6-1995

A Study of Teachers’ Perceptions of Principal Effectiveness Among Secondary School Teachers in Malaysia

Ariff B. Kasim
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations
Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation
http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1751

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 maira.bundza@wmich.edu.
A STUDY OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN MALAYSIA

by

Ariff B. Kasim

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
June 1995
A STUDY OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN MALAYSIA

Ariff B. Kasim, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1995

The focus of this study is to find out the difference in perceptions of teachers on principal effectiveness among two groups of secondary school teachers in Malaysia, namely: (1) graduate and non-graduate teachers, and (2) junior and senior teachers, in seven dimensions of principal effectiveness: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) student relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development.

The sample of this study consisted of all teachers who had been teaching more than one year and had a formal teacher training from 15 grade B secondary schools in the districts of Johore Bahru, Kulai and Pontian, the State of Johore, Malaysia. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed to the potential respondents and 449 (89.9%) were returned. Out of this number (449), only 425 (94.6%) could be used. The instruments used for collecting the data and information were questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaire was constructed by the researcher. One-way ANOVA was used to test the difference in means score of perception using .05 as the alpha level. One teacher from each of the 15
schools was randomly selected to be interviewed.

With the use of one-way ANOVA, a difference in perceptions on principal effectiveness between the graduate and non-graduate respondents in each of the seven dimensions of principal effectiveness was not found. However, there was a difference in perceptions between juniors and seniors in each of the seven dimensions. Seniors had higher perceptions of their principals’ effectiveness than did juniors.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

Managing an organization involves various components. One of the components in the area of improvement is feedback, which has played an important role in providing inputs for improvement. Feedback refers not only to materials that are produced in factories but also to human performance. To effectively manage an organization, the manager or leader should be able to measure his or her performance. This is conducted through a performance appraisal system which is mostly used for feedback purposes (McEvoy, 1985). According to him there are two major purposes of performance appraisal: (1) developmental, that is to improve utilization of human resources; and (2) judgmental, that is to assess performance for promotion, etc. This is normally conducted by superiors as a means of annual performance appraisal. This top-down appraisal is limited in terms of the source data and information that are gathered because the manager's performance affects not only superiors but also subordinates. Interestingly, subordinates are the largest number of individuals that will be affected by the manager's behavior or performance. This practice of top-down assessment is the norm among many organizations including schools. However, this practice will only give
a one-way picture of the total appraisal system. Therefore, appraisal by subordinates will help complete the picture and it is imperative that subordinates be included in appraising the managers. In fact, subordinate appraisal would enhance employee perception of their role regarding manager performance and ability to gather data about manager's functions. In the school system, principals are normally appraised by their superiors, for example, the superintendents. Teachers, as subordinates, are seldom utilized to help complete the appraisal system. Therefore, it will be beneficial to principals and the appraisal system to have teachers assess them as a form of feedback.

There are various advantages when subordinates appraise their superiors. Bernardin (1986) gives three reasons in using subordinates to appraise managers. The first reason is that subordinates are valid source of information and in a better position to evaluate due to their frequent and close contact. This reason is supported by McEvoy (1990). This is also true in the school system where teachers have frequent and close contacts with principals. The second reason is that multiple assessments provide greater validity which is in line with Mount (1984). The third reason is that subordinates' appraisals help strengthen employees commitment. This is based on the idea that allowing subordinates to appraise their superiors is seen as a sign of trust and trust is one of the promoters of commitment because one is more committed when trusted. The appraisal can also provide the perspective of subordinates on managers' performance and help provide useful data and information both as a criterion and a predictor of
subsequent promotion (Bernardin & Beatty, 1987). Other advantages of the subordinate appraisal systems are that they: (a) provide a valid source of assessment for certain manager's dimensions, (b) provide useful feedback to managers, (c) reinforce good manager behavior, (d) enhance employees' feelings that they are empowered in the organization's decision-making, (e) facilitate needed group change, (f) foster greater attention to subordinates' needs, (g) are more practical and efficient than other assessment procedures, and (h) enhance the recruitment of non-managerial professions (Bernardin & Beatty, 1987).

In the school system, one way of appraising the principal is evaluating their effectiveness, and leadership has been cited by many researchers as one of the main factors in most school effectiveness studies. Various reports such as the Nation At Risk (1983) and Leaders For American Schools (1987) also put a strong emphasis on the importance of the effective principal. In Malaysia, the role of principals as the catalyst of performance has attracted the attention of the Ministry of Education, especially with the implementation of the new curriculum for both the primary and secondary school systems. In order to attend to this problem, a committee was formed by the Ministry of Education to study the educational standards in Malaysian schools. This committee focused its recommendation on the role of the principal for improving students' performance and improvement. As cited in Mahmood (1989), the committee reported that principals have to be competent and that they spend more time in the schools' learning activities.
The report also cited that principals are expected to maintain effective supervision of the school. They should act as consultants, advisors and coordinators of the school teaching and learning programs. They should also spend more time with children and teachers in professional activities. They should not, as administrators, primarily work in the office issuing instruction and circular issued by the Ministry of Education and State Education Department (Ministry of Education, 1987a). The new guideline issued by the Ministry of Education (1985) specifies the duties and roles of principals as: (a) organizing the general administration of the school, (b) supervising the implementation of curriculum in accordance with the national education policy, (c) supervising the implementation of educational programs and supportive services, (d) providing professional leadership to all teachers in the school, and (e) fostering cooperation between the school and the community. To realize these roles, principals have to be effective.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The effective functioning of any organization depends on its leader. The leader sets the tone of the organization and the smooth running of its daily routine. Schools as organizations depend on principals as leaders in insuring their survival. To be effective in providing the stakeholders with the required roles and functions, schools need effective principals as leaders. The study of principal effectiveness has attracted many researchers in the United States since the 1970's. These studies strengthened the beliefs that effective schools can only be achieved.
when there are effective principals.

In Malaysia, principals have various roles and functions which include administering and managing the schools. However, some of the principals' capacity as leaders of administration and management are much to be desired. In 1974, a cabinet committee was formed by the government of Malaysia to study the educational condition in Malaysia and made recommendations in order to improve the standard of education. The Cabinet Committee Report, 1979, noted that the standard of administration and management in some schools has to be upgraded. This is due to the fact that the principals concerned lacked training in administration. To overcome this problem the Cabinet Committee Report states:

To safeguard the standard of management at the school level, it is recommended that headmasters be given training in the field of management. In these training courses, headmasters should be exposed to new development in education to enable them to provide effective professional leadership. (Para 279.1, p. 90)

Since that recommendation, the Ministry of Education, Malaysia, has conducted various in-service training courses for the primary and secondary school principals. These courses were conducted primarily by the Institut Aminuddin Baki (IAB), a division in the Ministry of Education, Malaysia, which is responsible for providing in-service training for teachers including principals and staff in the Ministry of Education. In these training programs, various aspects of principal roles and functions were delivered with the aim of improving their effectiveness. Such courses include financial management, evaluation, conflict management, interpersonal relations, and communications. However, indicators for principal
effectiveness have to be determined.

One of the human resource development aspects in any organization is the ability of the employees to perform according to the goals that have been set by the organization. To achieve this, schools as organizations need effective principals to steer them in the right direction. In Malaysia, principals in government schools are promoted to their position based on their seniority, academic qualification and merit. Since the position is limited to the number of schools, only a few qualified teachers are promoted to this position and they are considered the best among the candidates for the limited posts. However, the conditions for their selection do not make many of them more effective because the real world of principalship demands more than seniority, academic qualification and merit.

The role of principals as leaders in schools has attracted the attention of the Ministry of Education. The Federal Inspectorate of Schools, Ministry of Education (1987a), reported that there are several weaknesses in principals' leadership. It reports that principals did not demonstrate effective leadership in the following areas: (a) fostering collegiality among teachers, (b) providing guidance for teachers' professional development, (c) disseminating information and ideas gathered from external sources to teachers, and (d) motivating teachers to improve performance.

The Cabinet Committee Report also recommended that the curriculum for the primary and secondary schools be revised to reflect the change due to the demands made by the economic, social and political development of the nation.
Since that report, the curriculum for both the primary and secondary schools have been revised and implemented. A new curriculum for the primary school called the New Primary School Curriculum (NPSC) was implemented in 1983 and in 1994 its implementation has complemented its second cycle. The secondary school curriculum was also revised and called the Integrated Secondary School Curriculum (ISSC). The ISSC consisted of two parts: one for the lower secondary school and the other for the upper secondary school. The lower secondary school section of the ISSC was first introduced in 1989 and completed its first cycle in 1991. The second cycle started in 1992 and ended in 1994. This year (1995), it is in its third cycle. The upper secondary school section was implemented in 1992 and completed its first cycle in 1993. It entered its second cycle in 1994 and will end this cycle at the end of 1995.

The implementation of the ISSC placed greater responsibilities on principals. They have to answer to the various stakeholders and constituents, namely the Ministry of Education, teachers, parents and students. Principals are expected to implement the new curriculum and provide input in the form of feedback to the Ministry of Education. They are required to be involved in evaluating the new curriculum and to do this they have to equip themselves with the knowledge and skills of curriculum and instructional evaluation. They are expected to be well versed with regard to the new curriculum and provide instructional leadership.

To successfully implement the new curriculum, teachers have to be retrained and it is the responsibility of principals to insure that all teachers will
be trained in the new curriculum and knowledge about the contents of the curriculum. Although the Ministry of Education provide in-service training to teachers, principals are expected to provide avenues for in-house training to teachers in their schools, especially those that are not able to attend the training provided by the Ministry of Education due to the limited time and funds. Implementing change is a difficult process and there are bound to be constraints in the form of attitude change among teachers and faculty. Principals need full cooperation from teachers to successfully implement the new curriculum because principals will be held partly responsible for any sign of failure in implementing the new curriculum. Since the new curriculum demands additional materials, principals are expected to be able to marshal resources so as to ensure that these resources, in the form of facilities and support, are available to teachers for students' learning. To achieve this, principals need additional support from the central office, district offices, parents and the community.

In order to understand the various roles, functions and responsibilities of Malaysian secondary school principals, we have to understand the various factors that are related to the principalship, especially in light of the ISSC. Schools as organizations need leaders to provide the vision and guidance for their survival. Principals function not only as managers but, more importantly, as leaders in the schools. As leaders, they are expected to lead and provide good modeling so as to insure the success of the schools. With the implementation of the ISSC the role of principals as leaders is more obvious. Although they are expected to be
leaders, some of them have yet to realize this role. Therefore, it is important to know the effectiveness of principals as leaders so that any weakness regarding this role and expectation can be improved.

Schools are bound by the rules and procedures set by the higher authorities. It is the duty and responsibility of principals to ensure that the rules and procedures are adhered to, especially those that pertain to the implementation of the ISSC. For example, since implementing the new curriculum requires additional purchases of materials, principals have to be more cautious about insuring that procedures for procuring new materials for instructional purposes are properly followed. They are also expected to fully understand the additional rules and procedures that came along with the ISSC. Therefore, it is vital that principals understand organizational procedures so that they can maximize their utilization for benefits of the schools. However, a measure of principal effectiveness in the organizational rules and procedures has to be conducted to ensure that they are correctly interpreted and effectively utilized so as to expedite the change process with the implementation of the ISSC.

For students to learn and for teachers to teach them effectively, a conducive learning climate has to be established. With the implementation of the ISSC, more classrooms have to be built, and new facilities and resources have to be acquired. With the introduction of Living Skills subject, principals are expected to provide resources for teachers and students. Besides providing adequate facilities and resources, creating a conducive learning climate needs the maintenance
of discipline and order.

Principals need the cooperation of teachers in ensuring that the rules and procedures that pertain to the running of the school, especially in educating the students, can be achieved as planned. On the other hand, teachers need the cooperation and support from principals in performing their duties. Therefore, it is crucial that principals have good relations with teachers because there were reports that indicated tensions existed between principals and teachers, especially with the implementation of the ISSC. For example, Salleh (1993) found that there were teachers who reported their frustration because they were not given an opportunity to attend any in-service training program, although they had been teaching in the same school for more than 15 years.

The success of the school program depends also on the students as the target groups. Students as the main stakeholders in the new program need to be heard by principals. They also need the attention of principals, especially as they are seen as father-figures and the school climate is partly influenced by students' behavior and attitudes. Therefore, in the context of the ISSC and the National Education Policy, principals need to be more visible to students and available for communication. In this respect, there is a need for principals in Malaysia to have better relationship with students. However, the condition of principal-student relations can only be determined if principal effectiveness in this area is known.

Schools need the support of the constituents in order to function properly. It is imperative that principals develop positive working relationships with them,
and that faculty and staff are informed about new developments. In this way, the principal can develop a bridge between the school and the community which the school serves as well as other agencies related to the school. But a method has to be devised to measure the effectiveness of the principal in linking the school and the community so that measures can be taken to create better school-community relations.

The implementation of the ISSC needs an understanding by principals of the curriculum contents and the philosophy behind them. Although curriculum development is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, principals have to be knowledgeable about it. This is because teachers depend on principals in interpreting the contents of the new curriculum when problems arise. Therefore, they have to equip themselves with the knowledge of the curriculum. Principals are also expected to be instructional leaders. To affect this function, they should have the skills and ability to conduct clinical supervision of teachers. They are also expected to be more committed to quality instruction. Therefore, principals are responsible for the instructional improvement in their schools. However, teachers' expectations of principals to be their instructional leaders do not always materialize. This is why principal effectiveness in instructional enhancement has to be studied so that measures can be taken to improve areas of weakness. In this way the successful implementation of the ISSC can be assured more confidently.

In Malaysia there are two categories of teachers teaching in secondary
schools: graduate and non-graduate. These teachers have different academic and professional qualifications. Due to these, their views and opinions on principals may be different and it will be helpful to know if there is any difference in perceptions of principals so that information regarding this can be used by principals in relating to the different categories of teachers. Teachers in secondary schools have taught over varying lengths of time. The years of teaching bring with them different experience and opinions regarding principals' roles and functions. This may affect their views on principal effectiveness as well as principals' views on them. For example, generally it is assumed that older teachers are difficult to change and the authorities often exclude them in many discussions or meetings, and treat them less professional. However, there are cases where veteran teachers are open and willing to change. For example, Murchison (1992) found that teachers, having experienced many ideas and concepts throughout their teaching careers, were ready to accept change in school restructuring. Knowing whether there is any difference in perception of principal effectiveness based on their teaching experience will be helpful to principals so that improvement can be made with regard to principals' relationship with teachers, and better working cooperation can be realized.

One of the indicators for effective principals is how teachers perceive them to be effective. This is because teachers are closest to principals in term of work and have the most frequent contacts with them. Their perceptions are important to the school's well being (Valentine & Bowman, 1988). They noted that
teachers' perceptions are important because they affect individual productivity. As human resources, teachers are the most important assets of the schools. We can understand principal effectiveness by capturing their subordinates' perceptual evaluation (Ellet & Licata, 1987). To do this, information regarding teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness on certain dimensions has to be gathered. This information can be used as feedback for developmental purposes because, as Drucker (1967) noted, effectiveness can be learned. To measure principal effectiveness as perceived by teachers, the following dimensions will be used: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) students relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development.

Information regarding principals' performance is important so that authorities, especially the Ministry of Education, can better plan an intervention to help improve their effectiveness. This is so because principals are expected to be effective in carrying out their roles and functions. This information is in the form of perceptions by teachers regarding their principals' effectiveness. To obtain this information, teachers have to be utilized because they are closest to principals and any changes or plans that will affect the teaching and learning process have to involve teachers.

The importance of feedback from subordinates to evaluate one's performance has been reiterated by the Director of Education Malaysia in his keynote...
address at the Malaysian Annual National Education Conference held from 8-11 April, 1993 at the Institut Aminuddin Baki. In his address he stated:

I [would] like to suggest that the best way to evaluate and get feedback about ourselves is by asking those within our administration to conduct their evaluation on us. I have done this when I was at the Curriculum Development Center. I obtained useful information and feedback about myself. I think that we should not feel challenged when our subordinates gave their opinions about us. Actually, we need information to increase our effectiveness. (translation, p. 28)

This statement reflects the importance of feedback in improving effectiveness, especially among Ministry of Education staff which includes principals. The purpose of this study is to find out if there is any difference in perceptions of principal effectiveness among two groups of secondary school teachers: (1) graduates and non-graduates, and (2) juniors and seniors, in seven dimensions, namely: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) student relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development.

This proposed study is significant in that the results and findings of the study can be used as a guide for principals to better their roles and functions. The findings can also be used by the Ministry of Education to improve principals' performance by identifying the areas that need improvement. This improvement process will be conducted through training and professional development programs. This study is also intended to gather information on principal effectiveness so as to expand the existing knowledge on principal effectiveness in
secondary schools. This study is also significant in that, based on the record at the Educational Planning and Research Division (EPRD), Ministry of Education, Malaysia, which is responsible for granting permission to conduct research in government schools and colleges, no study of this nature has been conducted in Malaysia. Hopefully, it will spur further research on principal effectiveness in Malaysia.
CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND

Education in Malaysia

The development of Malaysia depends on education as a means of developing the human resources. This was stated by the Minister of Education when he said:

Education has been and will continue to be an important tool for human resource development. Through education we aim to promote personality and aesthetic development, as well as produce manpower with the requisite skills for economic and national development. This is carried out by providing pupils with essential intellectual, affective and psychomotor skills in a holistic and integrated manner, so as to produce individuals who are functionally and culturally literate. (Ministry of Education, 1990, forward)

The educational system in Malaysia is a heritage of her social, economic and political development. Historically, the development can be divided into three main periods: the nineteenth century, the Second World War, and the independence (1957). In the early nineteenth century, education was generally non-formal in nature. The emphasis was on Quaranic teaching, spiritual knowledge and morality. Handicraft and apprenticeship in agriculture were also included. Islamic religious scholars established a more formal system of education through the "pondok" or "madrasah" system with a strong inclination towards Islamic teachings.
The later part of the nineteenth century saw an increase in commercial enterprise and development, especially in the rubber and tin industries. Skilled laborers were needed to sustain the increase in industries. To solve this problem, the colonial administration promoted the influx of Chinese and Indian immigrants. The Chinese worked mostly in the tin industries while the Indians concentrated more on the rubber estates and infrastructure construction such as roads and railways. The Indians mostly originated from the southern part of India and thus their language is mostly Tamil.

The establishment of schools had different purposes during this time. The English medium schools were established to cater the educational needs of the colonial administration. Malay schools were built to provide secular education for the Malay children. The Chinese and Indian (Tamil) schools were established with the partial support of the colonial administration to cater the cultural needs of their respective communities. These schools had their own organizational structure, objectives, curricular orientation and medium of instruction.

After the Second World War, with the emergence of Malay nationalism and the position of the Chinese and Indian immigrants who looked at Malaya as their home, the needs for an education system that catered to the Malays, Chinese and Indians came into light. Two committees, Barnes, 1950, and Fenn-Wu, 1951, were commissioned to study the problems and make recommendations. Their recommendations were formulated and amalgamated in the Education Ordinance, 1952, of which the main features were: (a) to promote a national
school system by the gradual introduction of English language into Malay vernacular schools, and Malay and English language into Chinese and Tamil vernacular schools; (b) to maintain the existing English medium National Type schools; and (c) to develop vocational secondary schools.

In 1955, the Federation of Malaya attained her self-governing status and nationalism became the focus. A committee headed by Dato' Abdul Razak Hussein was set up to study the education system and made recommendations. A report known as Razak report, 1956, was completed and made a total of 17 recommendations. Among the major recommendations of the report were: (a) the introduction of common content syllabi for all schools, (b) the main medium of instruction in all schools will be the National language (Malay language), (c) the National language and English language will be made compulsory subjects for all primary and secondary schools, (d) converting the existing schools into National Schools (Malay medium) and the National-Type Schools (English, Chinese or Tamil medium), and (e) the establishment of one type of National Secondary Schools for all races.

After fourteen years of the Razak Report, a committee headed by the Honorable Encik Abdul Rahman Talib was formed to review the education policy based on the Razak Report. A report known as the Rahman Talib Report, 1960, further strengthened the Razak Report. Among the recommendations were: (a) universal free primary education, (b) automatic class promotion up to Form III, and (c) the extension of school leaving age to 15 years.
The Razak Report, 1956 and the Rahman Talib Report, 1960 were then amalgamated into the Education Act of 1961. Through this Act, the Chinese and Tamil primary schools were allowed to continue along with the Malay and English medium primary schools. In 1963, the Federation of Malaysia was established with the incorporation of Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore. However, in 1965, Singapore seceded from the federation. With the establishment of Malaysia in 1963, a language act known as the National Language Act 1963 was enacted. This act provided the legality of converting the English language into Malay language for all government machinery and the national education system.

In 1974, a Cabinet committee was formed by the Government of Malaysia to review the objectives and effectiveness of the education system. The main emphases of the report are: (a) equalization of educational opportunities, (b) improving educational opportunities for disadvantaged youths to further their education, (c) developing desirable and ethical qualities among school children; (d) emphasizing vocational orientation in education, and (e) improving the professional and management of the education system. This Cabinet Committee Report contains 173 recommendations with strategies in improving the quality of education. Some of the recommendations include: (a) the schooling period for general education for all students be extended from 9 to 11 years; (b) the output of middle-level skilled manpower be increased; (c) measures be taken to ensure that students are not influenced by undesirable, external cultural elements; (d) principals play their role to improve the attitude of teachers who contribute little
in the development of conducive educational environment and if necessary disciplinary actions be taken against teachers who demonstrate undesirable behavior and personal characteristics; (e) schools be graded according to the responsibility load; (f) principals be given training in the field of management and be exposed to new developments in education to enable them to provide effective professional leadership; and (g) the establishment of a National Educational Staff Training Institute for training professional officers and other personnel in the Ministry of Education to better the quality of work and output (Ministry of Education, 1985).

The educational programs in the 1970s saw academic development as the main focus. As these objectives are realized, the focus moves towards a holistic development of the individual which became the theme in the 1980s. This theme is manifested in the National Education Philosophy which states:

Education in Malaysia is an on-going effort towards further developing the potential of individuals in a holistic and integrated manner, so as to produce individuals who are intellectually, spiritually, emotionally and physically balanced and harmonious, based on a firm belief in and devotion to God. Such an effort is designed to produce Malaysian citizens who are knowledgeable and competent, who possess high moral standards, and who are responsible and capable of achieving a high level of personal well-being as well as being able to contribute to the harmony and betterment of the society and the nation at large. (Ministry of Education, 1988, p.5)

Based on this declaration, the aims of the national education can be summarized as an effort to produce good citizens whose intellectual, spiritual, emotional and physical development is balanced and integrated and who: (a) believe in and are faithful to God; (b) are knowledgeable, creative and rational beings;
(c) possess noble characteristics; (d) are competent; (e) are capable of contributing towards the prosperity of the society and nations; and (f) are loyal citizens and who are responsible for maintaining good and harmonious relationships between individuals and thereby fostering unity in the Malaysian society (Ministry of Education, 1988).

**Education Structure**

The formal school in Malaysia has a four-tier system: primary, lower secondary, upper secondary and post-secondary levels. At the tertiary level, education is provided by the universities, colleges and institutes. In the primary level, education is free but compulsory. The entry age at primary one is six years of age. Pupils study for six years at this primary level and promotion is automatic from year one to year six. There are three types of primary schools based on the medium of instruction, namely National Schools (Malay language), National-Type Primary School (Chinese) [NTPS (C)], and National-Type Primary School (Tamil) [NTPS] (T)]. Although the medium of instructions are different, these schools use a standard and common syllabus for primary schools. At the end of the year six in their schooling, pupils sit for a common Primary School Assessment Test (PSAT) of which the aim is to evaluate the pupils’ mastery of basic skills in reading, writing and arithmetic.

The lower secondary level starts from Remove Class or Form I to Form III. Pupils from the National Schools are automatically promoted to Form I
when they have completed six years of primary education. Those from NTPS (C) and NTPS (T) are promoted to Remove Class for a year before continuing to Form I. The purpose of this one year in the Remove Class is to help pupils acquire sufficient proficiency in Malay language which is the medium of instruction at the secondary level. At the end of Form III, all students will take the Lower Certificate of Education (LCE) examination. The purpose of this examination is to determine whether the students are qualified to be promoted to Form IV.

Students who are promoted to Form IV are channelled into academic or vocational streams. In the academic stream, students are offered two courses of study, namely arts and science. Students in this stream are placed in normal academic secondary schools, fully residential schools, science secondary schools, secondary religious (Islam) schools or MARA junior science colleges. Those in the vocational stream are placed in technical or vocational secondary schools. At the end of Form V, students in the academic and science stream will sit for the Malaysian Certificate of Education (MCE) examination which is equivalent to the British GCE 'O' Level. Those in the vocational stream will sit for the Malaysian Certificate of Education (Vocational) Examination [MCE (V)].

The post secondary school level is divided into two types, namely the Form VI and matriculation. The Form VI is a two year duration consisting of Lower Six Form and Upper Six Form. The Form VI prepares for the Malaysian Higher School Certificate Examination (MHSC) which is equivalent to the British 'A'
Level. The Form VI education is designed to meet the entry requirements of all universities. The matriculation is also a two years duration but it is patterned to meet the entry requirements of certain local universities only.

School Systems

At the primary level, schools can be classified into two categories, namely schools with hostels and schools without hostels. The hostels are built to cater pupils who have transportation problems. However, only a number of pupils are eligible to stay in the hostels due to the shortage of space. These schools are mostly located in the rural areas. At the secondary level, there are five types of school: normal secondary school, fully residential school, science secondary school, religious (Islam) secondary school, and vocational school.

In the normal secondary schools, classes are offered for students from Remove Class to Form VI. Some of these schools have hostels built to cater to students with transportation problems, especially those from rural areas. The fully residential schools have hostels that cater to all students and it is compulsory for students to stay in the hostels. Most of these schools are premier secondary schools. These schools offer arts and science courses. Students from these schools are selected from among the best school pupils based on their Primary School Assessment Test (PSAT) examination results. These type of schools offer classes from Form I to Form V. Some offer matriculation classes that prepare them for entering certain local universities. The science secondary schools are
similar to the fully residential schools except that they offer only science courses with the exception of core courses such as language arts, Islamic education and physical education. The secondary religious (Islam) schools are similar to the secondary science schools except that students in these schools have to take additional courses related to Islam. The vocational schools provide courses and have classes from Form IV and Form V only. They have hostels for students but can only cater to a certain percentage of them.

School Structure and Management

Schools are divided into certain grades in accordance with one of the Cabinet Committee Report recommendations which states that schools be graded according to the responsibility load. This load is based mostly on the number of pupils or students in each school. In primary schools there are three grades, namely grade A, B and C. In secondary schools the same grading is also used. A fully residential school, science secondary schools, certain vocational schools, and ordinary academic schools having Form VI classes are graded as grade A schools. These schools are headed by senior principals. Each of these principals is assisted by an assistant principal and four senior subject master teachers. The grade B secondary schools include some vocational schools and other academic secondary schools that have lower and secondary classes except Form VI. The principal is only assisted by an assistant. The principal in this grade school is equivalent to the assistant principal in the grade A secondary schools. The grade
C schools are comprised of schools having only lower secondary classes and headed by a principal which is equivalent to an assistant principal in grade B school. No formal principal assistant is provided to the principal in grade C school.

Most grade A primary and secondary schools are located in the urban areas while grade C schools are located in rural areas. The grade B schools are located both in rural and urban areas but mostly in rural areas.

Teachers and Principalship

There are three ways to become teachers in the government schools. The first is through a three-year teacher training in teacher training colleges that are established by the Ministry of Education, Malaysia. To enter these colleges, the candidate must have a minimum academic qualification of Malaysian Certificate of Education (MCE). Teacher trainees undergo a three-year training of both theory and practice. If they pass the training, they will be awarded the Teaching Certificate that qualifies them to teach in the primary or secondary schools.

The second method is for those who are undergoing a diploma level of education which are offered in the colleges, polytechnics or universities. In these programs, students are enrolled in courses that prepare them for a diploma for their academic qualification which is integrated with education as their professional qualification. The minimum qualification to enter this program is MCE. The diploma programs lasted for three to four years depending on the courses
that the students take. At the end of the program, qualified students are awarded
diplomas in their specialty with education. For example, a student with a specialty in accounting from this program will be teaching in the upper and post secondary schools only.

The third method is for those holding bachelor degrees who are interested in teaching as their career. After graduation, they will undergo a year of teacher training in theory and practice and those who pass will be awarded a Diploma of Education. This program is conducted by the local universities. Another variation of this program is the four-year integrated basic degree program. Under this program, students pursue a degree in their academic specialty while taking courses in education that prepare them to become teachers. Those graduated from this program will be awarded a degree in their specialty with education. For example, a student majoring in arts will be awarded a Bachelors in Arts with education. This type of program is also offered through the local universities. However, in 1990 the Ministry of Education implemented a special post-graduate teacher training program that is conducted at selected teacher training colleges. This program had to be initiated due to the shortage of facilities and places at the local universities to produce graduate teachers. This is in line with the Ministry of Education policy of having only university graduates in secondary schools in the near future. A teaching certificate is awarded to those that passed the program. Therefore, professionally and officially there are two categories of teachers, namely the graduate and non-graduate teachers. University graduates who have
basic degrees with Diploma of Education, bachelors with education or a basic
degree with a teaching certificate were called graduate teachers while those with
Teaching Certificate and Diploma with education are referred to as non-graduate
teachers. However, a non-graduate teacher can become a graduate teacher if he
or she manages to get a bachelors degree in the course of his or her teaching
career.

Besides trained teachers, there are also temporary teachers. These
teachers are not trained and they are recruited on a temporary basis to overcome
the shortage of teachers in schools. These temporary teachers may be teaching
from a few months to a few years depending on the vacancies available in schools.

In Malaysia, the principal post is a promotional post for senior teachers.
This promotion is based on seniority, merit and qualification. Therefore, only
teachers are qualified to become principals. Generally, principals are promoted
from among the assistant principals. However, there are cases whereby officials
from the District Education Department, State Education Department or the
Ministry of Education are promoted to hold the post of principal. This is due to
the fact that the teaching service in Malaysia is an open system. Teachers can
apply or be promoted to work in these departments and vice versa.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of the study is to find out if there is any differences in perceptions of principal effectiveness among two groups of secondary teachers: (1) graduates and non-graduates, and (2) juniors and seniors, in seven dimensions: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) student relations development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development. This review explores the changing roles of principals both in the United States and Malaysia, and the dimensions of principal effectiveness in the seven areas that are the focus of this study. The latter explores the conceptual framework of effectiveness as found in the literature as that relates to this study.

The Role of the Principal

To better understand the concept of effectiveness among principals, it would be helpful if we understand the roles of the principals both in the United States and Malaysia. In this way we will be able to better understand the problems that principals face in performing their duties and be able to connect these
with their effectiveness as principals.

The Roles of Principals in the United States

What is the role of a principal? Wolcott's (1973) seminal study on an elementary school principal gave us an insight into the role and function of a principal. His findings showed that a principal's life is highly varied. It is marked with brevity and fragmented. Wolcott's (1973) findings have been supported by other studies (example, Martin & Willower, 1981; Reilly, 1984). Reilly (1984) noted that, "the role of the principal is an ambiguous one with considerable and significant discrepancy existing between an idealized role image and actual job functions which are many and diverse." (p.242) He contends that the principal is a designer of environments conducive to learning. The principal is also a program planner, implementor and evaluator. Kron (1990) describes the principal's job "like a bramble of unpredictable and often contentious events" (p.256). The ambiguity of the principals' role is also mentioned by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) when they described the role of the principal as "extremely ambiguous and wrought with conflict" (p. 9). With leadership as the overriding emphasis, Lipham, Rankin and Hoeh (1985) describe the major functional areas of responsibility for principals as: (a) educational decision making, (b) educational change, (c) instructional improvement, (d) student services, (e) school's resource management, and (f) school-community relations.

Findley and Findley (1992) describe instructional supervision, evaluation
of teacher performance, and curriculum development as the three important domains in the performance of a principal's job. The principal is also responsible for the development of the school and his or her role in developing an effective school is extremely important. In the development of the school, the principal as leader sets the tone and direction for change and acts as facilitator and resource person. Many researchers indicated that the most important role of the principal is as an instructional leader. However, most of the principal's day is consumed in non-instructional chores (Howell, 1981; Beck, 1987) such as management (Manasse, 1982). They are forced to neglect their role as instructional leader due to time constraint (Acheson, 1985). Although many have indicated the important role of principal as instructional leader, Rallis and Highsmith (1986) take the exception. They maintained that instructional leadership should come from the rank of teachers. The role of principal as instructional leader has also been related to students achievement. However, Rowan, Bossert and Dwyer (1983) and Bossert (1985) expressed their caution about the causational effect of leadership to achievement. They noted that the relationship between student achievement and instructional leadership should be due to effective organization. This effective organization attracts and molds effective leaders and not the other way around. In discussing the role of principals, Finn (1987) redefined it as executive and entrepreneur rather than as an instructional expert. Others look at the qualities of the principal as the role. Batsis (1987) noted that there should be an emphasis on the following qualities for leadership roles of principals: (a) a sense
of vision, (b) an ability to clearly enunciate expectations, (c) skills in building a series of two-way communication channels, (d) high visibility, and (e) technical knowledge.

With the immense roles put on their shoulders, principals are not able to function as effective leaders. It has been found that time was the primary impediment for principals to become effective (McCurdy, 1983). Principals also act as catalysts so as to foster conditions that can create effective schools (Currence, 1986). In the day to day process of administering an organization, a principal not only functions as a leader but also as a manager. Bolman and Deal (1992) in their study of principals' roles as manager and leader found that the qualities of effective managers and effective leaders among principals overlap. This suggests that leadership and management are harder to differentiate for the school principals compared to managers in business and higher education. The managerial functions of a principal include: attendance, discipline, supervision, student affairs, public relation, curriculum development, staff development, clerical, maintenance, scheduling, budget development and report writing (Kron, 1990). As managers, principals are also involved in planning, organization, leading and controlling (Bookbinder, 1992).

Principals work with many people at various levels. They work with their superiors, subordinates, parents, students and among themselves. They are responsible and accountable for all the tasks assigned to them. At times they have to serve as mediators and resolve any dispute or conflict that arise so that
any disruption due to personality problems does not impede the learning process. They are also responsible for promoting school goals and support any plan for achieving the goals. In order to do these, it is the responsibility of the principals that resources are made available and to do that the principals have to act as politicians and public relations officers so that they can build alliances and collaborations with the community.

Roe and Drake (1974) explain the principal’s role as administrative-managerial and educational leadership. The administrative-managerial function include school budgeting, personnel administration, student discipline, resources management, and monitoring progress and instructional processes that are determined by the authorities. The educational leadership function emphasizes developing cooperation within and outside schools for the operation of the school, continually studying the curricular and instructional innovation, and providing leadership to students. Roe and Drake (1974) also maintained that although principals wanted to function more as instructional leaders, most of their time is consumed by administrative-managerial functions. This is supported by Buffie (1989) when he noted that principals spent most of their time on administrative or managerial tasks. He also gave the reasons why they are not able to exercise more of their instructional leadership as: (a) they prioritize their time based on the demands of the central office, (b) they often do not understand what is expected of them as an instructional leader, (c) their training does not prepare them for the role, (d) administrative-managerial tasks demand more of their time, and (e) it is much
easier for them to perform the role of administrator-manager than as instructional leader.

**The Roles of Principals in Malaysia**

Just like their counterparts in the United States, principals in Malaysia function as administrator-manager and educational leaders. As administrator-manager their roles and functions include managing: (a) finance and account, (b) non-teaching staff, (c) teachers, (d) educational program, (e) student services, and (f) physical facilities. As an administrator, the principals are responsible for administering their offices which includes answering letters and keeping office files, especially confidential files, in order (Ministry of Education, 1987b).

Minudin (1987) in his study of the role of secondary principals in Sabah, Malaysia, investigated the four main roles as perceived by the principals themselves. The four main roles are: managerial, political, academic and leadership. His findings indicated that the managerial roles of principals included matters that concern teachers and staff, students, programs and administration. The political role include matters that relate to staff, students, policies, and regulations. Six basic areas constitute the academic roles. There are: (1) evaluating the school program, (2) motivating staff to enhance their educational experience, (3) clarifying the purpose of the school, (4) directing all programs and other activities in the school, (5) teaching some classes, and (6) knowing and understanding regulations on courses of study for the secondary schools. The leadership role of the
principals includes preparing agendas for staff meetings, creating an atmosphere for scholarship of high quality, accepting and stimulating ideas from staff, providing assistance to both staff and students, supporting and defending schools from negative criticisms, and resolving problems.

Kamal (1981) in a study of eight domains of Malaysian secondary school principalship behavior and 191 behavioral evidence for the domains found that the order of importance for all the eight domains were: (1) leadership; (2) student welfare and student discipline; (3) school staff; (4) planning, deciding, organizing, coordinating, appraising and communicating; (5) curriculum and instruction; (6) personal qualities; (7) school office, physical facilities, financial and business management; and (8) school-community relations.

In a study on the workload of principals, assistant principals and afternoon supervisors in secondary schools, it was found that the functions emphasized by the principals in terms of priority were: planning, supervision, instructional leadership, and communication (Ministry of Education, 1987b). All the principals in this study indicated that they were involved in administration. They gave briefings to new teachers and staff. They also briefed new students at the start of a new school year. They delivered weekly speeches in the school assemblies that were conducted every week, and were responsible for keeping service records of the staff and ensuring their confidentiality. They were also required to complete the annual job performance assessment of each faculty and staff. Principals also reported that their workloads included mails. On the average, they received
about 15-30 letters a day and official letters have to be answered personally by the principals. Resource management has also been reported as an important function of the principals. They have to ensure that the physical facilities were adequate for the students and teachers. To do this they monitored the physical facilities used in the schools. Principals whose schools have hostels for students reported that the administration of the hostels was delegated to the hostel wardens and thus relieved principals from the daily responsibilities related to the hostels, such as food and minor health problems faced by the student occupants of the hostels. However, the principals were still responsible for the operation of the hostels.

With the implementation of the Integrated Secondary School Curriculum (ISSC), principals needed additional resources to support teachers in their teaching process. The introduction of the Living Skills subject required additional classrooms and workshops. Parents and community support were needed to construct additional classrooms which the Ministry of Education was not able to build in time due to bureaucratic procedures. Because of the introduction of new subjects and changes in the curricular contents, some teachers had to be assigned to teach subjects that they were not trained for due to the shortage of teachers in those areas. This created tensions among some teachers and principals. In a situation like this, principals had to marshal resources, and be knowledgeable about the new curriculum. They also had to establish better relationship with parents and the community, act as supporters, counselors and mediators to the teachers.
The Changing Role of the Principal

The roles of principals are determined by the political, social and economic changes that occur and influence decision makers in the school systems. The demands made by the constituents due to the changes that surround them force principals to review and change their roles also as to accommodate the demands put upon them.

The Changing Role of Principals in the United States

The changing role of principals in the United States can be traced from the 1920s to the 1990s (Beck & Murphy, 1993). They described that, in the 1920s, the principal was expected to be a social leader in the community. The principal was also expected to be a spiritual leader and scientific manager. In the 1930s, principals were seen as executives or managers. Principals’ roles increased in the 1940s. The 1940s was the era of war. Principals were viewed as the schools’ leaders and as such were expected to demonstrate their democratic leadership. In addition, they were expected to be curriculum developers, group leaders and supervisors. Within the community, principals were viewed as the school public relation’s representative. After the war, administration became the focus or theme. Principals were expected to be skilled administrators. As administrators, they were expected to defend the educational practice and manage time efficiently.
The decade of the 60s saw many changes. This was the decade of revolution where political and social upheaval and changes occurred. During this period, principals were expected to function as the bureaucrat. As such, they were expected to protect the bureaucracy. There were great political demands made of them. They felt vulnerable and confused about their role expectations. This is because they believed that they could be held accountable for their decisions and activities.

It was in the 70s that the expectation of principals to lead emerged. Principals were expected to be leaders for teachers and persons within the larger community. They were expected to play a number of roles even if those roles required very different traits and abilities. The role of instruction in students' achievements became the focus in the 80s. The 80s saw the increase in the role of principals in instructional leaders. As instructional leaders, they were to solve the problems related to instruction and provide resources. The demands on them were high. They were expected to have visions and capable of transforming the school. They were also expected to be able to develop and communicate an ideal school image. However, as Hallinger (1992) noted, "while instructional leadership demanded a new focus and set of work activities from the principal, the role conceived for the principal was still inherently managerial in nature." (p.38). In a study of elementary and secondary principals to determine whether seven aspects of principal's role had increased, not changed or decreased, Doud (1989) found four areas that have changed most: (1) personnel evaluation, (2) building
level authority/responsibility, (3) curriculum development, and (4) development of institutional practices.

The 90s see the changing position of the United States in the global community. The United States has lost its position in the world economy and public education has put the country at a competitive disadvantage. Less qualified people are available to the workforce and the social, political and demographic fabric of the United States has changed drastically. Principals in the 90s continue to be seen as leaders and their roles continue to grow. During this period, school reform and restructuring have become the main theme, and leadership has been identified as the main force for success. With the advent of school reform and restructuring, additional roles for the principals came to light. Such roles include organizational and social architects, educators, and moral agents. Beck and Murphy (1993) noted that the challenge for principals in the 90s is in transforming schools from a bureaucratic model to a post-industrial model. At the same time the challenge is for principals to change how they operate themselves. Therefore, the first challenge is to reorient the principal from management to leadership because as Beck and Murphy (1993) indicated, the competencies and skills in management is likely to be insufficient to face the challenge of leading the schools in the 90s.

Flanigan, Richardson and Blackburn (1990) noted that improving schools has emerged as a national focus and attention. They also noted that the principal of the 90s would be required to have leadership behavior skills as both educator
and administrator. This is in line with Blank's (1987) findings which indicate that leadership by principals was not found to be differentiated between "principal as administrator" and "principal as educator". He noted that the concept of principal as leader ultimately implies a redefinition of the relationship between the school and the school district. The 90s is the era of leadership and principals of this decade will need the skills and elements of leadership (Flanigan, Richardson & Blackburn, 1990). They need to be agents of the change, skillful in interpersonal relations, group dynamic, decision making, marshaling the sources of power and analytical acumen to school administration.

As the demands upon schools to improve quality and provide broader service increase, a new form of school leadership is required. Today's principals are no longer a manager of routines. They are increasingly called upon to initiate. They have to understand change and manage it. Other increasing roles required of the principals are: building group vision, developing quality educational programs, providing a positive instructional environment, maximizing human resources, applying evaluation processes, stimulating public support and engaging community leaders (National Commission for the Principalship, 1990). Bookbinder (1992) indicated that teacher performance, appraisal and evaluation has received increased attention and review in the educational and accountability movement and that principals' role in this area has to be focused.

The changing roles of the principal also affect the number of hours that they are involved in realizing their roles. In a study on middle level leaders and
schools, Valentine, Clark, Irvin, Keefe and Melton (1993) reported that the number of working hours among principals was up since 1981. For example, in 1981, 72% of the principals studied reported that they worked more than 50 hours per week. In 1992, 88% reported that they worked more than 50 hours. Twice as many principals in the study reported 60-69 hours per week in 1992 and three times as many reported 70 hours or more. The results of the survey also showed that school management continues to be the area in which principals spend most of their time and that principals in 1992 indicated more satisfaction with their professional position and the degree of related prestige than their counterparts in 1981 and 1966.

The Changing Role of Principals in Malaysia

The changing role of principals in Malaysia can be traced to the 1950s. In the 1950s, the main aim of education was mostly to provide the basic skills of writing, reading and arithmetics. In this decade, secondary schools were limited to the urban areas and the main objective of the secondary school systems was to prepare students to become officers to serve the colonial administrator. Therefore, the role of principals was to ensure future government officials were enculturated with the colonial life style so that they could easily be assimilated into the colonial system of administration and become 'good' officers.

The 1960s saw a drastic change in the educational system, especially with the effect of Malayan independence from the British in 1957. The social and
political climate changed as nationalism took precedence and education was used as the main force of change. The National Language Act of 1963, which made the Malay language the official language, provided the legal basis for the conversion from English to Malay language in the education and government administration systems. Principals and teachers were caught in the process of change. This was especially so for schools that started to use the Malay language as the medium of instruction since they lacked books written in Malay, and particularly textbooks in science and mathematics. There was a great drive for science and mathematics teachers who could teach in the Malay language in secondary schools since most teachers could not converse in Malay. To overcome this problem, the Ministry of Education recruited science and mathematics teachers from Indonesia on a contractual basis. Although this helped to alleviate the problem, difficulties concerning the terminology that Indonesian teachers used persisted. Principals were themselves unable to help in this matter because most of the terminology used in science and mathematics were new and principals were typically not trained in those subjects.

In response to the Education Act of 1961, the Malayan Secondary School Entrance Examination (MSSEE) was abolished in 1964 and more students were able to continue their study in secondary schools. The decade of the 60s saw the introduction of free education and the age for leaving school was raised to fifteen years. It was also the starting point of the national comprehensive education system at the lower secondary school level where students were offered both
academic and prevocational subjects with the goal of equipping students with the skills and knowledge for active participation in the economy. All these developments required that principals play a bigger role and hold greater responsibilities, particularly in implementing the process of change from the English-medium secondary school to National secondary school. It was in this decade that the role of principals as change agents was obvious.

The phasing out of English as the medium of instruction in national primary and secondary schools continued in the 70s. The problem of textbooks and terminology, especially in science and mathematics, started to fade. However, students' participation in schools, particularly from rural areas, left much to be desired. A dropout study was conducted to determine the causes and recommendations were made to improve the attrition rates of students. The report on this study, known as the Murad Report of 1972, recommended various strategies to reduce the dropout rate among students. Among the recommendations were: (a) the amalgamation of small primary schools especially in rural areas, (b) the award of scholarship and bursaries to needy students at the secondary level, (c) a textbook loan scheme, and (d) a supplementary feeding program for students in the primary schools. With these recommendations came additional roles and responsibilities to the principals. Principals in secondary schools have to provide information to students and parents regarding scholarships and bursaries. With the launching of the textbook loan scheme in 1975, principals had to accept additional roles and functions, especially in managing the scheme.
In response to one of the recommendations in the Cabinet Committee Report, 1979, the Ministry of Education introduced the New Curriculum for the Primary School (NCPS) in 1983. The main theme of the curriculum was the total development of the child with an emphasis on the 3Rs: reading, writing and arithmetic. With the implementation of the new curriculum, additional teaching and learning materials were needed. Principals were expected to be creative in acquiring resources, particularly because of the economic recession. Additional roles had to be carried out by principals which included: teacher developer; instructional guide; resource manager; supervisor of implementors; change agent; promoter in raising funds for the school activities; public relations officers; student, teacher and staff relations; staff developer; and school disciplinarian. Societal expectations put on the schools with regard to students' academic performance added another dimension to principals' role.

In 1989, the Integrated Secondary School Curriculum (ISSC) was introduced starting with the lower secondary level. With this introduction, new materials were needed to cater to the teaching and learning process. Additional classrooms had to be ready to suit the needs of the new curriculum. New resources had to be looked into and all these new and additional needs forced principals to be more resourceful in getting funds and support. The introduction of new subjects, especially the Living Skills, tested the principals' skill in dealing with human resources. This subject required special teachers trained in a particular skill area. However, most schools did not have all the teachers required to teach
this subject. Therefore, principals had to be more alert in mobilizing teachers to teach this subject. The implementation of the ICSS added the burden to the principals of discipline master, staff developer, resource entrepreneur and manager, fund raiser, school public relations officer, mediator, and instructional guide.

The second phase of the ISSC implemented in 1992 provided an assessment of its implementation. Strength and weakness had to be identified and ramification made where necessary. The results of the LCE at the end of 1991 provided a gauge of the level of success in the first cycle of the ISSC implementation. Principals were responsible for their students' performance. The rate of students' success in this national examination determined the roles that principals had to play. Strategies were studied and resources reexamined so as to ensure better performance of students in the LCE examination. Principal that had upper secondary students in their schools were anxious about the results of their students in the MCE examination in 1993 because they were the first class of students that had gone through the ISSC from Form I to Form V. Besides, with the abolition of LCE in 1993, the schools were receiving more students in the upper secondary classes. There were additional students and courses offered. This meant that additional facilities had to be provided to cater to the increase in the number of students. With this addition, other factors related to principals' roles had to be added. For example, with more students, additional supervision of students behavior and discipline had to be meted. More teachers had to be managed
and additional resources acquired to cater to the increase in demands made by the teachers and students. To provide additional facilities, support from the community was important since the Ministry of Education had a limited budget to provide the additional facilities required at that time. Due to this change, the roles of principals shifted from being a passive receiver of resources from the Ministry of Education to being an active pursuer of additional resources. To do this principals had to look to communities for support, and that working relationship had to be strengthened.

To successfully implement the ISSC, principals needed to initiate change, motivate teachers and gain their commitments. To effect this, they had to be more knowledgeable and skillful in the organizational dynamics and human relations. They also had to be more committed to the role of managing and supervising instruction. The management of buildings, materials and financial resources also needed additional attention from the principals. Since the implementation of the ISSC, principals have maintained high visibility as instructional leaders, knowledgeable about the new curriculum and function as teacher developer. To keep teachers' morale high in light of the curricular change process, principals have had to demonstrate their knowledge and interest in the contents of curriculums and ensure that the sequence and scope were adhered to. To demonstrate this, principals have supervised, provided needed guidance in interpreting the content of the curriculum, and provided support in the form of materials and non-materials. Since additional materials were needed for implementing the
curriculum, principals have had to be more entrepreneurial in their approach to resources and pursue opportunities outside the normal school channels.

The 90s saw the Total Quality Management (TQM) movement creeping into education management in Malaysia. Principals were caught with the wave of the TQM, especially in 1993, when concepts such as vision, empowerment, benchmarking, zero-defect and paradigm shift were introduced to them by the higher authority in the Ministry of Education. While some of the principals were confused and unclear as to the meaning of these ideas, they were expected to implement and function according to these terms. In light of this, principals’ roles had to be realigned to the demands as specified in the concept of TQM.

Dimension of Principal Effectiveness

For the past ten years or so, many studies have been conducted on effective principal and effective school (for example, Edmonds, 1979; Rutherford, 1985; Blase, 1987; Kowalski, Reitzug, McDaniel & Otto, 1992). The studies have indicated the critical role of the principal in school improvement. The effective school research contended that leadership is important for school success. For example, Shoemaker and Foster (1981) in a review of research on effective schooling found that the principal was a critical element in determining school success. They identified four elements that characterize effective schools: (1) the principal was characterized by achievement-oriented leadership, (2) there is a calm school environment, (3) high aspirations for students and faculty, and (4) the
existence of instructional goals and the means to evaluate each goal. Glasman (1984) indicated that the ability to lead depends upon the ability to understand one's own desires and the desires of others. He contends that as a leader, school principals must address both their own desires and those individuals associated with the school. DuFour and Eaker (1987) indicated that research findings on effective organizations, effective leaders, and effective schools calls for a definition of principalship that recognizes the four roles and responsibilities of principals as: (1) values promoter and protector, (2) teacher empowerer, (3) instructional leader, and (4) climate manager.

Blase (1987) conducted a two and a half year study on teachers' perspectives on effective school leadership. She found that effective leadership was linked to the development of productive social and cultural structures in schools. She found that competencies such as problem-solving skills, knowledge of curriculum, and listening skills were perceived as essential to effective school leadership. She also found that the emphasis on the principal is more towards the leadership competencies which are related to people than administrative competencies which are associated with technical aspects such as budgeting. The results of her study affirms that competencies such as listening skills, problem-solving skills and knowledge of curriculum were perceived as important to effective school leadership. Kowalski et al. (1992) confirm some of her findings. They found that the four most important skills that effective principals should possess as perceived by teachers are: (1) communicate effectively, (2) listen to others, (3) inspire others,
and (4) be diplomatic.

According to Huess and Psencik (1986), in identifying effective principals, five domains should be looked into: (1) vision, (2) organization/collaboration, (3) people skills, (4) communication skills, and (5) firmness. Goals and values have also been associated with effective principals. They must have goals and values that fit the system and the community. These goals and values must also meet the needs of the staff and students (Moorhead & Nediger, 1989). Related to values is needs. If they want to execute more effective leadership, principals should also be able to match their behaviors with the appropriate needs and concerns of teachers. Hord and Hall (1987) noted that effective principals accommodate the environment, provide instructional leadership, and cultivate interpersonal relationship.

Some researchers describe effective principals from the personal or behavioral point of view. For example, Lyman (1988) provide the qualities of effective leaders as: physically and emotionally well, time manager, grow professionally, and possess the highest standards of moral, ethical and professional conduct. In the same vein Manasse (1986) noted that effective principals have the following qualities: possess personal vision of the school; committed to purpose; initiative; discretionary decision-making; communicate high expectations; effective manager; effective instructional supervisor; have high energy levels; good listeners and observers; skillful in communication; and aware of their leadership style and its consequences. Murphy (1983) provides the profile of an effective principal as:
emphasizes goals and productions; active in decision-making; knows community power structure and maintains good relation with parents; emphasizes achievement; optimistic that students are able to meet instructional goals; emphasizes discipline and handles disciplinary problem personally; conducts more observation on teachers' works; supports teachers' efforts; and recognizes individual teacher's potentials and helps them achieve their own performance goals. Persell and Cookson (1982) reviewed 75 research studies and reports to determine the reasons why some principals are more effective than others. From the review, they identified nine behaviors that good principals display: (1) committing to academic goals, (2) creating a climate of high expectations, (3) functioning as instructional leader, (4) forceful and dynamic leader, (5) consulting effectively with others, (6) establishing order and discipline, (7) marshaling resources, (8) using time well, and (9) evaluating results. Sweeney (1982) in reviewing research on effective school leadership indicated that effective principals: emphasize achievement, set instructional strategies, coordinate instructional programs, provide an orderly atmosphere, regularly evaluate student progress, and support teachers.

Rutherford (1985) in describing the qualities of effective schools sees principals as instructional leaders. He listed the qualities as: having a clear, informed visions of what they want their schools to be; translating these visions into goals for their schools and expectation for the teachers, students and administrators; creates a school climate that support programs to achieve these goals and expectations; monitors progress continuously; and intervenes in a supportive or
corrective manner where necessary. Robinson (1985) listed the following as characteristics of principals in effective schools: (a) assertive instructional leader; (b) goal and task-oriented, (c) well organized, (d) convey high expectations for students and staff, (e) define and communicate policies effectively, (f) visit classrooms frequently, (g) visible and available to staff and students, (h) provide strong support to teachers, and (i) skillful at parent and community relations. By interviewing eight elementary and secondary school principals, Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) found that principals identified as effective: committed to certain personal values about schools and children, took initiative and were proactive, and did not allow themselves to be consumed by the demands of the organizational routines.

Besides providing instructional leadership, effective principals cultivate strong interpersonal relationships (Hord & Hall, 1987). In cultivating these relationships, they intensify the motivation and mutual trust among staff and colleagues. They recognize the value of recognition and respect. They also empower their staff as a sign of their respect and trust of them. Duttweiler and Hord (1987) listed nine dimensions of effective leaders: (1) they create and enhance environments for learning, (2) evaluate curricular to improve effectiveness, (3) analyze instruction and teacher performance, (4) appraise student/school performance, (5) understand and apply research outcomes, (6) manage school resources, (7) ensure order and discipline in the school, (8) are skillful in human relations, and (9) get parents and community involved.
Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) studied effective and typical principals. They discovered that effective principals have clear goals and set their priorities for the success of the students. They are task-oriented rather than people-oriented and viewed themselves as instructional leaders. They put high expectations on teachers to produce good results for students. They are concerned about teachers’ knowledge and skills. Because of that, they impart their skills and knowledge to teachers so that the teachers can impart the skills and knowledge gained to students. As resources in the form of facilities and support are important for students learning, they ensure that these resources are available to teachers.

From the brief review about principal effectiveness, a further discussion based on the seven dimensions of principal effectiveness as a focus of this study is provided as follows.

**Leadership**

Effective principals consider themselves as leaders (Manasse, 1986). As leaders, principals in effective schools articulate a vision concerning the school (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Manasse, 1982; Persell & Cookson, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1984; Rutherford, 1985; Huess & Psencik, 1986). Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) discovered that the personal vision of effective principals helped them to see priorities so that they were not consumed by the daily routines of the job. They also found that these principals were not afraid of change and
they like to experiment and thus they were proactive. Manasse (1986) noted that by having the visions and integrating as many activities towards the goals as possible, effective principals influence the overall institutional program and the specific learning objective of the students and staff. In realizing their visions for the schools, they fit their leadership style to structure their work and set priorities. They have a perspective which allow them to see how a particular task of program fits into a much broader scheme (Sergiovanni, 1984). They also provide leadership in implementing and evaluating the goals (Lipham, 1981). In describing the qualities of effective principals, Rutherford (1985) describes them as having clear and informed visions of what they want of their schools. These visions are translated into goals and expectations for the teachers, students and administrators.

Effective principals also promote and protect values (DuFour and Eaker, 1987). They have goals and values that fit the school systems and the community. These goals and values also meet the needs of the staff and students (Moorhed & Nediger, 1989). In their review of 75 studies and reports that determine principal effectiveness, Persell and Cookson (1982) found that effective principals demonstrate a commitment to academic goals and create a climate of high expectations. Their conveyance of high expectations for students and staff are also noted by Robinson (1985) who described them as goal and task-oriented. Most of these principals espoused goals that can provide good programs and insure success (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). Effective principals also emphasize achievement (Sweeney, 1982). They serves as role models to their staff, teachers
and students (McCurdy, 1983; Valentine & Bowman, 1988; Duttweiler & Hord, 1987; NAESP, 1991). As role models, effective principals emphasize excellence. They provide incentives, as motivation, to teachers and students for them to excel (McCurdy, 1983; Duttweiler & Hord, 1987; NAESP, 1991). They press teachers for better commitment (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer & Wisenbacher., 1979) and instill high expectations on teachers about the progress they can make (Brookover et al., 1979; Phi Delta Kappan, 1980). In making decisions, effective principals accept responsibility for their decisions (Sweeney, 1982). They also empower (DuFour & Eker, 1987), are able to tolerate failure, encourage innovation, and are flexible in their leadership (Rouche & Baker, 1986).

School Rules and Procedures

In any organization, rules and procedures are enacted to assure reliable behavior on the part of the members, to protect them from unjust demands and assure coordination for various tasks (Abbott & Caracheo, 1988). They are also established with the purpose of determining the stability of the organization. As administrator and manager, the principal is confined and constrained to the rules and procedures set by the higher authority in carrying out their duties and responsibilities, especially with regard to making decisions, solving problems, planning and implementing change.

Although rules and procedures can create roadblocks, they have positive functions such as serving as buffer between employees and external demands
which result in minimum risks and reduced anxiety associated with role performance and legitimate punishment. One of the daily functions of principals in managing schools is organizing tasks, personnel and school resources (Lipham, Rankin & Hoeh, 1985). As managers, their functions include maintenance, scheduling, budget development and report writing (Engelking, 1990). They also organize, plan and control (Bookbinder, 1992). Rules and procedures have to be developed so as to ensure that the school process can run smoothly.

School Learning Climate

A learning climate is important in the learning and teaching process. Resources have to be adequately provided to teachers and students so that they can function effectively. Effective principals marshall resources and make them available when and where they are needed (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan & Lee., 1982; Rutherford, 1985; Duttweiler & Hord, 1987). They also create school environments where messages are delivered clearly so as to prevent communication distortion (Duttweiler & Hord, 1987). Effective principals reward and encourage teachers by providing time, materials and assistance. They also protect teachers from a variety of internal and external pressures (Little, 1982). Maintaining discipline and order in the school is one of the greatest challenges a principal has to face. As the administrator in the school, the principal’s responsibility includes setting and enforcing standard student behavior and creating a climate of respect and order in the school (MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983). Discipline and order
have to be maintained as they are important in creating a conducive learning environment. To do this, students behavioral problems have to be contained. Effective principals are able to create and maintain orderly environment by being able to anticipate crises and problems (Morris, Crowson, Hurwitz & Porter-Gehrie, 1981; Murphy, 1983; Dwyer, 1984).

Discipline codes and rules are meaningless if schools are unable to enforce them. Effective principals enforce discipline personally with students. They provide support for enforcing discipline by assigning staff and resources to confront violators of rules that have been established (Russell, Mazzarella, White & Maurer, 1985). They ensure that the school and discipline are in order (Duttweiler & Hord, 1987; Persell & Cookson, 1982). Besides discipline, attendance is important in creating a good learning climate. As such, effective principals set discipline and attendance as high priorities (Doggett, 1987). They provide an orderly atmosphere by ensuring that the school is quiet, pleasant and well-maintained so as to create a conducive learning environment (Sweeney, 1982).

Teachers expect principals to solve problems in the schools, especially with regards to student discipline and completing task according to time schedules. They are also expected to make decisions on unexpected incidents. However, some of them are confused when making decisions on these types of incidents. This is different for effective principals. They are decisive when matters crop up for them to make decisions (Walker, 1990). Morris et al. (1981) in their study describe how principals use their "discretionary decision-making" to maintain
stability and order. They also describe how principals use their decision-making to limit intrusions, disruptions and uncertainties. Leithwood and Stager (1986) studied 11 moderately effective principals and 11 highly effective principals. They found that highly effective principals encouraged extensive involvement of staff in decision making. This finding is supported by Walker (1990).

The smooth functioning of a school depends on many individuals. Therefore, teamwork is necessary and effective principals appear to develop a sense of teamwork in planning, implementing and evaluating instructional programs (Heck & Marcoulides, 1993).

Teacher/Staff Relations and Development

The existence of principals is due to the existence of teachers. There is a leader-follower interaction because teachers look to principals for direction. Principals cannot function in isolation because as leaders they have to deal with the followers (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961) who are mostly teachers. Therefore, it is important that a working relationship between principals and staff be established and reinforced.

The success of students in schools is affected by their teachers' knowledge and skills. The changes in teaching and learning technologies have left some teachers behind and this has created problems not only for teachers but most importantly for students. To solve this problem, staff development programs have to be initiated. McEvoy (1987) found that effective principals influence the
development of their staff by: informing teachers of professional opportunities, 
disseminating professional and curricular materials, soliciting teachers' opinions, 
encouraging innovation, and recognizing individual teacher's achievement. 
Manasse (1986) noted that effective principals identify the strengths and poten­
tials of their staff so that they can provide learning opportunities and experience 
for them. To provide motivation and boost morale on their staff, effective princi­
pals often help teachers solve problems. They do this by looking out for the wel­
fare of teachers by doing personal favors, providing necessary services, and staying 
after school to help teachers with extra work (McCurdy, 1983). Effective princi­
pals also support teachers in attending professional meetings and workshops. 
They also provide in-services that promote improved teaching (Sweeney, 1982).

Teachers' understanding of the school vision is important so that they can 
fulfill their principals' expectation. Effective principals are able to communicate 
clearly their vision to teachers who consequently are able to realize their princi­
pal's vision. On the other hand, less effective principals lacked the common 
understanding of school-wide goals and expectation. Effective principals were 
also found to allocate resources in the form of funds and materials to maximize 
teaching effectiveness which will benefit the students. They use other means to 
help teachers instruct effectively such as careful assignment of teachers. To show 
their concern and commitment to teachers they attend grade-level and department 
meetings and see that problems with staff and faculty are solved amicably 
(Rutherford, 1985). To show their appreciation towards teachers' efforts, they
recognize and praise teachers contribution and accomplishments (Rutherford, 1985; Roueche & Baker, 1986). Principals have to work within a bureaucratic system that can create constraints. However, effective principals are able to make bureaucracy work for them by minimizing uncertainty and assuring emotional support for teachers (Morris et al., 1981; Pfeifer, 1986). They also cultivate strong interpersonal relationship (Hord & Hall, 1987; Kowalski et al., 1992). To ensure that classroom teaching is carried out as smoothly as planned by teachers, effective principals limit unnecessary intrusions into classrooms (Little, 1982).

Student Relations and Development

Principals have a heavy responsibility towards students in schools and are looked upon them by them as father-figures. Students need the motivation, encouragement and support from principals for their success in school. A working relationship between principals and students is important so that students can better understand principals’ responsibilities for schools and their responsibilities to principals. This can be achieved by the principals developing responsibility and encouraging leadership among students. Effective principals cultivate strong interpersonal relationship with students (Hord & Hall, 1987). They also regularly evaluate student progress (Sweeney, 1982) and take actions to facilitate student achievement in areas specified in school goals (Scanell, 1988). They are sensitive to students’ needs and concerns, and support students so that they can improve their performance (Rozenholtz, 1985; Walker, 1990). They also realize that they
are needed by students and as such emphasize the importance of being visible (Morris et al., 1981; Cooper, 1989).

**School-Community Relations**

Schools are not able to stand by themselves. Their survival is partly dependent on outside resources, especially parents and the community. With their support and help, schools will be able to provide a better learning environment for students. Therefore, it is imperative that schools get parents and the community involved in students' schooling which effective principals are able to do (Duttweiler & Hord, 1987). In dealing with the community, the principals cannot escape from being apolitical. It is important that principals know how to maneuver politics, especially in getting resources and aids for schools. Effective principals know and understand the power structure of the community and are able to manipulate it for the benefit of schools (Manasse, 1986).

Effective principals are also skillful at establishing a positive working relationship among schools, parents and the community. They accomplish this by meeting with parents and the public with the purpose of promoting the schools or discussing school programs. They continuously create programs that provide opportunities for parents to get involved as important participants in school activities. They also assess public opinions about schools and through the information gathered, they develop a plan of public relations for schools (Hoyle, English & Steffy, 1985).
One of the most important functions of the principal is in the improvement of teaching and learning. As noted by Lipham (1981), "the single most important factor in determining the success or failure of a school is the ability of the principal to lead the staff in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvement in the school's curricular, co-curricular and extracurricular programs." (p. 12). Many studies have been carried out on principals as instructional leaders (e.g., Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; DuFour & Eaker, 1987; Hord & Hall, 1987). The findings from these studies support the review by Persell and Cookson (1982) that identified instructional leadership as one of the behaviors displayed by effective principals. They use instructional management strategies that promote and enhance effective teaching practices (Little, 1982; Odden, 1983; MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983) and maintain high visibility as instructional leaders (Little, 1982; Batsis, 1987). They always learn about what teachers are attempting to do in classrooms so that they can be a knowledgeable and fair evaluator (Little, 1982). They are also knowledgeable about instruction and able to identify quality instruction (Look & Manatt, 1984). Heck and Marcoulides (1993) found that effective principals evaluate instructional programs while Duttweiler and Hord (1987) noted that one of the dimensions of effective principals is evaluating curriculums to improve learning effectiveness. They are also capable of communicating their knowledge in such a way that the teachers are confident and receptive to changes brought by them (Batsis, 1987).
Effective principals frequently coach teachers in developing instructional skills (Edmonds, 1979) and coordinate instructional programs (Sweeney, 1982). They monitor the types, amounts and uses of instructional materials. They also insure that these materials are educationally adequate and readily available to teachers (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). They also spend much of their time on instructional matters (MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983) such as analyzing instruction and teacher performance (Duttweiler & Hord, 1987). Compared to less effective principals, effective principals conduct more observations of teachers' work for the purpose of helping teachers improve their performance. They also provide support for teachers to improve (Murphy, 1983).

Russell et al. (1985) indicated that principals who are effective demonstrate knowledge and skills in each curriculum and ensure that the sequence and scope are adhered to. This finding is supported by Blase (1987) when she found the knowledge of curriculum was perceived by teachers as essential to effective school leadership. Since they are knowledgeable about curriculum and design, they are able to recognize effective instruction (Look & Manatt, 1984). They are also more likely to work together with teachers on instruction and share new ideas or practices (Little, 1982).

The Concept of Effectiveness

Much writing and research has been conducted on the issue of effectiveness in business, social work and education. The term "effectiveness" has been
used in various ways and, as Grady, Watson and Zirkel (1989) noted, the term was loaded with politics. In the work field, effectiveness was regarded as one of the most sought after performances. However, its concept is elusively defined and measured (Luthans, Welsh & Taylor, 1988). This implies that no consensus have been reached with regard to the meaning of this term. For example, Reddin (1970) indicated that the term "managerial effectiveness" is not always clearly understood. The term is not neutral because when we define individual effectiveness we have to make choices between competing values (Firestone, 1991).

Although the definition of effectiveness is difficult and elusive, it is important because, as Drucker (1967) noted, if executives do not know how to be effective, they are setting the wrong model. He said that effectiveness is a habit that can be learned.

The Meaning of Effectiveness in Business

What is effectiveness? Effectiveness is achieving the goals of the organization (Barnard, cited in Pankake & Burnett, 1990), doing the right things (Drucker, 1967; Bennis & Nanus, 1985), and the "extent to which a manager achieves the output requirements of his position" (Reddin, 1970, p. 3). This indicates that effectiveness is related to outcome. Therefore, it has to be defined in terms of what is achieved rather than what is attempted. The second point that Reddin puts forward with regard to effectiveness is that "it is not a quality a manager brings to a situation" (p. 2). This shows that we cannot see effectiveness
from the trait or personality point of view. This element was pointed out previously by Drucker (1967) when he said that there is no "effective personality" (p. 211). We have to see effectiveness from the results, that is the product or performance the manager produces.

According to Reddin (1970) there are three kinds of effectiveness: (1) managerial effectiveness, (2) apparent effectiveness, and (3) personal effectiveness. According to him, it is difficult and almost impossible to judge managerial effectiveness by observing the behavior alone. The manager may be effective in certain behaviors but the question remains whether the behavior is appropriate to the output requirements of the job. Therefore, to be effective the manager has to do the right things, that is, achieving the output requirements of the position. Reddin defined the second kind of effectiveness, apparent effectiveness, as the extent to which the manager gives the appearance of being effective. It is based on behavior that can be observed, for example, making quick decisions or good public relations. However, this behavior may or may not lead to managerial effectiveness because it is difficult to measure the extent of the effectiveness through appearance alone. The third kind of effectiveness, personal effectiveness, is the extent to which a manager achieves his private objectives. Reddin elaborated that personal effectiveness is related to satisfying personal objectives rather than the objectives of the organization. He added that this behavior usually occurs to a person that has only a few clearly defined management-output measures.

In discussing effectiveness, Pankake and Burnett (1990) posited four
elements of effectiveness: (1) the existence of results, outcomes, or outputs; (2) results or outcomes are not acquired at random due to the existence of doing the right things; (3) quality; and (4) the mode of operation is active rather than passive. Therefore, according to them, in measuring effectiveness, four elements should be present namely: accomplishment, priority, quality and activity.

The concept of effectiveness has to do with the way one handles a problem. Drucker (1967), in discussing the role of effective executive, noted that if executives cannot manage themselves effectively, they cannot be expected to manage their subordinates and associates. He noted that to be effective, one does not have to have special gifts, aptitudes or training because "effectiveness can be learned - and it has to be learned" (p. vii). He added that executives have to be effective because that is what they are being paid for and it is a prime requirement for individual accomplishment and achievement. Drucker added that intelligence, imagination and knowledge are essential resources. However, only effectiveness converts them into results. He differentiated between effectiveness and efficiency. To him "Effectiveness is getting things right" and "Efficiency is getting the right things done" (p. 2). He noted that there are five elements in effectiveness: (1) management of time; (2) focus on output rather than input; (3) build on one's own, superior's and colleague's strength; (4) set the priorities; and (5) effective decision making.

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) define effective managerial job behavior as "any set of managerial actions believed to be optimal for
identifying, assimilating, and utilizing both internal and external resources toward sustaining, over a long time, the functioning of the organizational unit for which a manager have some degree of responsibility" (p. 105). In their definition, an effective manager is an optimizer in utilizing all available and potential resources. These resources include materials, both human and financial, that come from internal and external sources that sustain long term functioning of the organization. They noted that one of the benchmarks for an effective manager is that the ultimate outcome is the maintenance of organizational functioning. They maintain that the measure for effectiveness must be over the long term and that effective managerial behavior includes many actions. They add that although an individual manager has his or her own personality and behavior patterns, the outcomes to be achieved might be the same. Therefore, utilizing entirely different behavior patterns, different managers might still accomplish the same or a very similar level of optimization.

The Meaning of Effectiveness in Education

In education, the topic of school and principal effectiveness has attracted the attention of various researchers. However, the majority of these researchers failed to agree on a common definition of effectiveness. Cross (1981) found that the research on principal effectiveness reflects the problem and complexity of the questions it addresses. He said that effectiveness is only an artificial construct that resides in one's mind. Therefore, its meanings and definition will always be
based on one's values and biases. Leithwood and Montgomery (1986) noted that effectiveness can be construed as the outcome and improvement. To them, effectiveness is defined as the gains or improvements that are achieved on behalf of the students. They describe an effective principal as one capable of: maximizing the cost effectiveness of students learning, increasing the number of students who can master the "basics", and increasing the students overall capacity to self-direct and solve problems.

Duke (1992), in discussing the concept of effectiveness, looks at it from four perspectives of functions: (1) traits, (2) compliance, (3) competence, and (4) attained school outcomes. Traits are different from behavior because they are stable and can endure in any situations (Byham & Thornton, cited in Duke, 1992). However, traits cannot be used as a form of measurement because they are difficult to measure and, as Drucker (1967) pointed out, there is no effective personality. But Kron (1990) notes that effectiveness can be measured by the personal treatment one gives to another. He gives the example that if we respect others and in exchange are being respected, then we can say that we are effective. Relating to traits, Lyman (1988) describes effective leaders in terms of their personal qualities. Some of the qualities of effective leaders are: physical and emotional wellness, and high standard of moral, ethical and professional conduct.

In carrying out their duties and responsibilities, principals perform a variety of tasks. These tasks can be routine, such as managing the office, and ad hoc, such as dealing with student disciplinary problems. These tasks are designated to
them. Therefore, it is their responsibilities that the tasks are carried out properly. Besides, principals have to adhere to rules, regulations, procedures and policies of the school they are charged to. Therefore, a principal can be judged to be effective when he or she is able to complete tasks within the official guidelines. This is the second point posited by Duke (1992). As noted by Duke (1992), the concept of compliance in measuring effectiveness is accountability, that is, accountable to the tasks expected of them. However, he cautioned that using compliance as the basis of measuring effectiveness raises two main issues: (1) the question of evidence, and (2) the type of judgement. In the question of evidence, Duke (1992) noted that there are certain tasks that can be assessed much easier than others in terms of objectivity such as financial accounting. However, there are other tasks designated to principals which are difficult to measure, such as public relations and counseling. These actions are normally continuous and often informal. Besides, they are not always documented. This leads to the problem of reliability. In the second issue, the type of judgement, the question is whether principals should be assessed on compliance and non-compliance of tasks assignments. Can we judge a principal who has to resort to non-compliance of rules and regulations to be effective when he or she is forced to make the choice so that learning and teaching process can be improved? For example, in a study of 16 effective principals in Chicago, Morris et al. (1981) noted that some principals short-circuited procedures so as to maintain normal functioning of the teaching and learning process in the schools. They gave an example whereby a principal
kept a pool of substitute teachers for the schools although it is against the state education department procedures. However, only by doing this could the instructional program in the school function normally because teachers could be substituted immediately without having to go through the bureaucratic red tape that often hinders the smooth flow of instruction that students should receive.

Principals are often burdened with making choices and priorities. Due to the mounting constraints and limited resources, principals have to make precise judgement on how to prioritize the tasks. This leaves the question of not able to complete certain tasks due to priorities. Can we judge a principal to be ineffective because he or she is not able to complete all the tasks but decides to concentrate on certain tasks that have a higher impact on the teachers and students? Or in a case like this, can a principal be considered effective if he or she is able to exercise good judgement on which tasks to prioritize?

The third point puts forward by Duke (1992) that is related to compliance is the question of competence. He notes that if compliance is related to doing a job, then competence is related to how well the job is done. The concept of competence then is based on certain standards. Most organizations have their own performance standards that as a means to measure the completion of tasks. Therefore, competence-based effectiveness can serve as an accountability measurement. For example, if the principal manages to keep the school funds in balance within a certain period of time in order to comply with the requirements of the central office, then we can say that he or she is effective based on
competence procedures. However, Duke (1992) added that using this concept to assess effectiveness has its own weaknesses. One of them is the question of validity. He notes that the validity is dependent on how the standards are developed. It also depends on the indicators used to measure the standards. Standards may be derived from state guidelines or based on the results of negotiation between management of committees created by public agencies and unions. These developers of standards have their own views of competence which may be different. The second criterion may be based on the job description that already exists. It may also be based on job analysis, expert opinions or on research findings. Besides, the performance standards may be determined by political maneuvers.

In Malaysia, the standard performance for government employees is developed and mandated by the Public Service Department which is responsible for the public service personnel in government agencies. Since teachers and principals are government employees, they are assessed by the standards of performance set by this department.

Competence as an indicator of effectiveness is useful if the person to be assessed has the skills and knowledge expected of the position he or she held, and these skills and knowledge are acquired through training. For example, if a principal is unable to achieve the performance standards after being trained in certain skills, then we can say fairly that he or she is ineffective. However, is it fair to judge a principal to be ineffective if he or she has not been trained in the areas that he or she will be assessed?
Effectiveness is generally measured by the outcomes or outputs. This is based on the business concept of input and output, and the main purpose for this view of effectiveness is accountability. This is the fourth point that Duke (1992) posited in discussing the concept of effectiveness. This concept has been introduced and discussed by various scholars (e.g., Drucker, 1967; Reddin, 1970; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986; Moorehead & Nediger, 1989; Pankake and Burnett, 1990). The concept of outcome-based school management has received much attention in recent years. Although outcome-based assessment can help administrators evaluate principal effectiveness, Duke (1992) noted that it has its own limitation. This limitation is related to the nature of outcomes that are to be measured. Since the outcome is the result of efforts by various parties in and out of schools, is it fair to attribute effectiveness to the principal alone? Duke (1992) adds that the second limitation has to do with what is to be defined as school outcome. The school’s outcome is influenced by many factors and that outcome can be in various forms: students’ academic achievement, students’ discipline, the schools’ goals and objectives that were accomplished, and the stakeholders’ contentment. Although the principal has been identified as one of the major factors in school outcomes, Duke (1992) cautions that not much has been known about the direct impact or causal relationship between the principals’ initiative and student outcomes.

The concept of effectiveness can also be related to the ability to maintain a certain status quo or practice. For example, if the discipline of the school is
already good, then effectiveness can be defined as the ability to maintain the status quo rather than to achieve it. The concept of maintenance can also be related to compliance as described by Duke (1992). For example, if a new principal is able to maintain a good working relationship that had previously been established with the community, we can regard this as compliance, that is complying to the tradition.

Another way of looking at effectiveness is from the concept of 'fit'. For example, Moorhead and Nediger (1989) noted that effective principals must have goals and values that 'fit' with the system and the community. The goals and values should also meet the school staff and students' needs. Looking from this point of view, they contend that principals' effectiveness is a function and also a process. They define effectiveness as a function of fit between system goals and school goals that match the needs of students, staff, and parents, and the strategies used to implement those goals. In this manner, a principal can be judged to be effective if his or her goals and values match with the system and school goals and the needs of students, staff and parents. It can be argued that based on this statement, an element of personality or trait is present because goals and values of a principal are derived from his or her traits. From this view, it can be construed that the concept of effectiveness does not involve the traditional concept of outcome or output at all. However, in detailing the concept of effectiveness, they also forwarded the idea of outputs or outcomes, but they define it not as an individual process but rather as a process of various factors. To them, outcome
is to be defined as a function of the following: students academic achievement, the short term external success of the graduates, student personal development, student personal achievement, staff personal development, parent satisfaction with the school, and support staff satisfaction.

The concept of 'fit' as a measure of effectiveness has also attracted other scholars. Duke and Iwanicki (1992) discuss the concept of effectiveness with the notion of fit. They define fit as: "the extent to which a leader is perceived to be appropriately matched to a given context" (p. 26). They describe it as a function of expectations. Therefore, if a person is able to meet the expectations that he or she fits with the context, he can be said to be effective. However, this concept of fit as an indicator of effectiveness has its limitation. Firstly, fit is a complex construct. It has various dimensions that has to be taken into account. For example, if a school is weak due to the actions by the school board, does it mean that the principal is ineffective because he or she does not fit with the board's expectations although he or she is supported by the teachers and parents? Secondly, it is difficult to determine the fit because it connotes a degree. For instance, if a principal is very friendly to his or her staff and faculty, and that makes it very difficult for him or her to deal with them on issues related to personal problems, can we say that this principal does not fit?

In determining effectiveness, various factors come into play, such as the person and the situation. Personal factors include traits and characteristics, such as the intelligence, aptitudes, knowledge, preferences, expectations and
temperament that make the principal effective. Situation include the organization, the subordinates, superiors, parents and other constituents. Campbell et al. (1970) noted that there are three determiners of managerial effectiveness: (1) ability, (2) motivation, and (3) opportunity. Individual abilities include: intelligence, skills, knowledge, interest and temperament. The manager is expected to maintain a certain job behavior that is determined by organizational objectives and outcomes. According to them, a manager’s effective behavior is the function of: (a) complex interactions between individual or personal characteristics; (b) the demands and expectations placed upon the persons by the physical, administrative, and social environments of their organizations; and (c) the nature of the feedback, incentive, and reward systems developed by organizational policies and practices.

The second determiner, motivation, includes not only individual incentives such as money or security, but also the temperamental and preference predispositions to stay with the job and to exert effort in performing it. The third determiner, opportunity, refers to factors related to the situation and organization that may influence the managerial process: These factors include organizational climate, network, influence, power and authority. In discussing the three determiners, the authors added that all three determiners must be considered concurrently. Additionally, the moderating influences and effects of different organizational environments must also be included. Therefore, in perceiving a manager’s effectiveness, the varieties or combinations of organizational circumstances,
personal characteristics and behavior patterns of the person should be factored into the equation.

The Definition of Effectiveness

In the context of this study, effectiveness covers the elements of traits, behaviors, outcomes, and compliance. Principals in Malaysia have to have the qualities of leaders. They are expected to be the catalysts and agents of change, especially since the implementation of the ISSC. They have to have vision and be the optimizer of resources. They need to have goals that are clearly communicated to the teachers, staff and students. To achieve this they require the help, support and cooperation of teachers, students and the community. Therefore, they have to have good relationships with all of them. As managers, they have to comply with the rules and procedures that have been determined by the authorities. To do that they have to understand the contents of the rules and procedures. These rules and procedures do not only refer to the school and office management, but also to instruction. As such, principals are expected to understand the curriculum and help teachers implement it. This expectation requires them to supervise teachers, provide staff development, and marshall resources while complying to the requirements stated in the roles, functions and responsibilities of principals. Therefore, in this study, principal effectiveness is defined as the extent to which a principal: (a) has the traits and behavior that are in tangent with the expectations of a leader, and (b) is able to comply to the
requirements stated by authorities while executing his roles, functions and responsibilities as a principal.
CHAPTER IV

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study had two main objectives. Firstly, it investigated whether there is a difference in secondary school teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s effectiveness between graduate and non-graduate teachers in seven dimensions namely: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) students relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development. The second objective of the study was to find out if there was any difference in perception on principal effectiveness between teachers with less teaching experience (juniors) and teachers with more teaching experience (seniors) based on the seven dimensions of principal effectiveness.

The main aspects of this chapter are: (a) the research design, (b) population and sample, (c) research instruments and data collection, and (d) data analysis.

Research Design

A survey method was used for data collection. For the purpose of this
study, a cross-sectional survey was utilized. In this type of survey, a sample is drawn from a predetermined population. Furthermore, the information is collected at one point of time although the time taken to collect all the desired data may take from a day to few weeks or months (Babbie, 1990; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). There are several advantages of using a survey. This method has been proven to be useful for measuring opinions, attitudes and behavior (Fox & Tracy, 1986). It is also the most commonly used technique of data collection (Fink & Kosecoff, 1985). The design of the study included survey of opinions through self-administered questionnaires and interviews.

Population and Sample

The population of this study consists of secondary school teachers in three districts, namely: Johore Bahru, Kulai, and Pontian in the State of Johore, Malaysia. As of January 1994 (Ministry of Education, 1994), 32 grade A and 17 grade B secondary schools are located in these three districts with 3,190 teachers serving these schools. However, out of this number only grade B school teachers from the schools that do not have hostels will be used as the population. There are a total of 15 schools that will be involved in this study because among these grade B schools, two schools have students hostels. There are 604 teachers teaching in these schools and all of them are used as the population of the study. The reasons for limiting the population to these two criteria are:

1. Principals in grade A and B schools have different degrees of
responsibilities. Grade A school principals are more senior and have more experience as principals. Grade A schools include normal secondary schools, normal secondary schools with hostels, vocational schools, and fully residential schools. These schools also include premier schools and fully residential schools which are more developed in terms of facilities. Grade A school generally have larger numbers of students and teachers. Therefore, there is a greater variation among the grade A schools in terms of their structure, and responsibilities and problems for their principals. Grade B school principals are mostly juniors and less experience compared to grade A school principals. The grade B schools consist only of normal schools and some vocational schools. These schools have smaller numbers of students compared to most grade A schools. The range of the number of students among grade B schools is small compared to grade A schools. Therefore, there is a smaller variation among the grade B schools in terms of their structure, and responsibilities and problems for their principals.

2. Grade A schools have classes from lower secondary to upper secondary. Lower secondary classes are taught mostly by graduate and non-graduate teachers while upper secondary classes are taught by graduate teachers only. The ratio of graduate and non-graduate teachers in this schools is about 60:40. In grade B schools the ratio of graduate and non-graduate teachers is about 45:55 (Johore State Department of Education, 1994). Since one of the objectives of this study is to determine whether there is a difference in perception between graduate and non-graduate teachers, the ratio of teachers in these two categories
teaching in grade B schools is more appropriate because the distribution is almost equal.

3. There are two grade B schools that have hostels in the three districts; one is a vocational school and the other a normal school with hostels. Principals whose schools have hostels will have additional roles and responsibilities that are unique as they deal especially with students and parents. For example, principals' problems that ensue from the hostels system are not being felt by colleagues in schools without hostels. This form of problem may influence teachers' perceptions of their principals' effectiveness which might be different if there were no hostel in the schools concerned.

The three districts were purposely chosen for this study for the following reasons:

1. The three districts represent different demographic and economic distribution. Johore Bahru is the capital of the State of Johore. It is about one and half miles across to Singapore. The city's economic activities are mainly commerce and industries such as car assembly, chemical-based industries, and ship construction and repair. Kulai is about twenty miles from Johore Bahru and it is a town that has smaller industries such as electronic and agricultural-based industries, and also agriculture. Pontian is about forty miles from Johore Bahru and its main economic activities are agriculture and fishing. From this description we can divide the districts into three categories: urban (Johore Bahru), semi-urban (Kulai), and rural (Pontian).
2. These districts have a good transportation network. This was important to the researcher because of the time constraints. It was faster and more efficient for the researcher to travel and administer the questionnaires. Although postal service is available, it is not dependable in terms of the speed of delivery. The researcher drove to schools for administering and collecting the questionnaires, and also to conduct the interviews.

3. The researcher is familiar with the locations of the schools and the road system in these three districts. This is important in terms of a strategic plan for the administration of the questionnaires. It is more important for the interviews that were conducted since it involves a total of 15 interviews that had to be completed in a limited time of about six weeks.

All trained teachers who had been teaching not less than one year were included as sample for this study. This is because there were temporary teachers who were not trained teaching in some of these schools. These teachers did not know some of the items which were asked, especially in regard to rules and regulations as they were not trained. Trained teachers are exposed to rules and regulations pertaining to their service. Therefore, although there were temporary teachers who had been teaching in the schools for more than a year, they were not included as part of the sample. There were also trained teachers who had just graduated from the universities and teacher training colleges and had been posted to these schools ranging from two months to eight months. These teachers may not have been able to assess principals as they were new to the schools. One
year was used as the basis for experience based on the Malaysian teaching service rule which specified that teachers can only be confirmed in their job after they have completed one year of teaching.

One teacher from each school was randomly chosen to be interviewed. The researcher informed the principal of the name of the teacher to be interviewed and arrangements were made to meet the teacher. The purpose of the meeting was to explain the purpose of the interview, the format of the interview, and receive his or her permission to be interviewed. Once the candidate agreed to be interviewed, the time and place of the interview was arranged. One teacher who had been selected declined to be interviewed because he was one of the senior assistants in the school and worked closely with the principal. He was afraid that he might give a biased opinion and would not be able to give fair answers. To replace him, another random selection of teachers without him was conducted. The newly selected teacher willingly agreed to participate in the interview. The interviewees were chosen from those who had answered the questionnaire so that the findings from the questionnaire could be strengthened through the interviews and better data and information gathered (Madey, 1982; Kidder & Fine, 1987).

Demographic Data on Respondents

**Questionnaire**

A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed to the potential respondents
and 449 (89.8%) were returned. Out of this number only 425 (94.6%) of the returned questionnaires could be used. There were 151 graduates and 274 non-graduates. There were 225 juniors and 200 seniors. Table 1 shows the demographic data about the respondents.

Table 1

Demographic Data on Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience (years)</td>
<td>1 - 33</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching in this school</td>
<td>1 - 28</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching under this principal</td>
<td>1 - 16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years knowing the principal</td>
<td>1 - 24</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 425 respondents, 78 wrote comments on the space provided in the questionnaire. Twenty-six of them were graduates with the rest (52) non-graduates. There were 35 juniors and 43 seniors among those who wrote comments. The demographic data on the 78 respondents is shown in Table 2.

Interview

A total of 15 teachers were interviewed of which 4 were graduates and 11 non-graduates. Out of this total, 2 were juniors and 13 seniors. The demographic data about the 15 teachers interviewed is depicted in Table 3.
Table 2

Demographic Data on Respondents Who Wrote Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience (years)</td>
<td>1 - 32</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching in this school</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching under this principal</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years knowing the principal</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Demographic Data on Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>7 - 29</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching in this school</td>
<td>2 - 16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching under this principal</td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years knowing the principal</td>
<td>2 - 14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Instruments and Data Collection

Questionnaires and interviews were used as instruments for collecting the data. The researcher developed the questionnaire by conducting a literature
review. Interviews were used to get an indepth view of the sample perceptions of principal effectiveness based on the dimensions that were used in the study. Interviews helped to enhance, supplement, illustrate and clarify results from the questionnaires (Greene & McClintock, 1985). Interview protocol was constructed by the researcher as a guide for interviewing selected teachers. Therefore, the triangulation method was applied since this method allowed the researcher to be more confident in the results (Jick, 1979). It also added breadth and depth to any investigation (Flick, 1992). Both quantitative and qualitative methods have been used by investigators studying the issue of administrator's influence partly because of the growing concerns about the shortcomings of quantitative methods in depicting organizational dynamics (Van Maanen, cited in Pitner, 1988). Brewer and Hunter (1989) also promote the use of the multimethods approach because it reduces the research weaknesses and complements strengths. Moreover, a combination of quantitative and qualitative data can provide more information regarding a phenomena than either one of them alone (Langebach, Vaughn & Aagaard, 1994).

Development of the Questionnaire

Questionnaire

In developing the questionnaire, the researcher reviewed the literature on principal effectiveness, and particularly studies that been conducted on the
subject. From this review the researcher identified fourteen dimensions of principal effectiveness for study which might prove to be applicable to Malaysia. The fourteen dimensions were: (1) school direction, (2) community relations, (3) government networking, (4) organizational conduct, (5) teacher relations, (6) staff relations, (7) student relations, (8) organizational procedures, (9) leadership, (10) instructional advancement, (11) curriculum improvement, (12) school climate, (13) communication, and (14) office management. To ensure that the fourteen dimensions were relevant in the context of Malaysia, the researcher conducted an exploratory survey to get opinions and suggestions from officers in the Ministry of Education, especially from the Educational Planning and Research Division (EPRD) and Institut Aminuddin Baki (IAB). The officers were sent questionnaires that describe the fourteen dimensions. They were asked to rank them in terms of priority in the context of the Malaysian situation. They were also asked to provide comments and suggestions. Ten questionnaires were mailed to officers in EPRD and IAB. Seven were returned. From this survey it was determined that the dimensions that were important in terms of priority were: (1) leadership, (2) school direction, (3) teacher relations, (4) staff relations, (5) students relations, (6) organizational conducts, (7) organizational procedures, (8) governmental networking, (9) community relations, (10) instructional advancement, (11) school climate, (12) communication, (13) office management, and (14) curriculum improvement. After analyzing the data and comments, the researcher consulted one officer from EPRD and one officer from IAB to get their expert opinions.
over the phone. Based on the results of the survey, and written and verbal comments, the researcher decided to employ only seven dimensions. The seven dimensions were: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) students relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development. Based on these seven dimensions, the researcher constructed the item statements that reflect the dimensions that were studied. The sources and authors referred to in constructing the item statements are as shown in Appendix B. After constructing the draft questionnaires, the researcher sent twenty questionnaires to Malaysia in April 1994 for the purpose of exploring the response and to get comments from teachers and principals, especially with regard to the contents and terms used in the item statements. One principal and ten teachers completed the questionnaires. The principal that responded happened to visit Kalamazoo in early May 1994, so the researcher used the opportunity to discuss thoroughly with him the item statements in the questionnaires. Some items were deleted and terms changed to reflect the situation in Malaysia at that time.

After the corrections were made, 15 sample questionnaires were sent back to Malaysia in the middle of May 1994 to a panel of experts. One was sent to a lecturer at the Faculty of Education, University of Malaya, seven to officers at the Institut Aminuddin Baki which is responsible for providing in-service courses to government school principals in Malaysia, and seven to officers in the Educational
Planning and Research Division (EPRD), Ministry of Education Malaysia. The questionnaires were written both in Malay language and English. There were two purposes for sending the questionnaires. Firstly, the respondents were asked to check on the contents of the questionnaire and to gather their expert reviews on the questionnaire. This was to insure clarity and appropriateness to establish content validity. Secondly, it was to get comments from the respondents about the translation and terms used. This was to ensure that the translation and the terms used were correct.

The researcher received responses from the lecturer at the Faculty of Education, University of Malaya, four from EPRD and four from Institut Aminuddin Baki. In the middle of June, 1994, the head of one of the teacher training colleges visited his daughter at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan. He holds a doctorate in education from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and is a former officer in EPRD. He was formerly an officer in the Johore State Education Office and the School Division, Ministry of Education Malaysia. He was also a former principal in one of the secondary schools in Pontian. The researcher used this opportunity to get his expert view on the questionnaires. The researcher thoroughly discussed the questionnaire with him. The researcher also found one former secondary teacher at East Lansing, Michigan, and two former secondary teachers at Madison, Wisconsin, who had followed their husbands studying at Michigan State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison respectively. Draft questionnaires were sent to them and
arrangements was made so that the researcher could collect the questionnaires personally because he wanted to get their comments orally and to interview them in order to pilot test the interview protocol. From the interviews, the researcher found that it would be better for him to provide the interviewees with the interview protocol so that they could concentrate their answers on the questions asked. It was also found that it took from 45 minutes to about one hour to complete an interview.

The questionnaire consisted of three parts. In Part I, there were 90 statements that asked the respondents to respond on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = least effective, 2 = less effective, 3 = moderately effective, 4 = effective, and 5 = very effective) (Appendix C). The measure of effectiveness was based on the seven dimensions: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) students relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development. Each dimension had a number of items in the form of statements that elaborated on the dimension. The number of item statements for each dimensions are as follows: (1) leadership (15 items), (2) school rules and procedures (12 items), (3) school learning climate 12 items), (4) teacher/staff relations and development (13 items), (5) students relations and development (15 items), (6) school-community relations (12 items), and (7) instructional supervision and development (11 items).

Part II of the instrument consisted of demographic questions of which the
items included: category of teacher - graduate or non-graduate, years of teaching, years of teaching in the school, years of working under the principal, and years of knowing the principal. Part III provided space for comments by the respondents regarding the principal effectiveness (Appendix C).

The researcher decided to use the questionnaire for the following reasons:

1. The use of the questionnaire enabled the researcher to include a larger number of subjects (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990; Borg & Gall, 1989).

2. The use of the questionnaire guaranteed confidentiality. This may well have elicited more truthful responses from the respondents. They were free to respond to unpopular or sensitive subjects because these points could not be used against them later (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990).

3. The use of the questionnaire as a tool for data collection was said to be efficient in that it requires less time and money (Borg & Gall, 1989).

**Interview Protocol**

In this study, interviews were also utilized to gather information about the seven dimensions that were studied. Semi-structured interviews were used. An interview protocol was prepared that consisted of open-ended questions (Appendix D). The open-ended questions were used to gather more indepth and complex information, especially as it related to respondents’ perceptions on the specific dimensions of principal effectiveness. The use of open-ended questions allowed a free response from subjects that was based on their own frame of

Interviews were used as one of the methods of data collection for the following reasons:

1. It could be used with greater confidence (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993).
2. Specific questions could be repeated or items that were unclear could be explained (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993).
3. Follow-up questions could be asked for additional information when the response seemed incomplete or not entirely relevant (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990), and particular questions of special interest or value could be pursued in depth (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993).
4. Personal contact increased the likelihood that the individual respondents would participate and provide the desired information (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990).

Pilot Testing the Instruments

Questionnaire

The questionnaires were pilot tested in three schools that are located in urban, semi-urban and rural areas. A total of 80 questionnaires were distributed to randomly selected teachers in each school. Sixty-five questionnaires were returned. However, only 59 completed questionnaires were useable. The rest could not be used because of incomplete information and skipped items.
The data from the pilot study showed that the range of teaching experience was from 2 to 31 years. Since one of the objectives of the study was to determine if there were any differences in perception between junior and senior teachers, the range of years of teaching experience was divided into two. The juniors were those who had been teaching between two and ten years while the seniors were those that have been teaching more than ten years. The ten years cut-off point used was based on the Ministry of Education, Malaysia, service procedures that determine the years teachers were eligible to be promoted to become master teachers in Malaysia. The demographic data of the pilot study respondents is shown in Table 4.

A reliability test was conducted on the pilot questionnaire by using Cronbach alpha in the SPSS program. The results of the reliability test shows that the alpha value for principal effectiveness construct is 0.99. Alpha values for the seven dimensions of the construct are shown in Table 5.

Table 4
Demographic Data on Pilot Study Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 31</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 24</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 29</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Cronbach Alpha Values for Seven Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Dimension</th>
<th>Alpha Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School rules and procedures</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School learning climate</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/staff relations and development</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students relations and development</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-community relations</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional supervision and development</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Protocol

The interview protocol was pilot-tested by using one former secondary teacher who followed her husband studying at the Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan and two former secondary school teachers who also followed their husbands that studied at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. All of them were graduate teachers whose teaching experience had ranged from three to seven years. Information about them was gathered from the Malaysian Students Department in Chicago. From this pilot interview, the researcher learned that it would be difficult and time consuming if the interviewees were not given some...
written guidelines for them to refer to as the interview progressed. Based on this experience, the researcher constructed the interview protocol that was also used by the interviewees as reference.

Data Collection and Processing

The description of data collection is based on the instruments that were used, namely questionnaires and interviews.

Questionnaire

Before any data collection could be conducted the researcher sent an application to conduct his study to the Educational Planning and Research Division (EPRD), Ministry of Education Malaysia. This division is responsible for reviewing applications to conduct research that involves schools and colleges under the Ministry of Education. Once he obtained the approval from EPRD, the researcher sent another application for permission to conduct his study to the Johore State Department of Education with the copy of letter of approval from EPRD. With the approval to conduct the study acquired from the department, the researcher sent letters to the fifteen principals of the schools that are in the sample informing them about the date that the researcher intended to meet them or their assistants to explain and discuss with them the process of collecting the data. These letters were followed by phone calls to confirm with them the date and time that the researcher could meet with them.
During the meeting with each of the principals, the senior assistant was available to discuss the mode and process of data collection. Since time was a constraint in the data collection, the administration of the questionnaires had to be given to the assistant principals, although the researcher have preferred to do it himself so that any questions that might be asked by potential respondents could be answered clearly. The assistant principals were asked to administer the questionnaires. The respondents were asked to put the completed questionnaires in the envelopes provided. The envelopes had the name and address of the researcher, and a brief title of the study. The respondents were asked to seal the envelopes and return them to the school office for collection. During this meeting the researcher obtained the names of the teachers that were to be respondents for the questionnaires. From this list, a teacher was randomly selected to be interviewed. The researcher visited each school after one week from his first visit to collect the returned questionnaires.

Once the potential interviewee was identified, the researcher asked the permission of the principal to meet the teacher to explain to him or her the purpose of the interview, the mode and process of the interview, and to get his or her approval to be interviewed. Out of the fifteen potential teachers to be interviewed, fourteen agreed. One teacher did not agree to be interviewed because he felt that he might be biased in giving his opinions and answers since he was a senior assistant and worked closely with the principal. In this case, another random selection was conducted and a new teacher was selected and agreed to be
interviewed. Once the approval for the interviews were obtained, the researcher made arrangements with them with regard to the time and place of interview. Fourteen teachers were interviewed during school hours while one teacher was able to be interviewed only during the weekend and at night.

Interviews

The researcher conducted the interviews on the dates and times that were mutually agreed upon with the potential interviewees. The researcher explained to the interviewees the method of the interview and asked their permission to record the interview by using an audio tape recorder. He explained to them that the recording was important because he did not want to miss important information that transpired from the interviews. He also explained to the interviewees that the recording would be transcribed and number codes would only be used for the purpose of reference. After the transcriptions were completed, the recording would be deleted completely. Therefore, confidentiality was assured.

In order to get the full cooperation and good responses from the interviewees, the researcher instructed them that all information provided by them would be treated as confidential. They were assured that no reference to them was made during or after the study.

Data Analysis

The items in the questionnaire were grouped into seven dimensions. The
null hypotheses for this study was that there is no difference in mean scores for perception between: (1) graduate and non-graduate teachers, and 2) juniors and seniors in each of the seven dimensions of principal effectiveness that are the focus of this study. The alpha level was set at .05 in order to reject or retain the null hypotheses. SPSS program was used to analyze the data gathered through the questionnaires.

Data From the Questionnaire

Purpose of Using Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used in this study to classify and summarize the data collected from questionnaires (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988). It was also used to describe the data that had been collected (Borg & Gall, 1989). Frequency, mean, range and standard deviation were used in explaining the characteristics of the sample in the study. Frequency was also used to analyze the comments that were received through the questionnaires. It was used to indicate the number of responses from each element that were derived from the comments that could be fitted into each of the seven dimensions based on whether it represented effective or less effective element.

Purpose of Using One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to measure the
differences between mean scores on principal effectiveness between the groups to be compared namely: graduates and non-graduates; and junior and senior respondents for the principal effectiveness in each of the seven dimensions that formed the constructs. The purpose of using ANOVA was to determine whether the observed differences in the results of the study from the questionnaires could be reasonably attributed to chance or whether there was reason to suspect that there existed a true difference between the two groups that were studied (Norusis, 1990). The one-way ANOVA was used because it is fairly robust to violation of the assumptions of normal distribution of the groups involved in the comparison and the equal variances on the dependent variable (Diekhoff, 1992). This statistic was also used to test the hypothesis that there is a difference in perception of principal effectiveness between graduate and non-graduate respondents, and between junior and senior respondents. The alpha level was set at .05 in order to accept or reject the null hypothesis.

**Information From the Interviews**

Data collected through qualitative methods had to be reduced to ideas, themes or meanings that could be managed so that conclusions could be derived (Miles and Huberman, 1994). According to them, there are thirteen tactics to draw meanings that can help in drawing and verifying conclusions: (1) noting patterns, themes; (2) seeing plausibility; (3) clustering; (4) making metaphors; (5) counting; (6) making contrasts/comparisons; (7) partitioning variables; (8)
subsuming particulars into the general; (9) factoring; (10) noting relations between variables; (11) finding intervening variables; (12) building a logical chain of evidence; and (13) making conceptual/theoretical coherence.

Data and information from the interview were used to supplement the findings from the questionnaires. The interviews with the teachers were audio tape-recorded and transcribed by the researcher. The transcripts were then grouped according to the interviewees demographic data: (a) graduates and non-graduates, and (b) juniors and seniors. In treating the information gathered by the interview, the researcher decided to follow two of the tactics recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994) to draw meanings and make conclusions. The two tactics were noting themes and clustering. Themes from the interview were noted and then clustered according to the seven dimensions. Anecdotes were also used to highlight findings from the interviews.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

In this chapter the data and information gathered through questionnaires and interviews is presented and interpreted. They are presented in two parts: (1) differences in perceptions between graduate and non-graduate teachers, and (2) differences in perceptions between junior and senior teachers. The first and the second parts are further divided into seven sections based on the seven dimensions of principal effectiveness which are the focus of this study. For each section, data and information is provided based on the two components for each part (one and two), that is, graduate and non-graduate teachers for part one and senior and junior teachers for part two. For each of the seven sections, the results from the questionnaires are presented first, followed by comments written by some of the respondents, and ending with information from the interviews.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out if there was any differences in perceptions of principal effectiveness among two groups of secondary teachers: graduate and non-graduate, and juniors and seniors in seven dimensions namely:
(1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) student relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development. The data on years of teaching experience showed that the respondents had been teaching between one and thirty-three years. To get the two groups of senior and junior teachers, the range was divided into two with the cut-off point of ten years. Junior teachers were those who had teaching experience of ten years and less, while the senior teachers were those who had been teaching more than ten years. Ten years was used as the cut-off point based on the criteria used by the Ministry of Education Malaysia in determining teachers who are qualified to be promoted to be master teachers.

Reliability Check

The principal effectiveness questionnaire that was used as one of the survey instruments for this study was comprised of 90 items that were divided into seven dimensions: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) student relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instructional supervision and development. Each dimension has a number of items that describe it. The number of items is indicated in the parenthesis for each dimension: leadership (15: item 1-15), school rules and procedures (12: item 16-27), school learning climate (12: item 28-39), teacher/staff relations and development (13: item
40 - 52), students relations and development (15: item 53 - 67), school-community relations (12: item 68 - 79); and instructional supervision and development (11: item 80 - 90).

Reliability is important in that it ensures that the instrument used was able to produce the same results in measuring the same thing each time it was used (Worthen, Borg & White, 1993). In this study, Cronbach's alpha-coefficient ($\alpha$) was used as a reliability indicator in testing the analysis for all the scales. The alpha value for all the scales was 0.99.

Table 6 shows the alpha values for all scales used. As can be seen from this table, all dimensions had alpha values above 0.9. The dimension with the highest alpha value was teacher/staff relations and development ($\alpha = 0.96$), the lowest being school learning climate ($\alpha = 0.93$). This shows that the scales used in this study had very high reliability indexes.

Differences in Perceptions Between Graduate and Non-Graduate Teachers

In this study, the operational hypothesis states that there is a difference in perceptions on principal effectiveness between graduate and non-graduate teachers in each of the seven dimensions while the null hypothesis states that there is no difference in perceptions on principal effectiveness among the two groups in each of the seven dimensions studied.
### Table 6

Summary of Reliability for Each Scale Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Dimension</th>
<th>Alpha Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School rules and procedures</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School learning climate</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/staff relations and development</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students relations and development</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-community relations</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional supervision and development</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results From the Questionnaires

1. **Leadership**

The leadership dimension consisted of 15 items that describe it. As a result of the use of the ANOVA (Table 7), there was no evidence that there is a difference between the graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of leadership dimension. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean scores between the two groups. If the null hypothesis was true, the probability that the difference between the graduate sample mean in their perceptions of leadership (Mean = 3.99, S.D = .79) and the non-graduate sample mean in their
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > 0.05

perceptions of leadership (Mean = 4.10, S.D = .76) would be lower than the alpha level. However, in the present data, the obtained alpha level was 0.18 which was larger than the chosen alpha of 0.05. Consequently, no conclusion could be drawn about the difference.

Information From the Comments

Comments written by the graduate respondents that contained elements of principal effectiveness in the dimension of leadership were as follows: responsible (4 responses); manages through consultation (2 responses); resourceful (1 response); considerate (2 responses); rational (1 response); tolerable (1 response); honest in work (1 response); possesses high moral values (1 response); ideal as a model (1 response); fair (1 response); always provides leadership to all teachers (1 response); adaptable to various social situations (1 response); considers himself
equal with others (1 response); the principal action is effective (1 response). Two elements that indicated the principals to be less effective were derived from the comments from the graduate teachers: did not practice participative culture in making decision regarding school and teachers (1 response), and lacks skill in managing meetings (1 response).

Non-graduate respondents also provided comments that were classified into the dimension of leadership that both indicated effective and less effective elements. The effective elements included: visionary (2 responses); firm in carrying out responsibilities (1 response); humanitarian (1 response); fair in handling teachers/staff problems (2 responses); has initiative to beautify the school (1 response); dedicated (1 response); always tries to improve the school's performance in academic and co-curricular (2 responses); always gives new ideas (1 response); good school management (1 response); outspoken (1 response); able to bring change (1 response); farsighted (1 response); considerate (1 response); an exemplar principal (1 response); good personality (5 responses); has an open mind (3 responses); flexible to teachers (1 response); very concerned about his role (1 response); tolerable (1 response); a responsible person (1 response); rational (1 response); sincere (1 response); good-hearted (1 response); and dependable (1 response). The non-graduate respondents also provided comments that indicated the less effective elements in this dimension. These included: less attention to school (1 response); not functional in developing the school situation towards better achievement in mental and physical (1 response); too dictative (1
response); not convincing in solving problems (1 response); likes to decide the outcome of something in a meeting (1 response); lacks decision making (1 response); does not practice consultation (1 response); lacks sensitivity on the impact of the decision made (1 response); and not firm in his stand and decision on a matter (1 response).

Both graduate and non-graduate respondents provided comments that indicated elements that were effective and less effective. However, more non-graduate respondents wrote the comments compared to the graduate respondents. Although some of the comments from both groups that indicated effectiveness were similar, such as tolerable, considerate and fair, the non-graduate respondents mentioned other elements that indicated effectiveness, such as farsighted, provides new ideas, and sincere. As for the less effective elements, only two comments were derived from the graduate respondents while there were nine comments that came from the non-graduate respondents.

2. School Rules and Procedures

The second dimension that was studied was rules and procedures. There were 12 items that described this dimension. As a result of the use of the ANOVA (Table 8), there was no evidence that there is a difference between graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of rules and procedures dimension. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean scores between the two groups. If the null hypothesis was true, the probability that the
Table 8

Difference in Mean Scores for Perceptions on the School Rules and Procedures Dimension Between Graduates and Non-Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>0.21 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > 0.05

The difference between the graduate sample mean in the perception of rules and procedures (Mean = 4.17, S.D = .73) and the non-graduate sample mean in the perception of rules and procedures (Mean = 4.07, S.D = .71) would be lower than the alpha level. However, in the present data, the obtained alpha level was 0.21 which was larger than the chosen alpha of 0.05. Consequently, no conclusion could be drawn about the difference.

Information From the Comments

The graduate respondents did not write any comments that could be classified in this dimension for both the effective and less effective elements. One non-graduate teacher wrote that the principal showed skill in using money resources. None of the non-graduate respondents wrote any comments that indicated less effective elements in the dimension of school rules and procedures.
3. School Learning Climate

This dimension had 12 items to describe it. As a result of the use of the ANOVA (Table 9), there was no evidence that there was a difference between graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of school learning dimension. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean scores between the two groups. If the null hypothesis was true, the probability that the difference between the graduate sample mean in the perceptions of school learning climate (Mean = 4.09, S.D = .69) and the non-graduate sample mean in the perceptions of school learning climate (Mean = 4.14, S.D = .74) would be lower than the alpha level. However, in the present data, the obtained alpha level was 0.47 which was larger than the chosen alpha of 0.05. Consequently, no conclusion could be drawn about the difference.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>0.47 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > 0.05
The graduate respondents wrote comments related to the dimension of school learning climate. There were two elements of effectiveness in this dimension that were drawn from the comments given by the graduate respondents: can keep disciplinary problems to a minimum (1 response), and always plans the facilities and welfare for teachers, supporting staff, and students (1 response). There were also two less effective elements that were derived from the comments: discipline deteriorates because not firm (1 response), and does not emphasize students' discipline (1 response).

Non-graduate respondents also provided comments that were classified into the elements of effectiveness. The comments included: takes great concern on discipline (1 response); puts priority on the internal and external peacefulness of the classroom (1 response); ensures that the daily functioning of the school goes without disruption (1 response); puts efforts into creating a pleasing environment for teaching and learning (1 response). None of them wrote comments about this dimension that could be categorized as less effective.

Both graduate and non-graduate respondents provided comments that were categorized into effectiveness, such as maintaining discipline. However, more comments came from the non-graduate respondents and none of them wrote comments that could be classified as less effective.
4. Teacher/Staff Relations and Development

The teacher/staff relations and development dimension consisted of 13 items. As a result of the use of the ANOVA (Table 10), there was no evidence that there was a difference between graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of principal effectiveness on the school teacher/staff relations and development dimension. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean scores between the two groups. If the null hypothesis was true, the probability that the difference between the graduate sample mean in the perceptions of teacher/staff relations and development (Mean = 3.85, S.D = .83) and the non-graduate sample mean in the perceptions of teacher/staff relations and development (Mean = 3.96, S.D = .89) would be lower than the alpha level. However, in the present data, the obtained alpha level was 0.19 which was larger than the chosen alpha of 0.05. Consequently, no conclusion could be drawn about the difference.

Information From the Comments

Elements of effectiveness in the dimension of teacher/staff relationship and development that were derived from the comments given by the graduate respondents were: always provides opportunities for teachers and staff to express their problems (1 response); problems solved amicably (1 response); teachers can have discussion with principal (1 response); with this principal, we did not feel stressed.
Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>0.19 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > 0.05

out (1 response); approachable (1 response); willing to listen to the teachers' problems (2 responses); gives advice (1 response); fair to all teachers (1 response); respects teachers as adults (1 response); trusts teachers/staff in doing their jobs (2 responses); likes to listen to teachers' opinions and views (1 response); flexible towards teachers (1 response); does not like to push subordinates to do their jobs (1 response); always tries to know staff better (1 response); and did not distance himself from teachers and staff (1 response).

There were also characteristics that indicated the principals as being less effective in this dimension from the comments. They included: does not provide financial support for teachers professional development (1 response); less sensitive to teachers with problems (1 response); not fair in giving jobs to teachers/staff (2 responses); lacks cordial relations with teachers/staff (2 responses); does not respect teachers opinions (1 response); unable to interact sincerely and honestly.
with the staff (1 response); fails to understand teachers/staff problems (1 response); not sensitive to teachers' welfare (1 response); and lacks human relations (1 response).

Non-graduate respondents also provided comments that were categorized into the dimension of teacher/staff relations and development. The characteristics of effectiveness in this dimension were: always likes to solve teachers' problems (1 response); always responds reasonably to reasonable monetary requests for buying teaching aids (1 response); respects teachers (2 responses); considerate to teachers/subordinates (3 responses); often discusses with teachers (2 responses); encourages teachers to express constructive ideas (1 response); respects others' views (1 response); always makes himself free to help others (1 response); flexible with his subordinate (2 responses); very concerned about the staff and teachers' welfare and problems (4 responses); interacts with teachers to know the latest development in terms of discipline or academic (1 response); accepts teachers' views and make judgement for further actions (1 response); in dealing with staff, he always likes to give them freedom psychologically to ensure that academic performance is improved effectively (1 response); strengthens the relationship between teachers and non-academic staff by having family day through sports and annual dinner (2 responses); ready to listen to other people's view (1 response); relationship with teachers/staff is very good (3 responses); easy to mix around with teachers and staff (1 response); able to provide guidance (1 response); and never has personal grudge towards any of his staff (1 response).
Elements indicating the principals as being less effective were also derived from the comments by the non-graduate respondents. These included: has few personal interactions with teachers and other staff to know their problems (1 response); not concerned about the problems faced by teachers in terms of physical, mental, emotional and intellect (1 response); lacks human relations skill (2 responses); did not support teachers’ professional development (1 response); used power to pressure teachers/staff (1 response); not sensitive to teachers’ needs and problems (2 responses); lacks responsibility (1 response); lacks self-discipline (1 response); lacks credibility when making decisions (1 response); not fair to all teachers in doing the time table for them (1 response); teachers’ mistakes were not kept confidential (1 response); spied on teachers’ mistakes (1 response); perceived bad feelings towards other staff; (1 response); and practiced favoritism (1 response).

Both the graduate and non-graduate respondents wrote comments that denoted effective and less effective elements in the teacher/staff relations and development dimension. From the comments written by the graduate respondents, 15 elements were derived that indicated the principals as being effective and nine elements that indicated them as being less effective. As for the non-graduate respondents, 18 elements indicated the principals as effective and 14 elements indicated them as less effective. Elements of effectiveness that had been mentioned by both groups included: flexible and discusses with teachers. Elements that were mentioned by the non-graduates and not by the graduates as
less effective included: not keeping teachers' mistakes confidential. Less effective elements mentioned by the two groups included: lack of human relations skills and not fair in giving work.

5. Student Relations and Development

Students relations and development was another dimension that was the focus of the principal effectiveness construct. This dimension consisted of 15 items. As a result of the use of the ANOVA (Table 11), there was no evidence that there was a difference between graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of student relations and development dimension. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean scores between the two groups. If the null hypothesis is true, the probability that the difference between the graduate sample mean in the perceptions of student relations and development (Mean = 4.10, S.D = .71) and the non-graduate sample mean in the perceptions of school student relations and development (Mean = 4.12, S.D = .79) would be lower than the alpha level. However, in the present data, the obtained alpha level was 0.72 which was larger than the chosen alpha of 0.05. Consequently, no conclusion could be drawn about the difference.

Information From the Comments

There was only one element of effectiveness that was derived from the comments given by the graduate respondents which could be classified in the
Table 11

Difference in Mean Score for Perceptions on the Student Relations and Development Dimension Between Graduates and Non-Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>0.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > 0.05

dimension of student relations and development and none that indicated the principals as being less effective. The component was: always provides opportunities for students to express their problems (1 response).

Comments from the non-graduate respondents also revealed only effective elements in this dimension. These included: takes great care of students academic matters (2 responses); very concerned about students' welfare and problems (3 responses); involves all students in curriculum and co-curriculum (1 response); and loving and charitable to students (1 response).

Both graduate and non-graduate respondents provided comments that were classified only into the elements of effectiveness. There was only one element of effectiveness that was derived from the graduate respondents' comments while there were four from the non-graduate respondents.
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6. School-Community Relations

The sixth dimension that was part of the principal effectiveness construct in this study was school-community relations. There were 12 items in this dimension. As a result of the use of the ANOVA (Table 12), there was no evidence that there was a difference between graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of school-community relations dimension. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean scores between the two groups. If the null hypothesis was true, the probability that the difference between the graduate sample mean in the perceptions of school-community relations (Mean = 4.06, S.D = .74) and the non-graduate sample mean in the perceptions of school-community relations (Mean = 4.12, S.D = .75) would be lower than the alpha level. However, in the present data, the obtained alpha level was 0.37 which was larger than the chosen alpha of 0.05. Consequently, no conclusion could be drawn about the difference.

Information From the Comments

There were no comments from the graduate respondents that could be classified in the dimension of school-community relations for both elements that indicated the principals as being effective and less effective. However, non-graduate respondents provided comments that were categorized under this dimension. The elements of the comments indicated effectiveness only. The elements
Table 12

Difference in Mean Scores for Perceptions on the School-Community Relations Dimension Between Graduates and Non-Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>0.37 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.05

were: relationship outside school is cordial (1 response); strengthens the relationship between teachers, non-academic staff and parents by having family day through sports and annual dinner (2 responses); and an active principal in the society (1 response).

No element were derived from the comments provided by the graduate respondents that can be categorized as effective and less effective. The non-graduate respondents provided comments that were categorized into the element of effectiveness only. There were three elements of effectiveness that were derived from their comments.

7. Instructional Supervision and Development

The last dimension on the principal effectiveness construct was instructional supervision and development. This dimension consisted of 11 items. As
a result of the use of the ANOVA (Table 13), there was no evidence that there was a difference between graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of instructional supervision and development dimension. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean scores between the two groups. If the null hypothesis was true, the probability that the difference between the graduate sample mean in the perceptions of instructional supervision and development (Mean = 3.84, S.D = .81) and the non-graduate sample mean in the perceptions of instructional supervision and development (Mean = 3.91, S.D = .86) would be lower than the alpha level. However, in the present data, the obtained alpha level was 0.38 which was larger than the chosen alpha of 0.05. Consequently, no conclusion could be drawn about the difference.

**Information From the Comments**

There were three elements of effectiveness that were derived from the

**Table 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>0.38 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > 0.05
comments given by graduate respondents which were categorized under the dimension of instructional supervision and development. These were: always gives ideas to teachers to expedite the learning and teaching process (1 response); built a hall and workshop for Living Skills subject (1 response); and likes to buy teaching aids and encourages teachers to use them (1 response). There was only one element indicating the principals as being less effective that was drawn from the comments for this dimension: likes to buy teaching aids and encourages teachers to use them (1 response). None of the comments given by the non-graduate respondents indicated effective and less effective elements in instructional supervision and development dimension.

The comments about the dimension of instructional supervision and development were only derived from those that came from the graduate respondents. None of the comments written by the non-graduate respondents could be categorized in this dimension for both effective and less effective elements.

Summary

The results of mean score in the perceptions of graduates and non-graduates on each of the seven dimension in principal effectiveness showed that there was a difference in their perceptions. However, as a result of the ANOVA, there was no evidence that there was a difference between the graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions of principal effectiveness in each of the seven dimensions. Therefore, the null hypothesis that stated there was no difference in
mean score for perception on principal effectiveness among the graduate and non-graduate teachers in each of the seven dimensions was retained. Comments from the respondents that were classified into each of the dimension came mostly from non-graduates except for the instructional supervision and development dimension where none of their comments could be classified into this dimension. Graduate respondents also did not write any comments that could be classified into the rules and procedures dimension, and school-community relations.

Information From the Interviews

Interviews were conducted with 15 teachers, one from each school. Each of the teachers interviewed were randomly selected. There were 4 graduate and 11 non-graduate teachers. The information gathered from the interviews is based on the seven dimensions of principal effectiveness.

1. Leadership

Information From the Graduate Teachers

The four teachers interviewed related that their principals had vision and ideas. They emphasized academic achievement and excellence, and had high expectation of students to do well. Three of the teachers described their principals as diplomatic when dealing with teachers' problems. They were resourceful and able to bring money from outside for the benefit of the school. For example,
one principal personally launched a campaign to collect donations to shift the school from the heart of the city to the present location. Principals were described as responsible and accountable for the decisions that they made. These principals did not push anybody. One of them was mentioned as free willing and fatherly while three of them were described as approachable. One teacher mentioned that his principal disliked backbiting. He did not like to listen to teachers complaining about other teachers to him. This principal preferred that he observed and investigated the matter himself. Three teachers mentioned that their principals, as leaders in their schools, were fair to their teachers, especially in distributing workloads. They gave new ideas and set good examples. These principals provided guidelines for the direction of the schools. Although these principals had a lot of ideas, they were receptive to new and other ideas brought up by teachers. One principal was described as "she cares" and another as an optimist.

He is a man who stresses the academic. He is very conscious about academic excellence. He does not like to listen to teachers complaining about other teachers to him. He makes his own judgement. He distributes the responsibility of the classes to teachers fairly. He mixes the good, medium and the weak classes for each teacher to teach. He does not like backbiting.

When she came here she already had the idea of making the school good. She had a lot of ideas when she came here. She is fair to all the teachers and does set a good example. She is a good administrator. She cares.

He has the vision. When asked for ideas, he would give a lot to teachers and students. He was responsible for his decision. For example, if a student has to be suspended from the school, he would suspend him or her and be responsible for his action.
Although all four of the graduate teachers described the elements of their principals' effectiveness, one of them also explained some elements that can be described as less effective. She mentioned that her principal did not give guidelines to teachers most of the time. This particular principal was not fair in dividing works among teachers. Most of the time decision was not made. Contrary to effective principals' characteristic, this principal is not diplomatic when dealing with teachers' personal problems.

When I first reported to this school, I find out very weird. I was required to report to the principal. Then she assigned my duty. And I was introduced to the Senior Assistant I. She gave me the time-table. And then I was left all on my own. Among the staff we were sort of segregated. The seniors were given task that doesn't require them to be in the sun. We find it very unfair. I find that she is not diplomatic.

Information From Non-Graduate Teachers

Most of principals were described as emphasizing academic achievement. Firmness about class time and work had been mentioned in regards to the principals. As leaders, nine teachers described them as showing a good example. For example, one teacher recounted how his principal went to the soccer field to see workers cut the grass. Sometimes, this particular principal cut the grass himself during the weekend as a physical exercise. This principal was also described as a man of principle. He was not easily influenced by the daily tide. Another teacher recounted how her principal was always at the school on Saturday which is a weekend and did not leave teachers if they had practices with the children.
This particular principal was teaching classes during the school semester breaks. He also encouraged teachers to give new ideas or innovations because he believed that by exchanging ideas they might get better ideas.

Most of the principals were also described as having good communication skills. They were approachable, accommodating and flexible. They liked to help others. They had new ideas, were up to date with new developments in education, and reminded teachers about the developments. They brought change to the schools. In dealing with teachers' personal problems, these principals had their own methods. One teacher described her principal as diplomatic, saying he did not criticize or pick on teachers for little mistakes.

As leaders, these principals were generally described as giving guidance, teaching teachers, and providing advice. They accepted teachers' ideas and were fair in delegating work to them. One teacher mentioned that his principal delegated work to teachers based on their talents and skills. School expectations and goals were conveyed clearly by most of these principals.

As a leader he has vision and produced new ideas. He is determined and works hard to find new ideas. He has a lot of ideas and gave them to the teachers. He sets a good example. For example, school starts at 7:30. At 6:45 he was already at the school. He went to the soccer field to see the workers cut the grass. In fact, sometimes he cuts the grass himself during the weekend for exercise.

He has vision, is dedicated and always likes to try something good. He always gives guidance. We can meet him anywhere and give our ideas. He is diligent. Some teachers say that he only says but never does. Sometimes he is willing to come to school at 3:00 p.m for extra classes. I saw that because I normally went home late. But the teachers who said that did not know because they went home early. He is very committed.
He will do what he says. He is in school on Saturday. He would not leave us when we have practices with children. He visited us. He is very concerned. During the holidays, I teach classes. He does the same thing. I was surprised he did that.

This principal is very up to date in the sense that he keeps in touch with what is going on. He is very well informed of new programs, the vision of the Ministry of Education and the minister. He is the kind of person who does not push you. He is approachable. We have to do what is expected but he did not pick on you when you are a little late.

Although the majority of the teachers described their principals as having effective elements, two of them tended to describe them as having less effective elements. One of the teachers described his principal as having no leadership qualities. The principal had no new ideas, no plan for the school, and was not involved in many things in the school. He was described as having no character, protocol or communication skills as a leader. This particular principal could not make decisions, was unable to resolve conflict, and was indifferent about what was happening in school, especially regarding conflicts among teachers. He never provided moral support and was afraid to use his authority. The other teacher depicted his principal as a man possessing vested interests. This principal liked to create uncertainty among teachers and showed immaturity as a leader. He was also not a good model to follow. For example, he smoked while other teachers were not allowed to do so within the school compound. Although this principal had certain knowledge, skills and experience, he did not like to share them with the teachers. As the man in charge of the school, this particular principal liked to show teachers that he commanded power and authority.
Through my experience working under him, there was nothing new nor were there new ideas that he gave himself. There was no future plan or complete plan. He did not have the character, the protocol, and the communication of a leader. He did not care whether you did the job or not. It all depended on the individual who did the job. If the individuals were responsible, they would do their jobs. Otherwise, let it be.

He does not concern himself with leadership. He will only do what is important to him. His leadership is more towards self-interests. He never provide guidelines or shares his experience. He wants maximum excellence for the school, but he never disseminates his knowledge to the students here. Now the government encourages leaders not to smoke and many teachers have stopped smoking. But he still smokes. In the staff room, no teacher smoked. But he smoked and the ashes were everywhere when he smoked. He likes to smoke wherever he likes. He is the boss. He wants to show his power.

Both graduate and non-graduate interviewees mentioned their principals as having the effective and less effective elements. For example, for elements of effectiveness, both groups mentioned that their principals emphasized academic achievement and fairness to teachers. As for less effective elements, one graduate teacher described her principal as being unfair when assigning workloads to teachers and not diplomatic when dealing with teachers who had problems. Two non-graduate teachers mentioned that their principals lacked the qualities of leadership. There were also elements that were not mentioned by the graduates. For example, most of the non-graduate interviewees mentioned that their principals showed good communication skills. However, none of the graduate interviewees mentioned this element.
2. School Rules and Procedures

Information From Graduate Teachers

The principals were described by the four teachers interviewed as knowledgeable about the rules and procedures that pertained to schools. These principals followed the rules that came from the Ministry or Department very closely. They gave briefings to the teachers and staff about new or revised rules. One principal was described as always reminding students about the school rules. One teacher mentioned that the principal knew about financial procedures and was thus able to juggle funds for the benefit of the school. Another teacher explained that his principal was very strict about finances, not because he was not supportive of teachers' requests but because he wanted to insure that the money would be spent wisely and that they followed financial procedures. He added that the principal was accountable for money spent. As discipline is important for maintaining order, these principals wrote rules for teachers. Also when formulating new policies they discussed them with teachers. As rules and procedures can be tricky and sometimes difficult to understand, one principal was described as giving instructions to teachers about ordering procedures for teaching materials.

He is very strict about finances. He gives instruction to teachers about ordering materials because as the head he is accountable. He discusses policy changes with teachers.

Variables that described less effective principals in this dimension were pointed out by one teacher. She said that her principal depended on others for
financial rules which meant that she was not well acquainted with the rules pertaining to finance. Without checking the rules, this principal just approved what the teachers requested which brought difficulty to the clerk who had to keep the financial accounts in order.

She depended on the clerk and the Senior Assistant I. Sometimes she just passed anything the teachers requested. Sometimes the clerk would make noise. "There is no money. How are we going to pay? No money."

Information From Non-Graduate Teachers

Principals were described by most teachers as giving briefings to teachers about rules and procedures. They were knowledgeable about the General Orders which are government rules and procedures that all government servants should know and understand. In fact one teacher mentioned that her principal asked teachers to buy a book on General Orders so that they could better understand the contents in the Orders. They followed the rules and procedures. Another teacher related that his principal reminded teachers about expenses and reimbursement procedures. This particular principal rejected an offer from a contractor for a job that was tendered although the tender quotation was the lowest because the contractor was not registered with the Ministry of Education. He advised the contractor to register first and then he could do business with the school. One teacher said that her principal discussed school rules with teachers and made the rules after their discussion. He was careful about school finances. Another principal was mentioned as teaching his subordinates on how to do book
keeping in school and open an account in a bank.

He is very strict with the money. Actually he is careful about it. He is very creative when it comes to money. He is wise. He made rules after discussing them with teachers, particularly in regards to incidents that had never occurred before, like molestation.

He paid the expenses, but he followed the rules as specified. Normally he reminded teachers about expenses. For example, a teacher had spent hundreds of dollars, but because this teacher did not have the receipt, the school did not reimburse the teacher. He reminded all the staff that every expense paid by cash must be accompanied by receipt. The school had a plan to build grills at the steps in block D, the new building. Three companies offered their tenders. Although one company offered the lowest bid, the principal did not accept it because the company was not registered (with the Ministry of Education).

He always explained to his subordinates (office staff) and the Senior Assistant I how to do book keeping for the school, and open an account in a bank.

Two teachers’ descriptions of their principals can be classified as less effective. One teacher recounted that although his principal knew the rules and procedures, he did not consult the school clerk to know the financial standing before allowing teachers to buy the materials that they needed. This created many unpaid bills. There were also cases where he bought things that he thought were useful to the school which turned out to be a waste of funds because he never consulted with the clerk on the budget situation before ordering. Another principal was described as always referring to others when he wanted to make decisions that had financial implications. He never consulted teachers when he wanted to make rules. There were occasions where his decision was in contradiction with the established rules of the school which proved that he did not even understand
some of the rules.

Although the principal gave his financial support, he put the clerk in a difficult position because of over-spending. When ordering things, he never consulted the budget. As a principal, he should have consulted with the clerk before ordering to find out if the funds were available. He should have checked the cash book. He went over budget and there were unpaid bills. He thought that the things he ordered are useful to the school. He never thought about the budget.

He permitted students to bring their motorbikes to the school but he did not explain clearly about the permission. This was contradictory to the discipline teacher rules that did not allow students to bring their motorbikes into the school. So there was confusion. Who was the student to listen to? The principal or the discipline teacher? It was only resolved when the discipline teacher explained the rule to the principal and not the other way around. When the discipline teacher explained to him and suggested the related and relevant policy, only then did he retract his statement. When he wanted to make rules, he never consulted (the teachers).

Both graduate and non-graduate interviewees mentioned that their principals were knowledgeable about the rules and procedures. Both groups also mentioned the less effective elements. For example, one graduate interviewee and one non-graduate interviewee mentioned that their principals did not check with the clerk before approving any purchase orders that involved money.

3. School Learning Climate

Information From Graduate Teachers

The principals were described by teachers as emphasizing discipline by going around the schools and personally enforcing the discipline on students. One teacher explained how his principal would stand at a strategic spot to see
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students lining up to go to their classes. This principal would also be present with the discipline teacher and duty teacher to catch late comers and those that tried to play truant. As drugs can be a menace to students, to ensure discipline in the school one principal held an anti-drug campaign in her school. As facilities are important for learning climate, one principal was described as very good at getting more classrooms to solve the problem of classroom overcrowding. Another teacher related how his principal held extra classes for students preparing for the Malaysian Certificate Examination (MCE) by organizing night classes with the PTA. This teacher also added that the principal was very concerned about the chairs and desks that the students used. This principal tried to get some allocation from the Secretary of the Finance Minister for getting more books. He also tried his best to solve the problems of noise and trash. As a conducive environment is important to learning, this principal upheld school cleanliness and looked for financial resources to beautify the school common. Since teaching aids are important for teachers to teach effectively, this principal tried to get a teaching resource room set up so that all teaching materials could be kept in order and teachers could use them with ease.

Once a week we had an assembly. He was there to see students lining up to go to their classes. For late comers, he was down there with the discipline teacher and the duty teacher to give punishment to them. He banned one student from bringing his motorbike to school because he did not push it in the school compound. He enforced the rules.

He got financial allocation for the resource club and also resource materials. He held extra classes for students preparing for the MCE by organizing night classes with the PTA. He was trying to get a special room as the
resource room so that teachers could easily access their teaching aids and not have them in the staff room where they would be laying around in an unorganized mess. He was trying to resolve the problem of chairs and desks that were broken.

Although the four graduate teachers mentioned elements of effectiveness about their principals, one of them also made a comment that indicated her principal was less than effective. She found that the students’ discipline in her school has deteriorated over the years and that most disciplinary problems were dealt with by teachers and not the principal.

I found that the discipline of the students has declined over the years. We encountered many problems, like playing truant and loafing around. If discipline was required, then the discipline teacher had to step in. Most of the time it was dealt with by teachers and not the principal.

Information From Non-Graduate Teachers

The principals were described by most teachers as emphasizing discipline. In three schools, the principals asked students to buy school rules booklets and to bring them every time they were in school. The booklets explained the punishments that would be imposed for particular types of infringement. Besides that, one of these principals implemented the card system to check student movement when classes were in session. This principal always encouraged his teachers to use the resource room and he never said no to teachers’ requests for teaching aids. Four principals were mentioned as taking great care about the desks and chairs that students used. One teacher recounted how his principal called the District Education Office for chairs to be sent to the school quickly. The
principal also ensured that classes have teachers during school hours.

Four principals were also reported by teachers as being able to manage resources properly. One teacher recounted that his principal asked that flowering plants be planted to beautify the school. Another principal was mentioned by his teachers as personally enforcing the discipline. He counselled students with disciplinary problems. Principals were also described by three of the interviewees as going around the school to ensure that learning activities took place.

After his arrival this year, we printed the booklet on school rules with all the punishments and actions to be taken and so on. The kids had to carry the booklet all the time in their pockets. The teachers also had their copies. When punishments were necessary, we referred to it. We couldn’t make up punishments anyway we felt. There was no loitering and there was no such thing as coming out of the classroom as you please because we had a card system whereby we had permission cards and the teachers had to give them to students to enable them to go to the toilet or something like that because we found many children were wandering around. He would never say no if a teacher came up and said this is a very good teaching aid and I want to buy it for my students. He went through the proper channels to find it and all that.

If a teacher was late for class and there was too much noise coming from the classroom, he would go to the classroom to control the students.

He always wrote letters to people to get some money, like the Head Minister of the State. From that, we managed to buy books.

One of the teachers provided information that described his principal as being less effective in the dimension of the learning climate. This teacher stated that his principal did not take action against students who went against the school discipline rules. He never scolded or caned students. He was also described as not resourceful.
He never scolded or caned students. In my opinion, it may be good counseling if we just talk to students and never scold them. As a principal, punishment and penalty are necessary once in a while to show that he has the authority. But look. Sometimes, the discipline teacher has to bear the burden. The principal never took drastic action. So, other teachers had to take action. So all are added onto the discipline teacher’s responsibilities. So, who’s to blame?

Both graduates and non-graduates indicated that their principals showed elements that were effective and less effective. For example, both groups mentioned that their principals emphasized discipline and ensured that the learning facilities and resources were available and in order. As for less effective elements, one graduate teacher and one non-graduate teacher mentioned that their principals lacked the attention to resolve disciplinary problems.

4. Teachers/Staff Relations and Development

Information From Graduate Teachers

The four graduate teachers described their principals as having good relations with the teachers. They were approachable and knew the teachers who have personal problems. They encouraged teachers to improve themselves academically and professionally. They provided information to the teachers when there were opportunities for staff development. In fact, one principal was described as paying her teachers for expenses incurred in attending in-service courses. Another teacher mentioned that his principal was willing to discuss matters with teachers even in the canteen. These principals also supported teachers when they
had disciplinary problems with the students. One teacher portrayed his principal as a buddy to teachers. He was down to earth to talk to and teachers could discuss their problems with him any time. He made his teachers happy so that they could concentrate on their students. The teachers were proud of him because he supported them.

She is very approachable. She is very understanding to those who have personal problems. She is quite nice compared to other principals that I have had.

He gave the teachers chance to present their views and ready to listen. So far he has good relations with the teachers and staff. He can eat and discuss together although in the canteen.

Generally, he is a buddy to the teachers. When teachers have problems, they will go and approach him and he is down to earth. We can discuss our problems with him and he will support teachers with disciplinary problems. He doesn't like to stop us from improving ourselves.

Although the four teachers described their principals in ways that can be categorized as effective, one of them also related some elements that portrayed her principal as being less than effective. This teacher explained that her principal has problems with non-academic staff. The principal concerned found it difficult to control them. Some of them defied her directives.

She has problems with the non-academic staff. She finds it very difficult to control them. So much so that they have the freedom to leave the school anytime they like. Come in, sign in, and then disappear.

Information From Non-Graduate Teachers

Six of the non-graduate teachers mentioned that their principals had good
relationships with teachers. Generally they gave guidance to teachers and supported them in improving themselves academically and professionally, though one teacher mentioned that many teachers did not get the support of the principal for professional development opportunities. Their principals recognized and celebrated teachers' successes. One teacher described how his principal gave speeches and letters of appreciation to teachers who were successful. This principal also remembered teachers' birthdays and gave birthday cards to them. He went to a worker's home to find out if the worker had problems when he did not show up for work. Most of the non-graduate teachers indicated that their principals supported teachers when they had problems with students. Three of the teachers also recounted how their principals helped teachers in distress, for example having family problems or a need to seek medical help. In situations like this, two teachers mentioned how their principals gave release time so that the teachers concerned could return home to attend to emergency family problems. These principals also released them if they had to go to a medical clinic without recording their absence. Otherwise, their salaries would be deducted for the days they were absent from work. One teacher mentioned that his principal visited teachers who were sick and had to stay home.

He gave encouragement and motivation to teachers to study. He celebrated teachers who were successful. He sent them to courses. He gave them the chance to attend in-service courses when there was the opportunity.

He gave a speech and then letters of appreciation. For example, a teacher brought the school team to the district level sports meet and the team won-
-or maybe placed second or third place. There were five teachers involved. He gave all the five teachers letters of appreciation. For example, the math scores for the LCE examination were good, so he gave letters of appreciation to the math teachers. He did likewise for teachers in other subjects. He remembered teachers’ birthdays. He gave birthday cards to them.

The relationship can be gauged by the closeness of the teachers and their principals, although two teachers indicated that their principals practiced favoritism. One principal preferred graduate teachers over non-graduate teachers. The teacher related that, if possible, the principal wanted all teachers in the school to be graduates. This teacher added, "He should not discriminate between graduate and non-graduates teachers when it comes to work." The other teacher recounted that her principal was close with some teachers and not with others.

The relationship with the staff was described as being good by most teachers, although one teacher related that his principal’s intimacy with workers had a bad implication. This principal could not control them; they took their work lightly and the school compound condition became unsatisfactory. It was not kept orderly and the school beautification project could not be carried out as planned. Another teacher related how his close relationship with one of the workers has strained his relationships with teachers. One teacher mentioned that her principal did not support teachers when they had problems with students. He believed that students were always right. He believed that teachers should follow the students’ tempo. They had to be creative and innovative so that students would like them.
He trusts them easily without investigating. For example, he fully trusted one of the workers in this school. He would listen to this man rather than to a teacher. Many teachers were trapped in this situation although they were not at fault. This created tension, although it was resolved later. But the damage was already done.

He is inclined towards the students (when there are discipline problems with students). He says students are always right. Teachers must follow the students' tempo. Teachers must be creative and innovative so that students will like teachers.

Both graduate and non-graduate teachers interviewed mentioned effective and less effective elements inherent in their principals in teacher/staff relations and development dimension. For example, graduates and non-graduates mentioned that their principals had good relations with teachers. Most of the teachers interviewed commented that their principals supported teachers in professional development. They also supported teachers that had disciplinary problems with students, although one non-graduate teacher stated that her principal believed that students were always right. Both groups of teachers also referred to elements that were less effective. One graduate teacher and one non-graduate teacher mentioned that their principals had problems with non-academic staff. One non-graduate teacher also said that his principal preferred graduates than non-graduates. This created a little uneasiness among the non-graduates.

5. Student Relations and Development

Information From Graduate Teachers

All the four graduate teachers narrated that their principals were
approachable by students. They could meet them in the schools without restrictions. These principals celebrated students who were successful academically. Three principals were mentioned as providing treats for students who were successful in co-curricular competitions. They circulated and talked to students. They were concerned about students and reminded them of their academic progress. One teacher explained how her principal saw students personally when teachers complained about their academic performance. Another teacher recounted how his principal was like a father figure to the students. Although he was strict with the students, he cared about them. He was appreciative about what the students contributed to the school. This was proven when he paid the students for their work for the school although the students' work was considered a voluntary service to the school. This principal was able to gather information from students that teachers could not. This shows how close he was with students. He also attended the Boy Scouts and Red Cross activities that were held on Saturdays. The principals were also described by graduate teachers as supporting students financially when they had to participate in competitions representing the schools.

They (students) can easily meet with him anytime he is in the school without any restrictions.

She mixed around with students. My girls, the debating team advanced to the state level for the inter-school debate. As an encouragement, she told me that they would be given a treat. She actually brought all of them to Sweenton Ice Cream, a very expensive place in Holiday Plaza. In that sense, she encouraged the students.
He is like a father figure to the students. He cares for them, but he is a strict man. For Scouts and the Red Cross in the school, he is always there on Saturday to see them doing their activities. Even students doing mural art are paid five dollars a day. He says they need drinks and other things. Students can get their allowance when attending district sports.

None of the four graduate teachers interviewed mentioned less effective elements inherent in their principals in student relations and the development dimension.

Information From Non-Graduate Teachers

Most of the teachers described their principals as having good relations with the students. Most of them attended co-curricular activities and gave support to the students. Two principals coached their students. One coached them in hockey because the school has no teacher that was good in hockey. The other principal coached the school swimming team because he was a swimmer and when the team won the swimming tournament he celebrated with them by having a feast. Celebrating with students that won a competition with a feast was also mentioned by another teacher. The students were also supported financially when they traveled to compete in co-curricular activities. Some of the teachers also described the closeness of their principals with the students. For example, one teacher recounted how her principal always tried to find opportunities to talk with students to find out about them. This principal was so close to students that they would talk and tell him many things that they did not tell their teachers. At least once a month, this principal will ask the students who were not doing well in their
studies to stay after school so that he can talk with them, giving them moral
advice for as long as two hours. He talked to them and got them to open up to
him so that they can tell him what their problems were and why their perfor­
mance was not up to the standard. He wanted them to improve. He took the
trouble to go to classes and called the students concerned.

Academic performance was mentioned by teachers as a concern of their
principals. One teacher described how her principal came during weekends to
teach students who were preparing for the public examination. He asked the
teachers to conduct extra classes even though there were only five or six students
because he believed that this was the most important thing that they did. To him,
what was important was the students who came and not those who did not show
up. His presence during the weekends confirmed his concern about students' per­
formance, and confirmed his support for teachers who sacrificed their weekends.
Another teacher recounted how his principal started a reading campaign for stu­
dents. He was very concerned that students read to increase their knowledge.
He provided prizes to students who read the most books. These students were
celebrated by announcing their names during an assembly where prizes were given
to them.

Two teachers described their principals as fatherly towards the students.
One teacher recounted how her principal asked students' opinions about a plan
to open up a new small gate so that their walking distance to the school building
could be shortened. By having the gate, those who came from certain areas
would not have to go round the school to enter the building because of the fence that surrounded the school compound. One teacher described his principal as humorous in class but firm with student discipline. Students were free to meet him anywhere and anytime.

But sometimes, the children did not come because of financial problems and many of them worked helping their parents in the flea market. But the principal said that we should conduct the session although there were only five or six students. The most important thing is that we proceed. To him, what is important is the students who come and not the ones who do not turn up.

Even today, this whole week, every afternoon, he is in the field because students are playing hockey--training our hockey team. He takes the trouble of coaching the team since there is no teacher who is good in hockey. He brings himself to the level of the students and he shows a lot of interest in what they are doing. At least once a month he will ask them (students who are not motivated to study like the Form IV students) to stay after school and he will talk to them, giving them moral advice for as long as two hours. He talks to them and gets them to open up to him so that they can tell him what the problems are, why their performance is not up to standard.

His relationship with the students is good. In class, he is humorous which makes the situation lively. But outside the class, he maintains his discipline....Yes, he does (attends students' co-curricular activities). Saturday, he will be there. If it involved students, he would give them fares for travel (for competition outside the school)....He was active in swimming. He trained students in swimming, everyday, for at least two hours. We entered the competition and won. So, he celebrated with them.

Although most of the principals were described as showing elements of effectiveness in the dimension of students relations and development, there were also principals that demonstrated less effective elements in this dimension. For example, one teacher related how his principal's relationship with students was through the teachers because he did not communicate directly with them. He did
not go to classrooms to meet students personally to ask their problems. He never came for co-curricular activities and made excuses for not coming. He would only come when there was a 'very important person' attending the activity. Although he was a former Boy Scout master, he never disseminated his knowledge and skills on this movement to students who were members of the Boy Scouts in the school.

He did not go to classrooms to ask the students their problems. As a principal he should be a good model—going to classrooms, observing what students are doing. Personally, he did not communicate with the students without teachers' contact. He never gave talks. He was knowledgeable. But why didn’t he disseminate his knowledge to the students? He had no direct communication with students.

Both the graduate and non-graduate teachers that were interviewed mentioned the elements of effectiveness in student relations and the development dimension. For example, most teachers from both groups related that their principals were approachable to students and had good relations with them. Most of them also mentioned that their principals were concerned about students' academic performance. The interviews also revealed less effective elements of the principals in this dimension. However, this only applied to the non-graduates because the graduates did not mention elements that could be classified as less effective in student relations and the development dimension. One non-graduate teacher stated that his principal did not communicate directly with students for the most part.
6. School-Community Relations

**Information From Graduate Teachers**

The principals were described as having good relations with the PTA. Two of the teachers mentioned that their principals knew and had close relationship with a few politicians. Two of them also related how their principals knew the parents of children who were having disciplinary problems in schools. One teacher told how her principal tried to have more interactions with parents and the other mentioned that his principal had a strong desire to meet parents. One of the teacher also recounted how her principal called parents and explained to them any disciplinary action taken with their children.

He is very active with the PTA because I’m on the PTA committee. He works very well with the chair and vice chair.

His relationship with the politicians is close. If parents come to the school, he treats them nicely, especially in cases that involve naughty children. He tries his best and had high expectation to meet parents, but was unsuccessful because of their attitudes.

The graduate teachers interviewed did not indicate any less effective elements among their principals in the school-community relations dimension.

**Information From Non-Graduates**

The principals were described as showing concern for the problems faced by the parents when their children met with disciplinary actions. Three of the teachers related that their principals met with parents and explained to them why
their children had received disciplinary action. One of them related how his principal went to the parents' home to personally explain disciplinary actions taken with their children. Another principal investigated the problems of children who were absent for many days by meeting with the parents. The investigation continued until the students returned to school.

Relationships with the PTA were also mentioned by teachers. Four teachers commented that their principals were concerned with PTA activities. As performance is a concern for every parent, one teacher explained how his principal called parents whose children's academic performance were declining. Another teacher recounted how her principal initiated what was called a 'center of excellence'. The center of excellence was established through a collaborative effort of teachers, parents and youth organizations in certain villages. The idea was necessary because most students had transportation problems when extra classes were held during the weekends or semester breaks. Centers were established based on locations which were central to other villages so that children would be able to attend classes. Three such centers were established and had the full support of parents and youth organizations. So teachers traveled to the centers. By doing this, not only did students benefit, the parents also had a better opportunity to meet teachers to discuss their children's academic performance. It also created a stronger relationship between the school and the community.

Taking the effort to know parents was mentioned by the teachers of their principals. For example, one teacher explained how her principal invited all the
parents of Form I students during the registration day and held a feast. His pur-
pose was to get to personally know as many parents as possible and also to
encourage them to visit the school as often as they could. He wanted the parents
to be aware of the development in the school and not be left behind. He also
initiated a special session with parents whose children would be facing the
national examination where he talked them about the examination. He wanted
parents to experience their children's success with them. Another teacher
described how her principal created relationships with the local youths by inviting
them to play soccer in the school during the school's Co-curricular Day. He was
also described as showing concern for local community activities, and he initiated
collaboration with the local Women Association. As politicians also play their
part in schools, three teachers spoke of their principals' relationships with them.
One teacher noted how his principal was politically active and managed to get
financial support from a politician.

He met with parents who have problem children. He investigated until the
children return to school.

If there was a disciplinary problem, he would call the parents to the school
to get to know them. He wanted to know the students' family. I think this
school is the best. Since he has been here, we had our PTA meetings
every year. The previous principal only held it once in two years. We
established centers of excellence in certain areas. We involved parents and
youth organizations in that area. So it's a combination of efforts.

I think his relationship with the community, youths and parents is good.
For example, about 200 parents turned up during the PTA meeting, more
than we expected. He invited them (the youths) to play soccer during Co-
curricular Day. The school also borrowed cooking utensils from the
Women's Association.
There were also principals that showed elements that were less effective in the dimension of school-community relations. For example, one teacher recounted how his principal did not show interest in the PTA. Another teacher explained that his principal asked the teachers to establish a close relationship with the local community without him personally getting involved in an active manner. The relationships between some of the teachers and the district office, citizen representatives, and politicians were closer than the principal's. This put them in a difficult position. Another teacher described his principal as peremptory towards some parents. Parents must respect him and his ideas to be accepted by them. He discriminated against certain parents. Some parents were frustrated with his attitude and action. They felt belittled when the principal behaved in that way.

Our relationship with the district office, people representative, and the politician are much closer than him. Sometimes I felt ashamed because the officers came to see me and not him. I am in a difficult position.

Parents must respect him for his ideas to be accepted. Some parents felt inferior when the principal behaved like that. Some parents were frustrated with him for not submitting their children's application for further study in vocational schools. He does not respect all parents equally.

Most graduates and non-graduates mentioned that their principals had good relations with the PTA. Some of non-graduates also noted that their principals had good relationships with parents. None of the graduate teachers interviewed mentioned elements that could be classified as less effective. However, some of the non-graduate teachers noted less effective elements inherent in their
principals. For example, one teacher commented that his principal did not show interest in the PTA while another mentioned that his principal had a negative attitude towards some of the parents.

7. Instructional Supervision and Development

Information From Graduate Teachers

The four graduate teachers described their principals as supportive of teachers acquiring teaching materials. They gave new ideas regarding teaching in an informal way. In fact, one of the teachers described her principal as helping teachers with their teaching. The principals also conducted instructional observations and provided feedback after the observations. One teacher mentioned that her principal was knowledgeable about the curriculum. The importance of instruction was highlighted by one teacher when he commented on how his principal had discussed how to solve problems related to instruction with the heads of departments, such as comparing methods of teaching and so on. One teacher mentioned that his principal taught a principles of accounting class because he majored in accounting in his undergraduate study.

He compares method (teaching) and sometimes discusses it with us.

Those who have problems with their teaching or receive a lot of complaints from parents, she will see individually and tell them what is wrong, and help them to improve in that area. She holds discussions with the teachers after the observation and there is a report given to the teachers.

His concern (teaching and supervision) was indirect. When he made a
round he would listen, observe teachers instructing, and watch what the children were doing. He taught principles of accounting.

None of the graduate teachers mentioned any elements that showed their principals as being less effective in the instructional supervision and development dimension.

**Information From Non-Graduate Teachers**

The concern of principals on what was going on in classrooms was one focus mentioned by the teachers. For example, one teacher recounted how her principal went to classrooms all the time. He would make sure that he entered one classroom every day. When in the classroom, he checked students' exercise books and textbooks. Although he did not believe in formal observation for a lesson, he sat at the back of the classroom and watched what the teacher was doing. He walked around and observed whether students were enjoying the lesson. If he found that teachers were unable to hold the interest of the class, he would take over the class and showed them how to create interest in the students. Many teachers appreciated what he did. Normally he walked ten times past each class in a month. In this way he knew what the teacher was doing in the class in a month. He knew who the students were in each class. Providing feedback after observation was an element that was mentioned by most teachers about their principals.

Understanding the curriculum and syllabus is important to principals.
Some teachers related that their principals were knowledgeable about the curriculum and syllabus. One teacher mentioned that his principal knew everything about the curriculum or instruction because he had worked in the State Education Office before. He had vast experience in supervising teachers. Another teacher described how his principal explained the curriculum and syllabus to new teachers. Another related that his principal liked to know of new teachers' experience and their teaching capabilities. He also briefed the teachers regarding teaching and learning. One principal was described by his teacher as briefing temporary teachers (teacher substitutes) about class control. He also informed them on how to get the syllabus and books, and whom to get help from when needed.

As teaching materials are needed to teach effectively, principals were described by some teachers as providing funds for them to buy teaching materials. Besides this, one principal was described by his teacher as demonstrating to teachers how to use the overhead projector (OHP). One teacher recounted how teachers who had attended in-service courses were required to explain to other teachers the new teaching methods that they had acquired. Another mentioned that his principal always checked the teachers' teaching preparation book.

He walks around and sees whether the students enjoy the lesson and if he finds that teachers are not able to capture the interest of the class, he takes over the class and gives the lesson, probably showing the teachers a better way to do it. I think many teachers appreciate that. He does not criticize, but he shows them. He likes to see activities in the class. He says if there is a certain amount of noise in the class, it does not worry him because he expects the pupils to be active.

He supervised teachers, and based on that he would point things out to
them in staff meetings, or he would call the teachers concerned. I could see this especially with the new teachers.

He showed us on how to use the OHP. Formerly he was a resource teacher. So, he understand that.

Although most of the teachers interviewed indicated elements of effectiveness about their principals in the dimensions of instructional supervision and development, one teacher mentioned that his principal did not like to observe teachers instructing, though they preferred him to do that.

There are teachers who like to be observed. But he does not like to do that maybe because it is his character to trust them a great deal. But the teachers still like to be observed because they want to know their weaknesses. But he said that it was not necessary.

Most of the graduate and non-graduate teachers interviewed revealed that principals showed elements of effectiveness. For example, they mentioned that their principals helped teachers with their teaching and provided funds to acquire teaching aids. Most of them also observed teachers teaching and provided feedback to them, though one non-graduate teacher said that his principal did not like to observe teachers teaching although they wanted him to do that. None of the graduate teachers interviewed indicated that their principals showed any element that portrayed them as being less effective in the instructional supervision and development dimension.

Summary

Both the graduate and non-graduate interviewees revealed information
about their principals that could be grouped into effective and less effective elements inherent in their principals in the dimensions of leadership, school rules and procedures, school learning climate and teacher/staff relations and development. Only graduates related information that could be classified as containing elements of effectiveness for the dimensions of students relations and development, school-community relations, and instructional supervision and development. None of them provided information that could be classified as being less effective about their principals in these last three dimensions. But non-graduate interviewees provided information about their principals that could be categorized as having effective and less effective elements in all seven dimension.

Differences in Perceptions Between Juniors and Seniors

In this study, the operational hypothesis states that there is a difference in perception on principal effectiveness between the junior and senior teachers in each of the seven dimensions while the null hypothesis states that there is no difference in perception on principal effectiveness between the two groups in each of the seven dimensions studied.

Results From the Questionnaires

1. Leadership

The perception on principal effectiveness as noted in the leadership
dimension was different between juniors and seniors. Table 14 contains the mean rating scores for the juniors (Mean = 3.97, S.D. = .79) and seniors (Mean = 4.17, S.D. = .73). The ANOVA test supported the hypothesis that there is a difference at the alpha level of 0.05 as the probability level obtained was 0.01. This shows that there was a difference between the perception of junior and senior teachers regarding leadership in their principal's effectiveness.

There were various reasons why there was a difference in perception on the leadership dimension between the seniors and juniors. First, the seniors had the most experience. Their teaching experience ranged from eleven to thirty years. Some of them had had more than three principals during their teaching careers. The experience brought along with it the ability to compare between the present principal and previous ones. Therefore, they were able to better judge the principal's effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>0.01 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
in the leadership dimension. Second, some of the senior teachers held official positions in the school that required them to be leaders. Since they had to act as leaders, they were able to perceive leadership elements existing in their principals. These may be the reasons why the results showed that senior teachers had higher mean rating scores than juniors.

**Information From the Comments**

Junior respondents also provided comments that could be classified in the dimension of leadership. Components of the comments contain both effective and less effective elements. Effective elements included: responsible (2 responses); always provides leadership to all teachers (1 response); action is effective (1 response); good in managing the school (1 response); possesses ideas (1 response); outspoken (1 response); helpful (1 response); very concerned about his roles (1 response); tolerable (1 response); always puts a great effort in improving school performance (1 response); a model personality (2 responses); even-handed/impartial leadership (1 response); dependable (1 response). These junior respondents also gave comments that indicated less effective elements in leadership which included: did not practice participative culture in making a decision (1 response); no planning (1 response); not sensitive to teachers' problems (1 response); lacks skill in human relations (1 response); less attention to school development (1 response); lacks responsibility (1 response); lacks self-discipline (1 response); lacks skill in problem-solving (1 response); not firm in his stand and
Senior respondents also provided comments that could be classified into the leadership dimension indicating effectiveness. These included: manages through consultation (1 response); resourceful (1 response); a responsible principal/leader (2 responses); practices a democratic administration (1 response); tolerable (1 response); honest in his work (1 response); possesses high moral values (1 response); sets a good model (2 responses); fair (2 responses); considerate (2); firm in carrying out responsibilities (1 response); has initiative to beautify the school (1 response); dedicated (1 response); always tries to improve the performance of the school academically and in co-curricular (1 response); gives new ideas (1 response); often discusses and encourages teachers to express constructive ideas in order to reach a decision on matters pertaining to curriculum and co-curriculum (1 response); able to bring change (1 response); farsighted (1 response); functions as a good principal (1 response); has good educational vision (1 response); good personality (5); open and flexible (1 response); firm in actions (1 response); very polite (1 response); has an open mind (1 response); a responsible person (3 responses); concerned about his subordinates (1 response); disciplinarian (1 response); rational (1 response); ready to listen to other people’s views (1 response); and sincere (1 response). Three less effective elements were derived from the comments that could be classified in the dimension of leadership: determined the outcomes of the meeting (1 response); not firm in his stand and
decisions (1 response); and did not weigh other people's views fairly and in detail (1 response).

Both the juniors and seniors provided comments that contained effective and less effective elements in the leadership dimension. There were 13 effective elements and ten less effective elements that could be derived from the comments given by the juniors. The effective elements included: being responsible, providing leadership to all teachers, tolerable and good personality model; while the less effective elements included: lacks skill in problem-solving, easily influence by certain groups, and lacks self-discipline. The seniors mentioned 31 effective elements and three less effective elements in this dimension. Example of elements that reflect effectiveness included: sets good model, gives new ideas, has an open mind, and has good educational vision. The less effective elements included: not being firm on decision made, and did not weigh other people's views fairly and in detail.

2. School Rules and Procedures

Table 15 contains the difference in mean perception ratings between juniors (Mean = 4.04, S.D = .74) and seniors (Mean = 4.24, S.D = .69) in the dimension of rules and procedures. The ANOVA test supported the hypothesis that there is a difference at the alpha level of .05. The obtained probability level was 0.01. This was below the alpha of 0.05. Thus, there was a difference between these two groups regarding their perceptions of principal effectiveness.
Table 15

Difference in Mean Scores for Perceptions on the School Rules and Procedures Dimension Between Juniors and Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>0.01 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

in the dimension of rules and procedures.

There were various reasons why there was a difference in the means between the seniors and juniors. The senior teachers had been exposed to more rules, regulations and procedures that pertain to their profession than the juniors. Some of the rules were new while others were revised. The changes in some of the rules and procedures were necessary to reflect current needs. For example, the per capita grant for each pupil had changed over the past ten years. With the introduction of new subjects and the new curriculum, the allocation of funds for certain subjects had also changed. The senior teachers were able to better judge the rules and procedures than the juniors because over time they had been more affected by the rules and procedures since they had been in the teaching service longer than the juniors. These senior teachers were able to better understand the rules and procedures that pertained to them as teachers. This was reflected in
their mean scores on their perceptions of principal effectiveness in the dimension of rules and procedures which was higher than that of the juniors.

Information From the Comments

Only one junior respondent gave comments that indicated effectiveness in the dimension of rules and procedures. The respondent wrote that the principal showed skill in using monetary resources. No comment could be derived that could be classified as less effective in this dimension. Comments from the seniors did not indicate any element, either effective or less effective, that could be categorized in the dimension of rules and procedures.

3. School Learning Climate

Table 16 contains the mean ratings of juniors (Mean = 4.00, S.D = .76) and seniors (Mean = 4.26, S.D = .66). The ANOVA test supported the hypothesis that there is a difference at the alpha level of .05. The obtained probability level was 0.00 which was less than the alpha of 0.05. Thus, there was a difference in the perceptions of junior and senior teachers in the dimension of the school learning climate.

The school learning climate was comprised of many elements which included the physical factor, such as the availability of chairs and desks for each student, teaching materials for teachers, and other facilities for students and teachers to use. It also consisted of the atmosphere of the school which included
Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>0.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

The element of discipline, support given to teachers facing disciplinary problems, and the instillation of appreciation among students on facilities in the school. The maintenance of cleanliness and the aura of the school were also included in the concept of learning climate. Senior teachers had experienced the problems of discipline and cleanliness which were the main topics that faced many teachers in Malaysia. Some of them also had to face difficulty in getting teaching materials, especially when the new curriculum was introduced. Junior teachers did not face this problem as much as seniors because by the time they started teaching most of the materials were already available. These experiences made the seniors better able to judge the learning climate which was reflected in their giving better ratings than the juniors on this dimension of principal effectiveness.

Information From the Comments

Junior respondents wrote comments that described three effective elements
and two less effective elements that pertain to the dimension of the school learning climate. The elements of effectiveness are: keeps disciplinary problems to a minimum (1 response); takes firm action on every problem related to student discipline (1 response); and puts efforts into creating a pleasing environment for teaching and learning (1 response). Less effective elements included: does not emphasize student discipline (1 response); and not firm enough which leads to deterioration in discipline (1 response). Comments from the seniors did not indicate any element that could be categorized in the dimension of school-learning climate.

From the comments provided by the juniors, it was clear that maintaining discipline was important as an indicator of an effective principal.

4. Teacher/Staff Relations and Development

Table 17 contains the mean rating of juniors (Mean = 3.77, S.D = .89) and seniors (Mean = 4.09, S.D = .82). The ANOVA test supported the hypothesis that there was a difference at the alpha level of 0.05 in the mean ratings between seniors and juniors in the teacher/staff relations and development dimension. The obtained probability level was 0.00 which was less than the alpha level of 0.05. This shows that there is a difference between the seniors and juniors in their perceptions of principal effectiveness in the teacher/staff relations and development dimension.
Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>0.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

Teachers have to interact with their principals and vice versa. Some of them sought the help of their principals in solving personal or professional problems. On the other hand principals required that teachers understand their work, the limits and constraints they faced as their superiors. A mutual understanding was vital for establishing a lasting relationship between principals and teachers and other members of the school staff. Principals changed as some of them were promoted or transferred to other schools. However, most teachers did not move from the school. Due to the regular changes of principals in the school, the senior teachers had more experience in working under different principals than did the juniors. Different principals have different ways of communicating, relating and dealing with human problems. How well principals handled certain problems or situations depends somewhat on how teachers perceived them.

Senior teachers were able to better understand their principals than juniors.
because most of them had worked under more principals than juniors. They had more opportunities to compare the qualities, skills and characteristics of principals. For example, they were able to compare the ease or difficulty in getting permission to attend professional development programs. Some of them were also able to better understand principals because principals would normally turn to them when they had just moved to the school to better understand the school. Besides, most senior teachers held office positions in the school that enabled them to interact more often with the principals than the juniors. All these factors may have contributed to the higher mean score ratings of seniors on the dimension of teacher/staff relations and development as compared to juniors.

Information From the Comments

Junior respondents wrote comments that could be classified in the dimension of teacher/staff relations and development. These comments indicated the characteristics that were effective and less effective. The effective elements were: always tries to know her staff better (1 response); considerate (2 responses); rational (1 response); likes to listen to teachers' opinions and views (1 response); flexible towards teachers (1 response); adaptable to many social situations (1 response); believes himself equal with his friends (1 response); respects others and their views (1 response); good relationship with teachers and staff (1 response); approachable (1 response); provides positive advice to teachers (1 response). The less effective elements included: does not support teachers in improving their
professional development (2 responses); less sensitive to teachers with problems (4 responses); not fair in delegating works to teachers (3 responses); lacks cordial relationship between teachers (3 responses); does not respect teachers’s opinions (1 response); does not interact sincerely and honestly with the staff (1 response); less sensitive towards the implication of decisions made (1 response); and few discussion before taking any action (1 response).

Seniors also provided comments that could be classified in the dimension of teacher/staff relations and development. The comments that have the characteristics of effectiveness included: always provides opportunities for teachers, and staff to express their problems (1 response); solves teachers’ problems amicably (1 response); open to teachers for discussion (1 response); approachable (1 response); listens to teachers’ problems (2 responses); fair to all teachers (2 responses); respects teachers (2 responses); gives advice and sympathetic to teachers (1 response); trusts most of the staff/teachers in doing their jobs (2 responses); does not like to push his subordinates (1 response); does not distance himself from staff or teachers (1 response); considerate to teachers/staff (3 responses); flexible with teachers/staff (2 responses); very concerned about the staff and teachers’ welfare and problems (3 responses); gives the latest ideas about education, especially after returning from in-service courses (1 response); interacts with teachers to know the latest development in terms of discipline or academics (1 response); accepts teachers views and make judgement for further actions (1 response); likes to give staff freedom psychologically to ensure that aca-
demic performance is improved effectively (1 response); close relations with teachers/staff (2 responses); always likes to solve teachers’ problems (1 response); likes to discuss matters with teachers before establishing something (1 response); relationship with teachers is very good (1 response); good hearted (1 response); easy to mix with teachers and staff (1 response); and able to provide guidance (1 response).

The senior respondents also gave comments that had less effective elements that included: has few personal interactions with teachers and staff (1 response); not concerned about problems faced by teachers in terms of physical, mental, emotional and intellect (1 response); does not maintain teachers’ confidentiality (1 response); lacks sensitivity to teachers/staff feelings (5 responses); does not trust teachers doing their jobs (1 response); practices favoritism (3 responses); easily influenced by a small group of teachers who try to get attention (1 response); does not keep teachers’ mistakes as confidential (1 response); and spying on teachers’ mistakes (1 response).

Juniors mentioned 11 effective elements and eight less effective elements that are related to the teacher/staff relations and development dimension. Seniors related more effective and less effective elements in this dimension. They mentioned 25 effective elements and nine less effective elements. Some of the elements of effectiveness mentioned by juniors and seniors included: approachable; considerate; respects teachers and others; and provides advice to teachers. The less effective elements mentioned by juniors and seniors included: practices
favoritism, and lacks credibility in trust.

5. Student Relations and Development

The perceptions on principal effectiveness as noted in the student relations and development dimension was different between seniors and juniors. Table 18 contains the mean rating of juniors (Mean = 3.99, S.D = .79) and seniors (Mean = 4.24, S.D = .71). The ANOVA test supported the hypothesis that there is a difference at the alpha level of 0.05. The obtained probability was 0.00 and the alpha level was 0.05. This shows that there was a difference between seniors and juniors in their perceptions of principal effectiveness for the dimension of student relations and development.

Students changed as they moved from one grade to the other. As the older ones left school, the younger ones took over. But most teachers continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>0.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
to stay as they watched new students come and old students go. Senior teachers were able to experience the variety of students that came to the school to study. They also had a better opportunity to relate with students and principals who changed over a period of time. These senior teachers were better able to assess how principals related to students than junior teachers. By working under different principals, they had additional insight into how principals resolved students’ problems or how they created relationships with students. Different principals put different degrees of attention on students. All the differences and similarities that new principals brought when they arrived at a school helped to enrich senior teachers’ perceptions of principals. These may be some of the reasons why senior teachers rated their principal’s effectiveness in the dimension of student relations and development higher than junior teachers.

Information From the Comments

As to the comments provided by the juniors, only less effective elements could be derived. There were: lacks sensitivity towards decisions that affects students (1 response); and lacks interaction with students (1 response). Comments from seniors provided effective and less effective elements in the dimension of student relations and development. The effective elements included: opens to students to express their problems (1 response); very concerned about students academic achievement (2 responses); very concerned about students’ welfare (1 response); involves all students in curriculum and co-curriculum activities (1
response); and very concerned about students’ problems (2 responses). There was only one less effective element from the comments that could be categorized in the dimension of student relations and development, which was does not take care about students’ academic progress (1 response).

Comments from juniors did not indicate any element of effectiveness. Only two less effective elements could be derived from their comments that could be categorized in the student relations and development dimension. However, the seniors provided comments that indicated effective and less effective elements

6. School-Community Relations

Table 19 contains the results of the rating scores between juniors (Mean = 4.02, S.D = .77) and seniors (Mean = 4.19, S.D = .72). The ANOVA test supported the hypothesis that there is a difference at the alpha level of 0.05. The obtained probability of 0.02 was lower than the alpha level of 0.05. This shows that there was difference in the mean ratings of seniors and juniors in their perceptions of principal effectiveness for the dimension of school-community relations.

Senior teachers had the opportunity to know the community better than junior teachers because their association had been established much earlier than the juniors. For example, they were involved in the PTA much earlier than the juniors. Additionally, they may have known local politicians and members of local organizations longer. Senior teachers were better able to understand the culture
Table 19

Difference in Mean Scores for Perceptions on the School-Community Relations Dimension Between Juniors and Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>0.02 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

and values of the local community than junior teachers. Understanding these two elements was important in establishing a relationship. It also helped to understand why certain relationships were possible while others were not. Senior teachers were often consulted by principals to better understand the community, especially in regards to politicians because by having a good rapport with them, principals could get financial help much easier. Senior teachers had close contact with most parents because they knew their children longer than junior teachers, particularly among parents of students who had been schooled from Form I to Form V in the same school. Some of the students had elder brothers or sisters who had studied in the school and later left the school. This revived their contact with parents and thus strengthened their relationship with them. With these opportunities, the senior teachers were better able to judge the principals’ relationship with the community. This was indicated by their higher mean ratings
compared to the juniors in their perceptions of principal effectiveness in the
dimension of school-community relations.

Information From the Comments

Comments from junior respondents did not indicate any elements that cor­
relate to the dimension of school-community relations. However, comments from
seniors provided three elements of effectiveness in this dimension though none
indicated as being less effective. They were: relationship with society is cordial
(1 response); strengthens relationship with parents (1 response); and active in the
society (1 response).

Juniors did not provide comments related to the school-community rela­
tions dimension perhaps because they were less familiar and less knowledgeable
about the relationship between the school and the community. This situation was
different with seniors. They were able to provide comments related to the dimen­
sion of school-community relations although their comments only indicated ele­
ments of effectiveness.

7. Instructional Supervision and Development

The result for the respondents' perceptions on principal effectiveness for
the dimension of instructional supervision and development is shown in Table 20.
Table 20 contains the mean ratings for juniors (Mean = 3.76, S.D = .88) and
seniors (Mean = 4.04, S.D = .78). The obtained probability level was 0.00 and
Table 20

Difference in Mean Scores for Perceptions on the Instructional Supervision and Development Dimension Between Juniors and Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>0.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

the alpha level was 0.05. This shows that there was a difference in the mean between juniors and seniors in their perceptions of principal effectiveness for the dimension of instructional supervision and development.

Teachers who had been teaching for many years experienced many incidents that may have involved their teaching. For example, in the early phase of the introduction of the Integrated Secondary School Curriculum, many teachers were faced with the problem of understanding the curriculum and the unavailability of teaching materials due to the lack of funds. It was at this time that most principals were tested on their resourcefulness. Some principals were not resourceful enough to alleviate the teachers’ problems in instruction. The senior teachers who experienced this event earlier faced a lot of problems. They needed their principals to help them not only in providing the materials but also in clarifying the contents of the curriculum and the syllabi. Principals had to
understand the curriculum and the syllabus in order to help their teachers. They should have been able to supervise teachers and provide them with feedback. The measurement of their capabilities to handle that can be measured by seniors teachers more effectively because they were able to compare the present principal’s knowledge and skills in supervision with previous ones. Junior teachers did not have as much an opportunity as seniors to compare the principals’ action and reaction towards issues related to instruction. These may be the reasons why juniors’ mean ratings on principal effectiveness for the dimension of instructional supervision and development were lower than that of seniors.

Information From the Comments

Junior respondents provided comments that could be classified into two effective elements and one less effective element in the dimension of instructional supervision and development. Effective elements were: the principal gave ideas to teachers to expedite the teaching and learning process (1 response), and always responded positively to reasonable monetary requests for purchasing teaching aids (1 response). The less effective element was that the principal never conducted any formal supervision in evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process (1 response).

There was only one element that could be derived from comments of seniors that could be classified in the dimension of instructional supervision and development. This element was that the principal liked to buy teaching aids and
encouraged teachers to use them (1 response). There were no less effective elements that could be derived from the comments provided by seniors for this dimension.

Both the junior and senior respondents provided comments related to the instructional supervision and development dimension, although seniors’ comments indicated elements of effectiveness only.

Summary

Results of the ANOVA indicated that there was a difference between the juniors and seniors in their perceptions of principal effectiveness in each of the seven dimensions. Therefore, the null hypothesis that stated there was no difference in mean score for perceptions on principal effectiveness among the juniors and seniors in each of the seven dimensions was rejected. The senior respondents had higher mean ratings on their perceptions of principal effectiveness on each of the seven dimensions compared to the juniors. There were various probable reasons why senior respondents’ rates were higher on their principals’ effectiveness than junior respondents. One of the obvious reasons is that senior respondents had more teaching experience and were thus better able to perceive an understanding of the roles, responsibilities, problems and challenges that their principals had to face.

Both junior and senior respondents also provided comments that could be classified in most dimensions although no comments from juniors could be classified in the school-community relations. As for seniors, none of their comments
could be categorized in either the dimension of rules and procedures or school learning climate.

Information From the Interviews

When the 15 teachers were divided into two groups, juniors and seniors, based on their teaching experience, the results were that there were two teachers classified as juniors and the rest seniors. One of the junior teachers had nine years of teaching experience and the other seven years. As for seniors, their teaching experience ranged from eleven to twenty nine years. The description of the information gathered was categorized based on the seven dimensions on principal effectiveness.

1. Leadership

Principals were described by two teachers as emphasizing academic achievement and excellence, and having high expectations of students to do well in their academic pursuits. They were resourceful and able to bring change to the schools. One teacher described her principal as a good model. She had lots of ideas, shared new perspectives, and was quite receptive to ideas from the teachers. She provided guidelines to the teachers about the direction of the school. She was flexible, open and caring. Another teacher provided information that characterized her principal as being less effective as a leader. Her principal was not fair in delegating work to teachers. Most of the time she could not make decision
and did not give guidelines to teachers. Teachers felt that they were segregated. Most heavy jobs were given to the junior teachers while the seniors received the lighter ones. The principal was not diplomatic when resolving personal conflicts between teachers. She was described by one teacher as putting fuel to the flame when there was a personal problem between teachers.

As a leader I think she is all right. I think she does set a good example. At the end of last year she wanted all the heads of the subject committee to prepare the yearly plan to make sure that they knew what to do for the year. She even stressed academic achievement during the meeting. She wants a 3% increase (in the public examination results). She is very open about this (encourages innovation among the teachers). She is flexible and open.

She stresses both academic and co-curricular activities, but I found that she was not diplomatic. Most of the time decisions were not made. They (seniors) were given the best, the ones they wanted, and normally those people that assign the duty will take that into consideration. So the new and inexperienced will get the job. Because of this, we (juniors) get loaded. We find it very unfair.

Information From Senior Teachers

Eight senior teachers described their principals as having vision and new ideas. They emphasized discipline and academic achievement. The teachers also mentioned that their principals were firm, especially with class time and work. The principals were described by some of the teachers as a good model. For example, one teacher recounted how his principal went to school on weekends to cut the grass on the soccer field himself. This principal was also described as a man with principles and not easily influenced by the daily current. Another
teacher recounted that her principal came to the school on Saturday. He did not leave school if teachers had practices with children. This particular principal also taught during school semester breaks. He encouraged teachers to give new ideas or innovations. He believed that by exchanging ideas they might get better ones. Most of the principals were also described as approachable, accommodating, diplomatic, flexible with good communication skills. They liked to help and were concerned about others. For example, one teacher recounted how his principal went to visit teachers who were sick and had to stay home. They had new ideas and were up to date with new developments in education. They also reminded teachers about these developments. Along with the new ideas, they brought change to schools. One teacher recounted how her principal introduced the school discipline rules and regulations booklet that every student and teacher must possess. In this booklet were printed the rules and regulations which were accompanied by the type of penalties for each infringement. In dealing with teachers' personal problems, these principals had their own methods. One teacher described her principal as being diplomatic, adding that he did not criticize for any small mistake.

These principals were described by their teachers as providing guidance and advice. They also coached teachers. Most teachers mentioned that their principals explained the school's goals and expectations. They accepted the teachers' ideas, and one teacher recounted how her principal liked to exchange ideas so that they can get better ones. They were also described by most teachers
as fair in delegating works to teachers. One teacher mentioned that his principal gave work to teachers based on their talents and skills.

I think the principal is visionary. His direction is clear. He has a lot of new ideas. To me he is a good in terms of leadership.

He has the vision and hope that everything will change. He often emphasizes the importance of academic achievement. He has the personality of a leader. He emphasizes discipline among teachers and students. He is a good model. At 6:45 a.m, he was already in school. During the weekend, Saturday, at 7:00 a.m, he was already in school. He is firm. He did not care whether you are a good friend or not. Work is work. Friend is friend. After work, we can be friends as usual. He has principles that he holds.

He is firm and reiterates what he wants. He always gives guidance, but we must be frank with him. He is in school on Saturday.

He is so pleasant. I think most of us work because he doesn’t criticize. We have to do what is expected, but he does not pick on you when you are a little late.

Because teachers have their own talents and skills, they were given works based on those talents and skills.

Although the majority of the teachers presented their principals as having effective elements, three of them tended to describe them as having less effective elements of leadership. One of the teachers described his principal as: has no vision for the school, lacks ideas, and is not involved in many of the processes in managing a school. He had no direction for the school. He was described as not having the personality traits and communication skills of a leader. This particular principal was indecisive, unable to solve conflict, and unconcerned about what was happening in the school, particularly regarding conflict among teachers. The teacher explained that the school was actually managed by a group of teachers.
which he called the "activators". The principal never provided moral support and
was afraid to use his authority. Another teacher depicted his principal as a man
who created uncertainty among teachers. This demonstrates that he was not
matured as a leader. This principal did not set a good role model. For example,
he went against the rule of not smoking in school by smoking himself. This prin­
cipal did not like to share his knowledge, skills and experience with teachers
although they knew he possessed them. This principal liked to show that he was
the authority. His actions were infested with vested interests. He did not show
his support for teachers who conducted night classes that were held to improve
the academic performance of students in the national public examination. It
made no difference whether he was in school or not.

There was no future plan or complete plan. There were the followers and
the activators in the school. The principal seems did not exist. He was not
involved in many things. He did not make decisions. Decisions were
made by the activators which consisted of four people. This group would
discuss things among themselves informally and reach a decision which was
then passed onto the principal. Workers came and went anytime they
liked without any control.

We conducted night classes every night. Teachers from far away came for
the night classes after the daily classes. He never came, but he wanted the
night classes. He supported it, but there was no motivation given to the
teachers. There was no difference whether the principal was around or
not.

Both junior and senior interviewees described their principals as having ele­
ments that were effective and less effective in the dimension of leadership. For
example, for elements of effectiveness both groups mentioned that their principals
emphasized academic achievement. As for elements that were less effective, one
of the junior teachers mentioned that her principal was unfair when giving workloads to teachers, and not diplomatic when dealing with personal conflicts among teachers. Senior teachers also noted other elements of effectiveness that were not mentioned by juniors, such as having good communication skills, having vision, being accommodating, and bringing change to schools. Three of them mentioned less effective elements in principals which included: not being a good model, lacks ideas, and is indecisive.

2. School Rules and Procedures

Information From Junior Teachers

Principals were described by two junior teachers as knowledgeable about the rules and procedures that pertain to the schools. One of the teachers mentioned that her principal knew about financial procedures and was thus able to manipulate funds for the school. Her principal wrote the school discipline rules along with the teachers. The second teacher described her principal as being very scared of making a mistake when it involved money. She followed the financial rules and procedures very closely. She only discussed formulating new policy or rules for the school with senior assistants. This could be the reason why some teachers did not cooperate with her in implementing some of the school rules. However, the good thing was that she gave briefings for new or revised rules that came from the Ministry or Department to the teachers.
When she came here she was alarmed to see teachers walking around with canes. She said no such thing was not allowed because teachers must have a letter of authorization to cane students. That rule is in the General Orders. Caning girls was not allowed. She prepared a circular on that and give it to teachers. The discipline book that we had was prepared by her and the discipline teacher.

Most of the time she follows the rules closely. If there are revision to certain rules, she will bring them up.

One of the junior teachers interviewed also mentioned that her principal was not careful when allowing the purchase of materials requested by the teachers. She did not check with the clerk about funds available before permitting the purchase.

Sometimes she just passed anything the teachers requested. Sometimes the clerk would make noise. "There is no money. How are we going to pay? No money."

**Information From Senior Teachers**

Most teachers explained that their principals gave briefings to the teachers about rules and procedures. They knew about financial procedures and were thus able to manipulate funds for the benefit of their schools. One teacher explained that his principal was very strict about finances because he was accountable for all expenses. Another teacher mentioned that her principal gave briefings to teachers about the rules and procedures. Some of the teachers noted that their principals wrote some of the discipline rules with the teachers. They also discussed formulating new policies with teachers. As financial rules and procedures can be tricky and sometimes difficult to understand, one principal was described...
as giving instructions to his teachers about ordering procedures for teaching materials.

General Orders are government rules and procedures that have to be understood and followed by all government officers which includes teachers. Most of the teachers stated that their principals were knowledgeable about the General Orders. One teacher mentioned that her principal asked the teachers to buy the book on General Orders so that they could better understand the Orders. As expenses have to be accounted for, another teacher related that his principal reminded teachers about expenses and reimbursement procedures. A tender on a job in the school had to be scrutinized in detail in compliance with the requirement of the rules and procedures pertaining to job tenders. One teacher recounted how his principal rejected an offer from a lowest bidder because the contractor was not registered with the Ministry of Education. He advised the contractor to register first. Then, he could do business with the school when there was an opportunity.

One teacher noted that her principal discussed school rules with teachers prior to making new rules. She was also careful about school finances. Another teacher recounted that his principal taught his clerical staff how to do bookkeeping in school and open an account at a bank.

He understood and knew the rules and procedures. For example, teachers were not allowed to take unrecorded leaves for seven days. Medical certificate was not encouraged; political activity was not permitted.

He was skillful and knowledgeable in terms of the financial rules and
regulations which included auditing.

He gave briefings to teachers on rules and procedures but not on very specific topics, except the new remuneration scheme. Later, on salary and types of leaves, but not in detail. If there was a death case, then we could take an emergency leave.

He gave us a course about that (rules and procedures), but a very general one. He asked us to buy a book on the General Orders.

Two teachers’ mention of their principals could be classified as containing less effective characteristics. One teacher recounted how his principal created many unpaid bills because he did not follow the financial rules and procedures, although he knew and understood them. He never consulted the clerk for the budget situation before ordering. Another principal was described as always conferring with others when making decisions that had financial implications because he did not fully understand the rules and procedures. Most of the time he could not make decisions that had to do with finance. This principal never consulted with teachers when making rules. There were occasions when his decision was contradictory to the established rules of the school. This indicated that he did not understand some of the school rules.

I am not sure whether he understood them (rules and procedures), but I found he conferred with the clerk when he had problems with financial regulations. If he had problems with the administration, he conferred with me because I knew more than he. As for the rest, he looked to the "activators" for ideas. So, if we said that he understood, it was not that he understood, but it was this group that gave the ideas. Most of the time he could not make decisions that had to do with finance.

Both junior teachers and most senior teachers interviewed mentioned that their principals were familiar with the rules and procedures. Some of the seniors
also related how their principals gave briefings regarding rules and procedures to teachers, and that they had meetings with teachers when making new rules for the schools. One of the juniors mentioned that her principal seldom consulted the clerk to see if funds were available when allowing teachers to make purchase orders. One of the seniors also mentioned that his principal was not fully knowledgeable about rules and procedures, especially those pertaining to the school.

3. School Learning Climate

Information From Junior Teachers

One of the teachers explained that the learning climate was not conducive because the school was located close to railway tracks, and there was a constraint on space for learning because of the high number of students that went to the school. This was because of large housing developments that were close to the school. However, the principal tried her best to solve the problem of classroom congestion. She was firm with discipline and called the police for any serious disciplinary problem. She also initiated an anti-drug campaign in her school. Another teacher described her principal as very resourceful and creative in obtaining funds to get more classrooms. At times, she also initiated activities that reduced disciplinary problems among students.

The learning climate here is not really good, not conducive. We have no control over the railway track. We have a constraint of space but I think we cannot blame her. We had a motivational course for the Form III and V students. We also had the anti-drug campaign.
In this area (learning climate), I find her very good because she works very closely with the PTA to raise funds to improve the learning environment for the students in term of getting more classrooms because it is congested. We managed to get five extra classrooms, get more computers, new chairs and desks for the students. We also enlarged the staff room for teachers. These were the things that she did.

One of the junior teachers interviewed also mentioned less effective elements about her principal. Her principal’s effort to reduce disciplinary problems among students was not successful because students’ discipline has decreased over the years. Most of the disciplinary problems were dealt with by the teachers and not by the principal herself.

I found that students’ discipline has gone down over the years. We have encountered many problems like playing truant, loafing around. If discipline is required, then the discipline teachers will come in. So most of the time it is dealt with by the teachers, not the principal.

Information From Senior Teachers

Principals were described by most senior teachers as emphasizing discipline. Three teachers noted that students in their schools were asked to buy the school discipline rules booklet by principals and to bring them when they came to school. The booklet explained the penalties that would be rendered for the types of wrongdoing. One of these principals implemented a card system in his school. The purpose of this system was to check students’ movement when classes were in session. Some of the principals went around school personally enforcing discipline on students. One teacher relayed that her principal personally counselled students with disciplinary problems. Another teacher described how his principal
stayed and watched from a corner after the weekly assembly to see if students walked to their classes in order. This principal, accompanied by the discipline teacher and duty teacher, would sometimes wait at the main gate to the school to nab late comers and truants.

To ensure that students can learn properly, chairs and desks have to be provided for them. One teacher related that his principal called the District Education Office for chairs to be sent to the school quickly when the teachers informed them that some students were without chairs. Another two teachers related how their principals asked workers to repair broken chairs and replace them with new ones when necessary.

A pleasing environment can help to create a conducive learning climate. One teacher mentioned that his principal asked that flowering plants be planted to beautify the school. Another principal preferred that fruit trees be planted around the compound of the school, not only to beautify the school, but also as a resource for generating money when the trees bore fruit in three years time. Another principal emphasized cleanliness. This principal checked the school's cleanliness and looked for financial resources to beautify the common. To solve the problem of cleanliness in the rest rooms, which has been a major problem for almost all schools, he implemented the pay-to-use system where any student that wanted to use the restrooms had to pay five cents per entry. This policy was successful, although there were quarters that did not agree with the system. He also attempted to solve the problems of noise and trash.
The classroom environment also affects the learning climate. Productive activities should take place in the classrooms. Teachers have to be present in classrooms so that no disruption of lessons occurs. One teacher described how her principal would try to visit at least one classroom a day to find out what the children learned. She recounted how he walked past each class at least ten times each month. Her principal knew more students personally than did the teachers which helped create a better discipline condition in the school.

Some of the teachers reported that their principals were able to find and manage resources. Three teachers mentioned that their principals managed to get financial support from politicians. One teacher commented that his principal had tried to get an allocation from the Secretary of the Finance Minister to buy more books for the students. Another teacher recounted that her principal always encouraged his teachers to use the resource room, and never objected to teachers' requests to buy teaching aids. As facilities are important for learning climate, one principal was described as being very resourceful at getting more classrooms to resolve the problem of classroom overcrowding. One teacher related how his principal held extra classes for students preparing for the Malaysian Certificate Examination (MCE) by organizing night classes with the PTA. Since teaching aids are important for teachers to teach effectively, this principal tried to get a teaching resource room set up so that all teaching materials could be kept in order and used with ease. Another recounted that her principal taught classes during weekends to students preparing for their national examinations.
The principal took great concern about the learning climate, especially the classroom climate. It was always in order. It was clean and the school compound was planted with flower plants. Compared to other schools, this school is very quiet. The school climate is good. Students do not make noise and the learning is good.

He took great care with desks and chairs. If there were no chairs, he would quickly call the District Education Office for the chairs to be sent to the school. We have allocations for chairs and desks from this department.

He tried diligently to improve the learning climate. For example, he tried to get an allocation from the Secretary of the Finance Minister for more books. He was trying to resolve the problem of chairs and desks that were broken. He also tried to resolve the problems of noise and garbage.

One of the teachers provided information that described his principal as being less effective in a few of the elements in the dimension of school learning climate. This teacher commented that his principal did not take action against students who went against the school discipline rules. He never scolded or caned students and was not resourceful.

There were no new rules and sometimes the rules were contradictory to the original ones. He permitted students to bring their motorbikes to the school, but he did not explain clearly that they needed permission. This was contradictory to the discipline teacher's rules that did not allow students to bring their motorbikes into the school.

Both juniors and seniors mentioned effective elements inherent in their principals. Juniors and most of the seniors interviewed noted that their principals emphasized discipline in the schools. They were also described as resourceful. Seniors also mentioned other elements about their principals that were not mentioned by juniors, such as implementing the pay-to-use system when using restrooms and having extra classes to help the students prepare for the Malaysian
Certificate Examination (MCE). Both groups also mentioned elements that indicated their principals were less effective in this dimension. For example, one of the junior teachers interviewed commented that the disciplinary problems in her school were not dealt with personally by the principal. Among seniors, one of them mentioned that his principal was not resourceful and paid little attention to the students' disciplinary problems.

4. Teachers/Staff Relations and Development

Information From Junior Teachers

One of two teachers interviewed described her principal as very approachable, understanding and quite lenient to the extent that some teachers took advantage of her leniency. She encouraged teachers to improve themselves academically and professionally. She paid for teachers attending in-service courses. She supported teachers who had disciplinary problems with their students. Her relationships with non-academic staff were also good. The second teacher mentioned that her principal was also supportive of the teachers in improving themselves professionally. Just like the principal described by the first teacher, this principal sided with teachers when they had problems with students. She accepted teachers' ideas or comments and provided reasons if she rejected them. She was sympathetic and had the welfare of the teachers in her heart.

She is very approachable. You can see her anytime. She is very understanding to those who have personal problems, but to some of us she is too
lenient. She looks into our complaints about students. She supports teachers who have disciplinary problems with students.

She does not hide any in-service offerings and supports teachers who have disciplinary problems with their students. In one instance, the parents complained about the actions (disciplinary). She helped the teacher although the teacher was at fault. On the quiet, she called the teacher and told her that she should not have done that. So, she is actually on your side. She is sympathetic. She allows teachers to go out during school hours if the teacher’s child is very sick or if she has a problem transporting her children to school. She has the welfare of teachers in her heart.

One of the teachers interviewed also mentioned less effective elements inherent in her principal in regard to teacher/staff relations and the development dimension. She said that her principal could not control the non-academic staff, especially the gardeners. Some of them defied her directives. This created uneasiness among the teachers. She also segregated the teachers into two when she gave heavier workloads to the junior teachers.

She had problems with the non-academic staff. She found it difficult to control them. So much so that they had the freedom to leave the school anytime they liked. Come in, sign in, and then disappear. Among the staff we are sort of segregated. We are divided. So those people who are very senior in the school because of age and experience felt that they should be left out of certain things like field activities.

Information From Senior Teachers

The majority of teachers related that their principals had good relationships with their teachers. They gave guidance to teachers and supported them in improving themselves academically and professionally. They recognized and celebrated their teachers’ successes. One teacher related that his principal delivered
a speech and a letter of appreciation to successful teachers. This principal remembered the teachers' birthdays. He also gave birthday cards to them. On one occasion he went to a school worker's home to find out if the worker has problems when he found out that the worker was absent from work. Most of the teachers indicated that their principals supported the teachers when they had problems with students.

The closeness between teachers and their principals can be used as a measure of their relationship. Principals were described by most teachers as having good relations with teachers and staff. This closeness was exemplified by one teacher who portrayed his principal as a buddy to the teachers. He described his principal as down to earth to talk to. Teachers discussed their problems with him anytime. He made his teachers happy. This enabled them to concentrate on their students. Teachers were proud of him because he supported them. Most of the seniors interviewed also described their principals as approachable and understanding of teachers who had personal problems. They also encouraged teachers to improve themselves academically and professionally. They provided information to teachers when there were opportunities for staff development. These principals also supported teachers when the teachers had disciplinary problems with the students.

Some of the teachers also recounted how their principals helped alleviate teachers' personal problems. Two teachers mentioned that their principals provided release time so that the teachers concerned could be at home to attend to
emergency family problems without their absence-being recorded. In this way, their salaries would not be decreased although they were absent from work. These principals also gave emergency leaves to them to go to the medical clinic to get medical treatments. One teacher mentioned that his principal visited teachers who were confined at home due to illness.

He gave all five teachers letters of appreciation. For example, the math score for the LCE was good. So he gave letters of appreciation to the math teachers. He did so with other subject teachers. He remembered teacher’s birthdays. He gave birthday cards to them.

Generally, he is a buddy to teachers. When teachers have problems, they will go and approach him. He is down to earth to talk to. We can discuss our problems with him and he will support teachers that have discipline problems with students.

Although he did not like to talk, he tried to create good and close relationships with the staff. For example, he visited teachers who were unable to work because of illness. He also got involved with teachers’ activities outside the schools.

The relationship with the staff was said to be good by most of teachers, although one teacher related that his principal’s intimacy with workers had bad implications. This principal could not control them; they took their work lightly and the school compound condition became unsatisfactory. It was not kept up properly and the school beautification project was not carried out as planned. One teacher mentioned that many teachers did not get the support of her school principal for professional development opportunities. Another teacher related that her principal did not support the teachers when they had disciplinary problems with the students. This principal had his own reason for not supporting
teachers when they had problems with students. He believed that students were always right. He believed that teachers should follow the students’ pace—that teachers have to be creative and innovative to attract the students’ attention.

Two teachers alleged that their principals practiced favoritism. One principal was described as preferring graduate teachers over non-graduate teachers. If possible, this principal wanted all teachers in the school to be graduates. This senior teacher believed that the principal should not show favoritism when it came to work. The second teacher stated that her principal was close with some teachers and not with others.

So far, there is not an open manner of encouraging teachers to further their studies. It all depends on the teachers. There is no such thing as: "Here, there is an in-service course. You should attend--none."

I don’t think so (informing teachers about opportunities to attend in-service courses). Most teachers I heard applied, but he did not offer his support. But there was one course that I applied for and surprisingly he supported it. So, for certain teachers, he may offer support, and for others, he may not.

For example, he fully trusts one of the workers in this school. He would listen more to this man than to a teacher. Many teachers were trapped in this situation although they were not at fault. This created tension among teachers and staff.

He is proud and speaks highly of graduate teachers. He should not discriminate between graduate and non-graduate teachers when it comes to work. In the meeting he always identifies teachers as either graduates or non-graduates.

Both the juniors and seniors mentioned that their principals had elements that could be described as effective in the teacher/staff relations and development dimension. Both groups commented that their principals encouraged and
supported the teachers in improving themselves professionally. Juniors also mentioned that their principals supported teachers with disciplinary problems. This was also mentioned by most seniors. Some seniors also mentioned that their principals celebrated their teachers’ successes. This was not mentioned by juniors. Both groups also described their principals as having less effective elements in the teacher/staff relations and development dimension. For example, one junior said that her principal could not control support staff, especially the gardeners, and that she was biased when delegating work to teachers. One senior teacher mentioned that her principal supported some teachers for professional development and not others. Another senior claimed that his principal preferred graduates over non-graduates.

5. Student Relations and Development

Information From Junior Teachers

One junior teacher mentioned that her principal often went to the classroom to talk with students. In this way she managed to gather information. She celebrated students’ successes and encouraged them to be good persons. She attended co-curricular activities and insured that students got reimbursed for food when they attended co-curricular activities that were held outside of the school. Another teacher recounted that her principal was approachable by students and that they found her comfortable to talk to. She circulated with students and
attended competitive events. She celebrated the students who were successful academically. This principal was concerned with students' academic performance and encouraged them to study hard. She would see students personally when teachers complained about their academic performance.

I think she found her own way of finding the students. What she did was just go into class and talk to them. In that way she managed to gather information. Yes (attending co-curriculum activities), almost all. She came to activities, like the motivational course. Students claimed support and food for activities.

In terms of academics, she stresses excellence. She gave encouragement to them and reminded them. If teachers complained about students' performance or students not doing their homework, she saw them personally.

Neither of the two junior teachers interviewed mentioned elements indicating that their principals were less effective in the students relations and development dimension.

Information From Senior Teachers

Most of the teachers described their principals as having good relations with students. Some of them described the closeness of their principals with students. For example, one teacher recounted how her principal was so close to students that they would talk and tell him many things that they did not tell their teachers. Another teacher described how his principal managed to get information from certain students that helped him catch students who brought in pornography books. Teachers were surprised with his ability to get the information because no teacher could get it from students.
Academic performance was mentioned by most of the teachers as a concern of their principals. One teacher described how her principal asked teachers to conduct additional classes during weekends for students that were sitting for the national public examination, even though there were only five or six students. He believed that the most important thing was that teachers conducted the classes. To him, help should be provided to those who came for the classes. Those students were more important than those who did not attend. In fact, this particular principal also conducted classes during weekends. This proved that he was very concerned about students’ performance. His action also indicated that he supported teachers who had sacrificed their weekends for the students’ benefits. Another teacher mentioned that her principal talked to students and got them open up to him. In this way, they would tell him what their problems were and the reasons why their performance was not up to standard. He was very concerned about them and wanted them to improve. He would go to class and address the students’ concerns. Another teacher noted that his principal started the reading campaign among students so that they could increase their knowledge. Students who read the most books were given prizes. These students were celebrated in an assembly by announcing their names and having the prizes given to them. Yet another teacher described how his principal conducted special meetings with students who were not doing well in their studies. He asked them to stay after school so that he could talk to them. In these meetings, which lasted as long as two hours, he would advise them and give moral support for them to
better their studies.

Most principals were reported to have attended co-curricular activities as a show of support for students. Two teachers mentioned that their principals coached their students. One coached his students in hockey because the school has no teacher that was good in hockey. The other principal coached the swimming team because he was a swimmer. Celebrating students that won a competition by holding a feast was mentioned by some teachers of their principals. For example, one principal celebrated the team by holding a feast when they won a swimming competition. Another principal also celebrated with a feast when the students won their soccer tournament. The students were also supported financially when they traveled to compete in co-curricular activities.

Principals' relationships with students were described in other forms. For example, two teachers portrayed their principals as fatherly towards students. In creating a positive relationship, the students' voice should also be heard. One teacher recounted how her principal asked students' opinions when he planned to open a new small gate so that their walking distance to the school building could be reduced. By having the gate, those who came from certain area did not have to circle the school because of the fence. Another teacher described his principal as humorous when he teaching a class but firm with student discipline.

Four teachers reported that their principals were approachable by students. They could meet him in school without restrictions. These principals circulated and talked with students. They were concerned about the students and reminded
them about their academic progress. These principals celebrated students who succeeded academically. One of the teachers mentioned that students were free to meet the principal anywhere and anytime. This principal always tried to find opportunities to talk with students to find out about them. One teacher described how her principal saw students personally when teachers complained about their academic performance. Another teacher recounted that although his principal was strict with students, he cared about them. He appreciated what the students contributed to the school. He showed his gratitude by paying the students who painted a mural for the school, although the students' work was considered as a voluntary service to the school. This principal always attended Boy Scouts and Red Cross activities that were held on Saturdays.

He encouraged students (to be successful in academics). Now there was a special project. A record was made of the number of books read in one week. Last month, students who read the most books were announced and given prizes. He was very concerned about students reading to increase their knowledge and was willing to provide prizes.

Our soccer team managed to be the runner up. He gave a special treat to the team. He did that in the afternoon while other students were around. He wanted other students to see.

Another thing that he did was he tried to make a gate at the back so that students did not have to make a big turn to come to school.

I think good (relationships with students). Never scolded. If they made mistakes, he would explain. If they did not change, he would bring them to the discipline teacher or give light punishment. He used diplomacy. He provided allocations for those taking part in activities outside the school. He would come if there was a camping activity, day and night.

He said students did not see him as the principal when he was in the classroom. His relationship with students was good. The students did not feel
pressed. In one way he did not show any serious character towards students. His character is more fatherly.

Although most of the principals were portrayed as showing elements of effectiveness in the dimension of student relations and development, there were also principals that demonstrated less effective elements in this dimension. For example, one teacher related that his principal did not communicate directly with them. He only communicated with them through teachers. He did not meet students personally to discuss their problems and never attended any co-curricular activities. He often made up excuses for not attending these events. He would only come when there was a hidden benefit for him, such as when there was a "very important person" attending the activity. He never disseminated his knowledge and skills at the school's Boy Scout activities although he was a former Scout master. Another teacher related that his principal seldom attended co-curricular activities and never attended student training sessions.

He never provided any guidelines or shared his experience with the students in this school. He did not go to classrooms to ask students about their problems. As a principal he should be a good role model—going to classrooms and observing what students are doing. Personally, he did not communicate with students without the teachers' contact.

I think he seldom did that (attending co-curricular activities) because he was not interested. As for training, he never came.

Both juniors and seniors mentioned effective elements inherent in their principals in the student relations and development dimension. Both groups noted that their principals had good relationships with students and that some of them attended co-curricular activities. Some seniors reported that their principals
showed concern for students' academic progress. Juniors also mentioned this. Two seniors also stated that their principals coached the students in hockey and swimming. Juniors made no mention of elements that would indicate their principals were less effective in the student relations and development dimension. But seniors noted less effective elements inherent in their principals. For example, one senior teacher related that his principal did not communicate directly with students. Another senior teacher said that his principal seldom attended students' co-curricular activities.

6. School-Community Relations

Information From Junior Teachers

The first teacher related the good relationship that her principal had with members of the PTA. She knew some politicians and managed to obtain a donation from a Member of Parliament. A second teacher reported that her principal had many interactions with parents. She called parents and explained to them why disciplinary actions were taken with their children. She was kind. In one case she was supposed to expel a student but decided to not do it. She knew parents whose children had problems in school.

She has good relationships with members of the PTA. She knows a few politicians. The Member of Parliament for Pasir Gudang donated some money for PTA activities.

She called parents and explained any disciplinary action taken with their children. At times she was supposed to expel the students but she didn't.
She had more interaction with the parents.

None of the junior teachers interviewed mentioned any elements that indicated their principals were less effective in the school-community relations dimension.

**Information From Senior Teachers**

The school-community relations existed in many forms. One of them is through the parent-teacher association. Four teachers mentioned that their principals were concerned about PTA activities. One teacher related that his principal encouraged activities being initiated through the PTA. He rented out the school hall for the public use so that the rental income could support the PTA. Another teacher mentioned that his principal was active with the PTA. He worked very well with the PTA's chair and vice chair. Principals were also described by most teachers as showing concern for problems faced by the parents when disciplinary actions were taken with their children. Three of the teachers commented that their principals explained to parents the reasons disciplinary actions were taken with their children. One of them mentioned that his principal visited parents personally so that he could discuss the disciplinary actions. Another principal met parents to investigate the problems of children who were absent from school for many days. He continued his investigation until the students returned to school.

Academic performance was a concern for every parent. Principals knew
this. One teacher noted how his principal called parents to discuss their children's academic performance which was declining. Another teacher relayed that her principal started the "center of excellence". The center is a result of a collaborative effort between teachers, parents and youth organizations in certain villages. The principal came up with the idea of establishing the center when he found out that the main reason many students failed to attend extra classes that were held for them was lack of transportation. The center was sited at a central location among the villages so that children would be able to attend the classes. Three centers were eventually established. Through this system teachers travel to centers to conduct the extra classes. These centers have benefitted students and their parents. Parents had better opportunities to meet teachers to discuss their children's academic performance. By establishing the centers, the relationship between the school and the community was strengthened.

To create a stronger school-community relationship, principals were described by some teachers as putting forth an effort to know parents. For example, one teacher commented that during registration day of Form I students, her principal invited all of the students' parents to a feast. Through this effort, he was able to personally get to know as many parents as possible. Through this meeting too, he encouraged them to visit the school as often as they could. He wanted parents to know what was going on in school so that they could follow their children's progress. He also held a special session for parents whose children would be facing the national public examination. In this meeting he spoke
about the examination so that parents could experience their children’s success. Another teacher described how her principal established relationship with local youths by inviting them to the school’s Co-curricular Day to play soccer. The principal also initiated the school collaboration with the local Women’s Association. Three teachers recounted their principal’s relationship with politicians. One of them described how his principal was politically active and managed to get financial support from a politician. Another teacher mentioned that his principal managed to get some money from two politicians for buying books and improving the school compound.

He tried to meet the parents. If the students’ performance (academic) was declining, he would call the parents. He would ask about the activities of the PTA in every meeting. I think he knew the PTA activities.

If there was a disciplinary problem, he would call parents to the school to get to know them. During the registration of Form I students, we invited the parents and had a party. He was in the school. He wanted parents to know their children’s progress and not be left behind.

Although most teachers stated that their principals possessed the elements of effectiveness in the dimension of school-community relations, there were also principals who showed elements which were less effective in this dimension. For example, one teacher recounted how his principal did not show concern for the PTA. Another teacher explained that his principal did not personally engage in an active manner in establishing school-community relations. Instead, he asked teachers to do that. In this particular school, some of the teachers had closer relationships with the district office, citizen representatives, and the politicians.
than did the principal. This put teachers in a difficult position because most communications were conducted through them rather than the principal. Another teacher commented that his principal practiced discrimination with respect to parents. His principal was peremptory towards some parents. He discriminated against certain parents. Some parents felt demeaned and were frustrated by his attitude and actions.

I did not think he was concerned (about the PTA). I dare to say that because the PTA annual meeting should not be conducted later than the end of May. Although he was informed of this, he still postponed it. If he was concerned, surely by January or February he would have asked the PTA secretary to plan for the meeting.

We can see that some parents were frustrated by his attitude. He didn’t respect all parents equally.

Both juniors and most seniors mentioned that their principals were involved with the PTA. They also noted that their principals had good relationships with politicians. Additionally, some seniors also related that their principals met with student’s parents when their children had academic problems. This was not mentioned by juniors. The juniors did not mention any elements that indicated their principals were less effective in the dimension of school-community relations. However, some of the seniors described their principals as being less effective in this dimension. For example, one teacher related that his principal was not concerned with the PTA while another mentioned that his principal discriminated against some parents.
7. Instructional Supervision and Development

Information From Junior Teachers

One of the junior teachers described her principal as knowledgeable about the curriculum. She briefed teachers about new ideas in instruction. She observed the teachers instructing and provided feedback to them after the observations. This principal supported teachers that needed to buy teaching materials. A second teacher mentioned that her principal also observed the teachers at work and provided feedback to them. She discussed her observations with them. She briefed teachers about new teaching methods that she came across. For example, she informed the English language teachers about choral reading as a method of teaching English. This principal also provided guidance to teachers on how to conduct an enrichment program in English. In a way, she supported teachers in their instructions.

Because of the new curriculum, once she made the observation, she would call teachers and talk about their weaknesses or whether she was happy with the way the teacher was teaching. She attended a meeting—something about benchmarking. When she came back, she relayed that to us.

She actually asked me to try out choral reading (for teaching English). She said she had tried it during her teaching and found it very interesting and effective.

None of the junior teachers interviewed mentioned any elements that portrayed their principals as being less effective in the instructional supervision and development dimension.
Information From Senior Teachers

Principals have to be knowledgeable and understand the curriculum and syllabus. Some senior teachers mentioned that their principals were knowledgeable about the curriculum and syllabus. One teacher related that his principal knew many things about the curriculum or instruction because he had worked in the State Education Office previously where he acquired vast experience in supervising teachers. Another teacher commented that his principal briefed new teachers about the curriculum and syllabus. Yet another teacher related that his principal liked to know the teaching experiences of new teachers who were posted to the school. He briefed teachers on teaching and learning. Sometimes temporary teachers were employed because there was a lack of teachers. These teachers had not received any formal training in teaching and class management. One teacher recounted that his principal briefed temporary teachers about class control. He also explained to them how to get the syllabus and books, and who to get help from when it was needed.

The importance of instruction became the focus of most principals. One teacher recounted that his principal discussed with school department heads how to solve problems related to instruction, such as comparing methods of teaching and so on. Another teacher mentioned that his principal taught a principles of accounting class because he felt he was the most qualified person to teach the subject in the school since he had majored in accounting during his undergraduate
The concern of principals as to what was going on in classrooms was one of the focuses mentioned by teachers. One teacher related that her principal made sure that he entered at least one classroom every day. During this visit, he would check the students' exercise books and textbooks. Some teachers also mentioned that their principals observed teachers during instruction. However, not all principals believed in formal observation. One teacher described how his principal would sit at the back of the classroom and watch what the teacher was doing. He would then walk around the classroom and check to see whether students had enjoyed the lesson. He would take over the class and show the teacher how to generate interest in the students if he found that the teacher had been unable to capture the interest of the students. Many teachers appreciated this practice. In a month, this principal would normally have walked ten times past each class. In this manner he knew what activities were conducted by each teacher in a class for each month. Providing feedback after observation was an element that had been mentioned by most teachers about their principals. These principals gave comments after they observed their teachers' instruction.

Some teachers mentioned that their principals provided funds for the teachers to buy teaching materials. However, it was important that teachers know how to handle the instruments as teaching aids. One teacher recounted that her principal demonstrated to teachers how to use the overhead projector (OHP). Another teacher recounted that his principal asked teachers who had attended in-
service courses to impart their knowledge gained through the courses to the teachers in the school. One teacher mentioned that his principal always checked the teachers' teaching preparation book for the week's lessons.

I think he is okay (understands the curriculum and syllabus). For example, when the temporary teachers arrived in school, he briefed them about class control. He told them where they could get the syllabus and reference books, and whom to ask for help.

He showed us on how to use the OHP. Formerly he was a resource teacher. So he knew about it.

If teachers did not send their teaching record books, then he would remind them. If I want to purchase something for the resource room, he supports it. He is somebody who knows everything (curriculum and instruction) because he has worked in the SEO (State Education Office). He was also a senior assistant for students affairs. His knowledge is wide and he is an experienced man.

Although observing teachers at work is one way of getting feedback about the teachers' instruction, one teacher commented that his principal believed that it was not necessary, even though they wanted to be observed.

There are teachers who like to be observed. But he did not like that, maybe because his character is such that he trusts them very much. But the teachers still wanted to be observed because they wanted to know their weaknesses. But he said that it was not necessary.

Both juniors and seniors mentioned elements about their principals that could be categorized as effective. Both juniors and most seniors stated that their principals observed the teachers instructing and provided feedback to them. They also described them as knowledgeable about the curriculum. Seniors also mentioned other elements of effectiveness that the juniors did not. For example, one senior teacher said that her principal gave a briefing to temporary teachers about
teaching and learning. None of the juniors mentioned any elements which portrayed their principals as being less effective in the instructional supervision and development dimension. However, one senior teacher noted that his principal did not like to observe teachers instructing, even though some of them requested that they be observed. This demonstrates that this principal had an element that portrayed him as less effective in this dimension.

Summary

Both junior and senior interviewees revealed information about their principals that could be grouped into effective and less effective elements inherent in their principals in the first four dimensions namely: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, and (4) teacher/staff relations and development. Juniors only related information that could be classified as containing elements of effectiveness for the dimensions of student relations and development, school-community relations, and instructional supervision and development. None of them provided information that could be categorized as less effective regarding their principals in these last three dimensions. But senior interviewees provided information about their principals that could be categorized as having effective and less effective elements in all seven dimensions.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three parts: discussion, conclusion, and recommendation. In the discussion, the findings of the study are discussed based on the analysis and interpretation as presented in Chapter V.

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to find if there is any difference in teachers' perceptions on principal effectiveness in seven dimensions namely: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, (4) teacher/staff relations and development, (5) students relations and development, (6) school-community relations, and (7) instruction supervision and development between: (a) graduate and non-graduate teachers, and (b) junior and senior teachers. Two methods of collecting data and information were used: questionnaire and interviews. Data collected through questionnaires showed that there was no difference in the mean rating scores for graduate and non-graduate respondents' perceptions on principal effectiveness for each of the seven dimension. In Malaysia, non-graduate teachers have been teaching secondary school students since the
introduction of secondary schools in the late fifties. Some of them are still teaching upper Form classes such as Form IV and V in various subjects because there are too few graduate teachers trained, especially in mathematics and science subjects. This is due to various reasons. First, most new graduates are more attracted to work in the non-teaching sectors which offers better salaries. Second, science students are more inclined to pursue professional courses in engineering or medicine which offer better prospects for their futures. Some graduate teachers moved to administrative positions because most of those positions needed graduates, while others transferred to non-school teaching positions, such as lecturer positions in the teaching colleges or universities. With the opening of many private educational institutions that offer tertiary levels of education, it was reported that there were cases where graduate teachers tendered their resignation from teaching in government schools because of higher salaries that were offered them. On the other hand, non-graduate teachers did not have better avenues to improve themselves socially and economically because of their academic qualifications. Therefore, most of them will continue teaching until they retire as teachers at the age of fifty-five.

Based on the results of the data collected from the questionnaires, it has been indicated that there was no difference in perception on principal effectiveness among graduate and non-graduate teachers. However, principals should realize that graduate and non-graduate teachers have their own strengths that should be optimized for the benefit of the school. As members of the teaching
team in the school, they are the pillars that support the school system. They should be treated equally, even though non-graduates are less qualified academically. Treating them differently only creates animosity and conflict among them which does not benefit anybody. In an interview, a non-graduate teacher commented on his principal:

He is proud of himself. He is so proud and speaks highly of graduate teachers, but when it comes to work, it is not all done by graduates. He should not discriminate between graduate and non-graduate teachers when it comes to work. In the meeting, he always identifies whether teachers are graduate or non-graduates. If possible, he wants all teachers in the school to be graduates.

It is clear from this interview the frustration teachers feel when they are discriminated against based on their academic qualifications. Graduate teachers were paid more than non-graduate teachers. Therefore, any jobs given to them should commensurate with the amount of pay they received. By doing this, teachers would hopefully be satisfied with their work, and could turn their attention to educating the students.

The results showing that there was no difference between the graduates and non-graduates in their perceptions on principal effectiveness implies that perception is not determined primarily by the academic qualification that one has. There are various other factors that come into the equation. Therefore, it is important that principals consider the other factors when dealing with their teachers. These other factors may include their skills, expertise, experience and connections. One senior non-graduate teacher commented in the questionnaire:
At times he is not sensitive to the age and experience of the old teachers (non-graduate). A harmonious running of the school should be based on mutual respect. Teachers' experience should be considered, even though they are without degrees.

Contrary to the results in perception between the graduate and non-graduate teachers on principal effectiveness, the results between juniors and seniors showed that there was a difference between the two groups in each of the seven dimensions. The seniors had higher mean ratings for all the dimensions. The years of teaching may have made the senior teachers more mature in their thinking. The many years of teaching had exposed them to various numbers of principals over time. They were better able to judge principals. In an interview with a senior teacher who has been teaching for 29 years and who had worked with seven principals, the teacher said:

Before we had a principal who was very strict. He was so strict that practically everybody felt like they were walking on a tight rope. We were very happy to see him go and very happy to welcome this new principal. After knowing this principal for about one month, we said this is the best thing that could have happened. It is like a dose of medication has been given to us. He is very approachable and sympathetic towards the staff and he can talk to students. After working with so many principals, I think he is one of the best.

The willingness to listen, be approachable, and respect subordinates are some of the traits inherent in effective principals. One senior teacher wrote:

With this principal, I did not feel stressed out. He was approachable and willing to listen to our problems. He was fair to all teachers. With my experience in six schools, I have known principals who treat teachers like children. The principal of this school respects teachers as adults who can do their jobs without always being supervised.

Senior teachers experienced and felt the impact of rules and procedures
when new policies replaced old ones or something new was introduced. They were able to compare the effects of rules and procedures upon them. To be effective, principals have to comply to the rules and regulations imposed on them and the teachers by the higher authorities. It is their responsibility to abide by rules, regulations and procedures because they are accountable for any actions taken by them or their subordinates that may be contrary. For example, one principal left his school with debts involving tens of thousands of dollars because he did not abide by the rules and procedures (PKPSM Selangor, 1994). However, some of the principals' subordinates felt uncomfortable when rules and procedures were strictly adhered to. They felt that their principals did not have any human feelings towards them. A situation like this sometimes put a principal in a dilemma. On one hand, the principal has to strictly follow the rules and procedures, but by doing so he may place a strain on his relationship with the staff.

One senior teacher wrote:

The principal should be sensitive and not just blindly follow orders and procedures. At times, he should use his humanitarian judgement when administering rules. He should be reminded that those he administers are not robots but humans. Therefore, he can expect various problems to follow.

The implication of this is that principals should be aware that in complying with rules and procedures, human variables should be considered. Senior teachers may be more sensitive than juniors when rules and procedures impact on them because they have been governed by them for more years than the juniors.

The relationship of principals with teachers and staff were perceived
differently by senior and junior teachers. Throughout their years of teaching, senior teachers managed to gain more experience in relating with other teachers and principals. Whatever the condition or situation, fairness in delegating work to teachers was an issue among seniors and juniors. It was important that work not be delegated according to seniority, although sometimes this was the case. A junior teacher, in an interview, narrated that juniors in her school were given heavier workloads.

Among the staff we are sort of segregated. We are divided. So, those who are very senior, because of age and experience, felt that they should be excused from certain things, like field activity and sports. They felt they should be given priority. They should be assigned tasks that don't require them to be in the sun. Simply because of their age and experience—their seniority. They also felt that they deserved a certain amount of respect. They will choose the best job—the one they want. So the new and inexperienced get what's left. So we carry out our duty. Simply because of this reason we get dumped on. We find it very unfair.

On the other side, a senior teacher wrote that at times, his principal was not sensitive to the age and experience of the senior teachers. He added that experience should be considered when giving works.

Indeed, being a principal is not an easy job, especially when dealing with human problems. Both seniors and juniors had different demands. Juniors felt that work should be divided fairly, while seniors felt that they should be respected and their requests or demands heeded. Therefore, it was important that principals be extra cautious in dealing with teachers with different years of teaching experience. They brought along their experience and values that the principals need to be aware of, and with this information, principals should be better
prepared to deal with the human problems in management.

Students change every year as new ones come and old ones leave the school. Familiarity with this cycle of change makes senior teachers perhaps more understanding of the nature of students—their needs, their weaknesses and strengths. This helps them in relaying their views on principal effectiveness with regards to student relations and development. They have more experience dealing with students than the juniors. They have more observations about how their principals interact with students, how they solve student problems, and what types of response they display towards students’ welfare and needs. Therefore, principals should be aware that senior teachers have different views about their effectiveness in relating to students than juniors. In order to have a better understanding of how to relate to students, both types of teachers should be consulted because they have different perceptions of them. By getting information, views and opinions of both parties, principals can better judge themselves in regards to their relationship with students.

A school cannot live by itself. As part of a larger system, it depends on other constituents. These constituents may include the community, parents, business and voluntary organizations, politicians, and officers from various departments. Due to earlier contact with some of these constituents, most senior teachers had known some of these constituents longer than juniors. In Malaysia, senior teachers, especially those who teach in rural areas, normally have better contact with local politicians. This is because teachers, especially seniors, have
traditionally been involved in supporting politicians who support the government. In fact, some politicians holding power in the government now were formerly teachers. Traditionally, they were also strong supporters of the parties that controlled the government. Besides that teachers, especially in rural areas, were looked to for leadership. Many of them held leadership positions in organizations or committees organized by the community. Through these positions, they were able to get to know more people, parents and other members of the community. Most of the teachers who held leadership position were seniors and had settled in the community. Therefore, most of these senior teachers had better contacts and knew more people than juniors.

It is imperative that principals utilize the help of senior teachers in interacting with the community because they have established the bridges. They were better able to perceive their principals communicating with the community than juniors because they better understood the situation in the community. They knew whether the principals were making the right connections or not. They could differentiate among principals who can relate better with the community. Principals can utilize their experience and connections to strengthen the relationship between the school and the community.

Teaching demands that teachers understand the curriculum and syllabus so that they can effectively teach. This demand was more apparent when new curriculum was introduced into the secondary schools in 1989. New subjects were added, and the need for teachers to understand the new curriculum caused them
to seek guidance and coaching on how to materialize the contents of the syllabus. Teachers looked to their principals as the instructional leaders who could help them teach the students according to the new syllabus. Therefore, principals had to be knowledgeable about curriculum and syllabus. Only by being knowledgeable could they provide guidance and advice to the teachers regarding instruction.

Teachers also need to be updated with new methods of teaching and instruction. This can be achieved if they are given the opportunity to improve themselves through professional development programs. They can also be guided through supervision in their teaching and by feedback given to them.

Senior teachers had more opportunities to assess their principals in terms of their knowledge in curriculum and syllabus. They were also better able to judge their principals' efforts to improve teachers' instructional skills. Some senior teachers have been teaching longer than the principals themselves. With these advantages, senior teachers were able to perceive their principals' effectiveness in the dimension of instructional supervision and development better than juniors. This is probably why senior teachers had a mean rating score higher than juniors for their effectiveness in this dimension. Therefore, it is important that if principals want to evaluate themselves as instructional leaders, they refer to seniors as the main source of information because of seniors' longer experience in teaching. However, they should also confer with junior teachers regarding this.

Information gathered from the interview revealed much additional information about principal effectiveness that was not collected through the
questionnaires. Both graduate and non-graduate interviewees indicated that their principals had effective and less effective elements in the dimensions of leadership, school rules and procedures, school learning climate, and teacher/staff relations and development. The graduates mentioned only the elements that can be categorized as effective for the other three dimensions, namely student relations and development, school-community relations, and instructional supervision and development. However, non-graduates noted both elements that were effective and less effective in the last three dimensions. Interestingly, the interviews revealed the same pattern of results for juniors and seniors. Juniors mentioned effective elements for all seven dimensions and less effective elements for the only first four dimensions of principal effectiveness, namely: (1) leadership, (2) school rules and procedures, (3) school learning climate, and (4) teacher/staff relations and development. However, seniors reported elements that could be classified as effective and less effective for all the seven dimensions.

Although the teachers interviewed could be classified as: (a) graduates and non-graduates, and (b) juniors and seniors, it is difficult and almost impossible to measure if there was any difference in their perceptions on their principal effectiveness between the groups based on the interviews alone. This was due to the fact that the information gathered about the principal was only from one teacher for each school. However, information gathered from the interviews provided indepth insights into principal effectiveness. It provided another dimension about the principals--their strengths and weaknesses as principals in the seven
dimensions that are the focus of this study.

Conclusion

From the analysis and discussion on the data collected through the questionnaires, it was found that there was no difference in teachers' perceptions in each of the seven dimension between the graduate and non-graduate teachers. Therefore, one would not draw any conclusion about the difference in principal effectiveness among these two groups of teachers. However, there was a difference in the perceptions of principal effectiveness in each of the dimensions when a comparison was made between senior and junior teachers. Senior teachers perceived their principals as being more effective in each of the dimensions when compared to juniors. This shows that there is a relationship between experience and the level of perception among teachers.

An interview is a form of collecting information that is qualitative in its methodology. Information gathered through the 15 interviews was based on only 1 teacher from each school. There were only 4 graduate and 11 non-graduate teachers. When divided into seniors and juniors, the 15 teachers broke down to 13 seniors and 2 juniors. Therefore, information on principal effectiveness was reflected by only one teacher which does not allow a comparison to be conducted on each principal between graduate and non-graduate teachers, nor between senior and junior teachers. This limitation was due to the inability of the researcher to interview more respondents. Ideally, there would be one
representative in each category in the sample to be interviewed in each school which means that there would be one interviewee among the graduate, non-graduate, senior and junior from each school. However, this was not feasible due to time and financial constraints. But it does not mean that we cannot gather information that is useful in comparing the perceptions of the four groups of teachers in the seven dimension. In fact, the information from the interviews provided insight into teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness. Although Wolcott (1990) noted that we did not make conclusion in a qualitative study, the interviews provided rich information about principals that can be used as a reference and guideline in evaluating them. For example, through the interviews, the researcher was able to know that there exists a case where a principal discriminated against his teachers based on their academic qualification. From the interviews also, it was found that there were principals who favored senior teachers over juniors. This information is crucial in helping the Ministry of Education to determine some acts of principals that can jeopardize the educational welfare of students. The interviews also helped to identify effective and less effective principals and the variables that made them more effective or less effective.

Recommendations

Based on the data gathered through the questionnaires and information from the interviews, the researcher would like to make the following recommendations:
1. Supervision and observation of new principals should be made by the School Inspectorate to gather information that can help improve their effectiveness. This is important because most new principals need feedback and guidance to improve themselves as principals. The School Inspectorate can then make recommendations on how to improve the principal's effectiveness to the Ministry of Education. This need is reflected in one of the interviews when the interviewee recommended that the School Inspectorate inspect the school, particularly the principal.

2. Further study should be conducted in other parts of Malaysia since the sample is limited to the southern part of the State of Johore. By adding samples from other areas, a more accurate conclusion could be reached.

3. A study on the effects of principal effectiveness on students' achievement should be conducted in Malaysia as this may provide information about the importance of effective principals.
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Items Construction on Dimension Based on Literature
## Items Construction on Dimension Based on Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Sources of Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Sources of Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Relations and Development</td>
<td>Kamal (1980); Little (1982); Sweeney (1982); Leithwood &amp; Montgomery (1982); McCurdy (1983); Murphy (1983); Harrison &amp; Peterson (1988); Herman (1988); Duke (1982); Look &amp; Manatt (1984); Robinson (1985); Rutherford (1985); Rouche &amp; Baker (1986); Manasse (1986); McEvoy (1987); Duttweiler &amp; Hord (1987); Hord &amp; Hall (1987); Ministry of Education Malaysia (1987); Minudin (1987); Kowalski et al. (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Relations and Development</td>
<td>Kamal (1980); Morrison et al. (1981); Duke (1982); Sweeney (1982); Look &amp; Manatt (1984); Robinson (1985); Rosenholtz (1985); Duttweiler &amp; Hord (1987); Hord &amp; Hall (1987); Harrison &amp; Peterson (1988); Herman (1988); Scannell (1988); Cooper (1989).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td>Kamal (1980); Murphy (1983); Look &amp; Manatt (1984); Robinson (1985); Hoyle, English &amp; Steffy (1985); Manasse (1986); Duttweiler &amp; Hord (1987); Hord &amp; Hall (1987); Harrison &amp; Peterson (1988); Herman (1988).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Principal Effectiveness Study Cover
Letter and Questionnaire
Dear Colleagues,

A STUDY OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN MALAYSIA

I am a doctoral student at the Western Michigan University, United States of America. I am conducting a survey on the above topic to collect data for my dissertation to fulfill the partial requirement of my doctoral degree.

The purpose of this study is to determine the principal effectiveness as perceived by teachers. The results of the study hopefully can help principals identify areas that can improve their professional development. The findings can also be used as guides for the Ministry of Education in conducting courses for the principals.

Please complete the questionnaire and seal it in the self-addressed return envelope provided. The data collected through this questionnaire will be collated and a general statement be made about the results. No individual analysis will be made from the data collected. You are also not required to write you name. Therefore, your confidentiality is assured. You may withdraw from this survey if you wish.

Your cooperation is mostly appreciated. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

(ARIFF KASIM)
PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

PART I: STATEMENTS ON PRINCIPAL'S EFFECTIVENESS

DIRECTION: Below are statements about your school principal's effectiveness. For each statement, circle the number that tells about the principal's effectiveness based on the scale as a measure of effectiveness:

1 = Least Effective  2 = Less Effective  3 = Moderately Effective  4 = Effective  5 = Very Effective

---

**Principal of this school** ...

1. Possesses vision for the school's direction .................................. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Clarifies the school's goals to teachers, staff and students .......... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Creates a climate of high expectation ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
4. Emphasizes academic achievement ............................................ 1 2 3 4 5
5. Demonstrates persistence in achieving school's goals ................ .
6. Emphasizes a balanced personality among students .................. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Provides new ideas for school development ................................ 1 2 3 4 5
8. Holds responsibility for any decisions he/she made .................... 1 2 3 4 5
9. Resolves conflict effectively ...................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
10. Provides mentoring to new teachers in the school ...................... 1 2 3 4 5
11. Encourages innovation among teachers ...................................... 1 2 3 4 5
12. Delegates work fairly .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Makes precise decision ........................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
14. Sets a good behavioral model .................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
15. Specifies clearly school priorities ........................................... 1 2 3 4 5
16. Provides consistent policies .................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
17. Monitors teacher's and staff's work performance ....................... 1 2 3 4 5
18. Ensures that textbook loan scheme is implemented fairly ............ 1 .2 3 4 5
19. Ensures monies allocated to school is received on time .............. ,  1 2 3 4 5
20. Practices effective resource management .................................. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Demonstrates full understanding on school regulations .......... 1 2 3 4 5
22. Monitors school's expenses ...................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
23. Informs teachers, staff and students on the priorities in the use of resources and materials ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
24. Clarifies to teachers and staff rules and regulations that are in the Government General Orders ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
25. Demonstrates persistence in marshalling resources to develop school ............. 1 2 3 4 5

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Makes rules for the maximum use of school resources and materials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Demonstrates full understanding about financial regulations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Emphasizes discipline and order in the school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Enforces discipline on students personally</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ensures that educational resources are adequate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Ensure school peacefulness is maintained</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Provides space and place for students to rest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Protects teachers and students from pressures inside and outside the school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Ensures that school cleanliness is maintained</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Ensures ample learning space</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Ensures school’s facilities can be used</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Instills in students appreciative attitude towards school’s facilities and materials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Provides activities that reduces students’ behavioral problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Celebrates academically successful students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Seeks opportunities for teachers’ professional development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Practices two ways communication with teachers and staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Takes actions to solve teachers’ and staff’s personal problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Provides opportunities for teachers and staff to express their opinions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Supports teachers who face disciplinary problems with students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Helps teachers solve their professional problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Appreciates teachers’ and staff’s success</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluates teachers’ and staff’s annual work performance fairly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Informs clearly work performance expectation to teachers and staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Supports teachers’ attendance in professional meetings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Provides orientation to new teachers and staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Provides feedback to teachers and staff on their work performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Involves non-teacher staff concerned in the school maintenance problem solving process</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Provides incentives to students successful in co-curricular</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Encourages students to voice their opinions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Ensures that students are able to use welfare facilities provided to them in the school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Supports prefects’ actions to maintain discipline among students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Explains to students disciplinary actions taken on them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Facilitates students to meet him/her</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Seeks financial supports for students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Entertains students’ complaints</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
61. Motivates students to achieve excellence in academic and co-curricular ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
62. Ensures visibility to students in the school ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
63. Motivates students to be creative ...................................... 1 2 3 4 5
64. Provides leadership activities to students ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
65. Supports students competing in co-curricular activities ........... 1 2 3 4 5
66. Monitors students' academic progress ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
67. Presents in various students' co-curricular activities and programs ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
68. Informs parents and the community about schools' activities and programs ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
69. Interacts directly with parents and members of the community to develop the school ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
70. Supports teachers, staff and students that are involved in community projects .................................... 1 2 3 4 5
71. Takes concerns about the activities of various community's organizations ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
72. Establishes good working relationship with the local political leaders ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
73. Concerns about the school PTA's activities ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
74. Encourages parents to visit the school ................................ 1 2 3 4 5
75. Takes into account public opinions about the school .............. 1 2 3 4 5
76. Creates cooperation with other district's principals and headmasters ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
77. Attempts to acquaint with parents ...................................... 1 2 3 4 5
78. Presents in teacher-parent meetings .................................... 1 2 3 4 5
79. Explains to parents any disciplinary actions taken on their children ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
80. Supports teachers gather materials to help them teach effectively ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
81. Supervise teachers' instruction regularly .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
82. Provides feedback on teachers' instructional performance ........ 1 2 3 4 5
83. Demonstrates knowledge on new instructional methods ........ 1 2 3 4 5
84. Demonstrates knowledge on curriculum ............................... 1 2 3 4 5
85. Helps teachers evaluate their instructional effectiveness .......... 1 2 3 4 5
86. Motivates teachers to continuously develop their instructional skills ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
87. Ensures that instructional materials are readily available for teachers' use ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
88. Informs teachers about new ideas on instruction .................... 1 2 3 4 5
89. Respects teachers' opinions on instruction in the classroom .... 1 2 3 4 5
90. Inspects students' exercise books regularly .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
PART II. A LITTLE INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF.

1. You are: [ ] Graduate teacher  
   [ ] Non-graduate teacher

2. How long have you been teaching? _______ years.

3. How long have you been teaching in this school? ______ years.

4. How long have you been working with this school principal? _____ years.

5. How long have you known this school principal? _____ years

PART III. COMMENTS

If you have any comments about the principal effectiveness, please write below.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you.
Appendix D

Principal Effectiveness Study
Interview Protocol
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Introduction (2-3 minutes)

2. Are you a: i) graduate teacher _____ or ii) non-graduate teacher ______

3. How long have you been teaching? ______ years.

4. How long have you been teaching in this school? ______ years.

5. How long have you been working under this principal? _____ years

6. Prompt questions will be forwarded to the respondents to elicit information about the following dimensions:
   - principal leadership
   - school direction, conduct and procedures
   - school learning climate
   - teacher/staff relations and development
   - student relations and development
   - school-community relations
   - instructional supervision and development

7. What areas do you think the principal is most effective?

8. What areas do you think the principal is least effective?

9. In what ways do you think the effectiveness of the principal can be improved?

10. Do you like to add any other comments? Yes _____ No ______

Thank you for your cooperation.
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