and high school directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>This power is invested in the guidance and counseling committee of the school:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1. Perform the necessary procedures according to the rules of regulating the behavior and perseverance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2. Study the case of the student by the school committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>3. Inform the student’s parents by that officially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4. Discuss the education department to issue a decision to transfer the student to another school and inform both schools with the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>5. The first school supplies the school which the student is transferred to a report about the programs which were executed and suggested to treat its situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Accept the student’s delayed excuse for the exam of the first stage of both semesters and the second stage for no more than half time of the subject exam duration, in condition that no student leaves the exam committee, and it is restricted to the directors of the intermediate and high school directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>This power is invested in the school director:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1. Allow the student to participate in the exams committee and inform the committee of regulation and supervision with that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>2. The school director documents the student’s excuse in a minute kept before the regulation and supervision committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Prepare the schedule within the study semester for a student or group of students, and it is restricted to the directors of the intermediate and high school directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>This power is invested in the guidance and counseling committee at school:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1. The committee studies the case and the approval is with majority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>2. Issue the necessary decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Assign whom he wants from teachers to prepare exams questions for study courses in his specialization for other than the classes he teaches and it is restricted to the directors of the intermediate and high school directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>This power is invested in the school director:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1. Issue a decision to assign the substitute teacher in implementing the questions and the answers mode before the exams date by a sufficient time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>2. Supply the education office or the department of the education supervision with a copy of assignment decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Decrease the credits of the teacher who is designated for other tasks at school, in which his credit isn’t less than six courses weekly, only if there was an excess of courses, after covering the study plan in specialization according to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>This power is invested in the school director:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>1. Restrict the excess of teachers credits in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>2. Specify the tasks of the teacher whose credits were decreased, and those concerned with the decrease, in a way that accomplishes the educational interest of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 37   | Adopt study courses distribution among teachers according to specializations, in the elementary stage in case specialization was available, distribution of school schedules at the beginning of year and amend it within the school year when necessary | This power is solely invested in the school director:  
1. Prepare schedule in a way that guarantees applying the study plan and teachers teaching their credits  
2. Prepare supportive school schedules like schedule of waiting and shifts, along with exams notes, etc  
3. Take in consideration in preparation for school schedules achieving educational best interest and applying official instructions  
4. Issue necessary decisions and inform the school employees about everything related |
| 38   | Decrease the study plan for courses when there is a deficiency in number of teachers at school after completing the regulative credits of all teachers, including all those designated with tasks other than teaching (activity officer, secretary of education sources, officer of Islamic awareness, students guide, etc, except for school supervisor officially assigned) to block the deficiency temporary until it is solved | This power is solely invested in the committee of guidance and counseling of school:  
1. The committee prepares substitutive courses schedule which guarantees completing teachers credits in specialization in the intermediate and high school stages as well as school credits in the elementary stage  
2. Issue decision and inform all school employees  
3. Supply the competent authority in the education department, office of education by a copy of decrease decision  
4. Refer back to the basic plan when paying the teachers deficiency |
| 39   | Perform educational studies for the school employees                         | This power is invested in the board of school:  
1. The study subject is to be determined, its reasons, research methodology, benefits purposes in study, then the subject is presented to the board.  
2. The school board adopts the decision with majority  
3. Supply the specialized parties in the education department and office of education with the results of the study |
| 40   | Adopt technical development programs for school employees during school day, like training and exchanging visits and meetings for teachers of specializations, workshops and discussion seminars, which suits the school schedule and students department, as well as need and nature of work for each | This power is invested in the school director:  
1. Classify the school employees according to their technical levels through their functional performance in the past years and the private file for each, as well as the visits of the supervisors and specialists.  
2. Determine the technical needs  
3. Determine the technical development programs for school employees  
4. Adopt the appropriate programs and prepare a timetable to execute it in the school  
5. Employ school capabilities in training and technical development  
6. Schedule the programs |
| 41   | Adopt programs which aim at solving the school problems or achieve an educational interest | This power is invested in the committee of counseling and guidance of school:  
1. A scientific documented vision for the programs to be applied in order to solve the school problems, or achieve an educational interest which suits the school environment  
2. Committee adopts programs with majority |
| 42 | Schedule performance of all workers at school | This power is invested in the school director solely  
1.-Activate adopted scheduling tools and inform the workers of it  
2.-Classify the school employees-according to their technical levels through functional performance in the past years ad private file of each, visits of specialists and supervisors, to determine the number of technical and field visits suitable for each  
3.-Verify from proofs of assessment  
4.-Inform each employee of the private scheduling card  
5.-Send model of functional performance scheduling t the department of education to be adopted and keep a copy of it after being adopted |
| 43 | Apply educational experiences to support the proficiency of teaching and learning performance at school | This power is invested in the school board:  
1.-Prepare a printed scientific vision for the educational idea to be experimented to support the qualification of the educational performance in condition that the application duration doesn’t exceed two school years  
2.-The proposed experiment is presented to the school board and the approval of it is with majority  
3.-The experiment is included in the school plan  
4.-Inform the competent party in the education department ad office of education officially with the programs plan  
5.-Th experiment is documented from the beginning of application until its end  
6.-Periodical and final reports for the school board supported by evidences and indexes, in which by virtue of it is decided upon the adequacy if proceeding in the experiment or halting it  
7.-In case the experiment succeeds, the school supplies the department of education with the report about it, in order to apply it in other appropriate schools |
| 44 | Specify the teacher to be transferred from school, whose performance has decreased 85 degree in the functional performance schedule adopted for last two years, to another school, not more than one teacher in school year, in condition that no financial commitment or external transfer is subjected for the teacher or deficiency which can’t be paid in school. It is restricted to the schools directors whose students don’t exceed 500 students. | This power is invested to the school board:  
1.-Study purposes for guidance in transferring the teacher by the school board and the board approval is with majority  
2.-Present the teachers statements and name to be transferred to the teachers affairs department within the specified date officially for the teachers transfer movement. |
| 45 | Guidance to transfer any of employees of the administrative jobs, and employees of educational jobs at school, other than teachers if the performance decreased | This power is invested in the school board:  
1.-The school director presents to the board purposes of transfer and the approval of the board in with majority  
2.-Discuss the department of employees affairs in the
from “excellent” in the adopted functional performance schedule for last two years

department of education for transferring the employees of the administrative jobs to another side by them within two weeks from the date of receiving the letter.
3-Discuss the competent side in the department of education to transfer the employees of the educational jobs, other than teachers, to another school, by them within two weeks from the date of receiving the letter.

| 46 | Agree with the private sector to sponsor the school programs with what matches the educational goals, according to the regulation and the official lists and instructions. | This power is invested in the school board. 1-Specifying the programs and activities t be sponsored within the school plan. 2-Accept the sponsorship and advertisement which suits the educational goals only 3-Board approval for that with majority 4-The school director agrees with the private sector directly to sponsor the executed programs in the school according to official letters 5-Agreement duration doesn’t exceed one school semester for sponsoring any school program and the sponsorship is separate for each program 6-The financial committee in the school documents the revenues and expenses in special registers. |
| 47 | Agree with specialized parties accredited by the governmental sectors related to operating the school cafeteria. | This power is invested in the school fund committee: 1-Declare about operating the cafeteria according to the regulation and specify the opening day for envelopes unless the cafeteria was within a bid established by the department of education 2-The committee opens the envelopes and chooses the most fitting with health terms and most giving. 3-Signature of the school director on the agreement with the side operating the cafeteria according to model of unified contract for school cafeterias and send a copy of it to the competent side in the department of education. |
| 48 | Agree with family training institutions for executing training programs for school to its employees according to its capability | This power is invested in the school board. 1-The programs are within the professional development plan for school employees 2-Board approval for the training programs with majority 3-Employ the school capabilities to nationalize the training and professional development |
| 49 | Adopt the naming of teachers who deserve a reward for teaching waiting courses which they perform in substitution for an absent teacher in addition to their official credits (24) course | This power is invested in the school director solely. 1-The teacher deserves a reward if the teachers credits exceed (24) main course and waiting for each within one school week 2-Teachers with decreased credits by virtue of an official decision, their claiming for reward as waiting courses number which they are assigned for in addition to their official credits of courses. 3-The maximum limit for number of waiting courses, for which the teacher is entitled to a reward is four courses only in a week. 4-To get a reward, the teacher must present an educative material, supportive or new, related to the study material given to the students within the waiting courses. 5-The priority is for the mathematics, science, English language unless the guidance and counseling committee at school determines another specialty. 6-Restrict the teachers monthly, who performed more
waiting courses than their credits within any school week, and admit that to the employees affairs department at the education department at the end of each month to get the reward-75 riyal, for each waiting course.

7-The education office handles studying the reasons of absence which leads for reward demand at the related schools and work for solving the damage if found.

| 50 | Nominate not more than five employees of educational jobs at school chosen for professional development in the school year, and restricted to schools whose students aren’t less than 800 students. | This power is invested in the school board:
1-The school director presents to the board the delegation plan of employees of education jobs at school within adopted professional development programs in the school plan and the approval of the board for it is with majority.
2-Notify the education department with the amount and issue the delegation decision before execution no more than five days for the designated in the school year.
3-Inform the officially designated with the issuance of the decision in order to be able to be present at the program
4-The school or the education department doesn’t bear any financial fees related to the presence of the delegated person to the program |

| 51 | Afford the labor for cleaning school in case contracting was impossible with the cleaning officers, or in case the labor contracted with didn’t perform the work directly, or didn’t perform the required work according to the followed regulations. | This power is invested in the school director:
1-Afford the required labor according to the adopted regulations
2-Present the documents of spending to the education department |

| 52 | Contract with competent institutions to perform urgent maintenance for school according to the specialized budget | This power is invested in the financial committee of the school:
1-The education department delivers the amount specialized for urgent maintenance at school
2-Contracting with schools whose students aren’t less than 200 students isn’t more than five thousand riyal.
3-Contracting with schools whose students range between 200 and 400 students isn’t more than ten thousand riyal.
4-Contracting with schools whose students are more than 400 students isn’t more than fifteen thousand riyal.
5-The financial committee of the school documents all the expenses to pay the amount before the end of the financial year according to the official regulations, while keeping a copy of the procedures ad bills in a special file for school. |