

UNIVERSITI MALAYA

LEMBAH PANTAI
KUALA LUMPUR



ALAMAT KAWAT: UNIVSEL
TALIPON: 54361 (6 saraf)

Bil Kami:

20 Februari 1974.

Dekan,
Fakulti Pendidikan.

Pencalunan Sarjana Pendidikan Encik
Serjit Singh s/o Gurbaksh Singh

Dengan ini disertakan senaskah disertasi bertajuk
"The Leadership role in Education of the Inspector of
Schools as perceived by Inspectors themselves and teachers
in selected primary and secondary schools in Negri
Sembilan" oleh calon tersebut diatas, untuk perhatian oleh
tuan.

Sila kembalikan naskah tersebut ke Seksi Peperiksaan
selepas dibaca tidak lewat 2 minggu dari tarikh surat ini.

(Sivakumar Nambiar)
Penolong Pendaftar
(Peperiksaan)


THE LEADERSHIP ROLE IN EDUCATION OF THE FEDERAL
INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS AS PERCEIVED BY INSPECTORS
THEMSELVES AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED PRIMARY AND
SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NEGRI SEMBILAN.

by

Sergit Singh s/o Gurbaksh Singh

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Faculty of Education, University of Malaya
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the degree of
Master of Education (Postgraduate)

January 1974



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank the Ministry of Education, Malaysia, for permission to carry out this study. Sincere thanks are extended to the Chief Inspector of Schools, West Malaysia, and all Inspectors who gave their valuable time to complete the questionnaire, to the Director of Education, Negri Sembilan and to heads and teachers of Schools where this study was undertaken.

I also acknowledge herewith the extremely valuable advice, guidance, criticism and comment rendered me by Mr. A.L. McGregor of the Faculty of Education, University of Malaya.

ABSTRACT

The objective of the study was to obtain an insight into the present functions and powers of Inspectors of Schools as perceived by Inspectors and teachers in selected Primary and Secondary Malay and English medium schools in Negri Sembilan. The investigation was primarily concerned with the setting in which the Inspector works - his functions and work load and the distribution of his time among various responsibility areas. Of particular concern in the study was the advisory and guidance function of Inspectors of Schools which may be viewed as directly related to the Inspector's staff leadership role. The views of Inspectors and teachers on the effectiveness of his performance and on problems and hindrances relating to educational inspection were also determined. The Inspector's leadership role in education was examined in terms of relevant information found in the literature on educational inspection and supervision.

In conducting the study, an examination was made of Sections 92-96 of the Education Ordinance 1957 which relate to the duties of Inspectors of Schools. The major source of information, however, were the questionnaires which were completed by 28 Federal Inspectors of Schools and 244 teachers in the state of Negri Sembilan.

The findings indicate that the legal status of the Inspector needs some clarification, especially with respect to the Inspector's leadership role. The findings also indicate that a little more than

50% of teachers did not perceive the Inspector's role as primarily that of giving advice and guidance to teachers. The study also showed up that the large number of staff personnel in the state in relation to the number of Inspectors makes the task of providing adequate professional guidance to teachers a difficult one to perform without assistance.

The four most important recommendations arising out of the study are: (1) that the Ministry of Education initiate a revision of the Education Ordinance 1957 for the purpose of defining what the advisory and executive functions entail; (2) the number of appointments in the Federal Inspectorate of Schools be increased if Inspectors' services are to be effective and efficient; (3) the Ministry of Education should consider assisting Inspectors to obtain higher qualifications by making such provision as study leave or attendance at university or other relevant courses, and (4) the establishment of closer liason between Inspectors and teachers' colleges out of which fuller understanding of each others' tasks, problems and potentialities can develop.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
The Study	2
Significance of the Study	4
Definitions of Terms Used	7
Survey of Related Literature	12
Chapter 2 - DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	28
Introduction	28
Population and Sample	30
The Sample of Teachers	30
The Instrument	35
The Questionnaire	36
The Time Schedule for the Study	38
Administration of Questionnaire	39
Chapter 3 - PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	41
Question 1	42
Question 2	73
Question 3	82
Question 4	91
Question 5	104
Chapter 4 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	121
Introduction	121
Conclusions	122
Recommendations	136
Further Research	138
BIBLIOGRAPHY	139

APPENDIX

Page

A - Questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools	145
B - Soalselidik Soalselidik untuk Guru Guru	156
C - Questionnaire for Teachers	169
D - List of Schools in the Sample	180
E - Distribution of Teachers by Age, Race and Sex in English and Malay medium Schools	183
F - Job Satisfaction of Inspectors of Schools	185
G - Duties and Powers of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools	187

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	The Representativeness of the Teacher Sample on the Criteria of Type of School and Geographical Location	33
2	Distribution of Teachers Completing Questionnaires by Type of School and Language Medium	34
3	Inspector and Teacher Responses of the Order of Importance Attached to Inspector's Administrative, Assessment and Guidance Functions	44
4	Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Providing Advice and Guidance to Teachers at the Present Time as Perceived by Inspectors of Schools and Teachers	46
5	Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Providing Guidance and Advice to Teachers as Perceived by Inspectors and Teachers	49
6	Inspectors' Allocation of Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility	52
7	Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers	53
8	Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers	54
9	Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers	55

TABLE

Page

10	Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers.	56
11	Inspectors' Preferred Allocation of their Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility	60
12	Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers	61
13	Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers	62
14	Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers	63
15	Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers	64
16	Responses of National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers to Ten Questions About the Professional Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools	66
17	Responses of National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers to Ten Questions About the Professional Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools	67
18	Responses of National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers to Ten Questions About the Professional Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools	69

TABLE

Page

19	Responses of National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers to Ten Questions About the Professional Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools	70
20	Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by Inspectors of Schools	75
21	Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers	77
22	Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers	79
23	Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers	80
24	Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers	81
25	Inspector's Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time.	84
26	National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time	86
27	National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time	87
28	National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time	89

TABLE

Page

29	National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers' Perception of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time	90
30	Inspectors' Perceptions of the Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors of Schools from Achieving their Ideal in their Job	92
31	Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers	95
32	Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers	97
33	Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers	99
34	Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers	101
35	Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Teacher Responses, by Age Group, to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision	106
36	Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Teacher Responses to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision	110
37	Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Replies from Primary and Secondary School Teachers to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision	113

TABLE

Page

38	Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Teacher Responses, by Sex, to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision	115
39	Teacher Preferences for Formal/Informal Visits by Inspectors of Schools, by Type of School and Sex	116
40	Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Summary of Teachers' Suggestions and Remarks	118

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The functions of Inspectors of Schools are important in that they are related to maintaining and improving standards in educational establishments.¹ The role of school inspectors is to generalise the best practice in education and to act as change agents to promote improvement.

The tremendous social, economic and political change in Malaysia in the last two decades, and especially since August 1957, has thrown up new challenges to Inspectors of Schools to keep abreast of times and to re-define their roles² for it would be strange indeed if the many changes that have occurred in Malaysia's complex educational situation had failed to affect educational standards quite substantially. A pertinent question to ask would be: how do the functions of School Inspectors, defined for him when the Federal Inspectorate of Schools was established in October, 1956,³ relate to the present educational scene?

1. The Education Ordinance, 1957. Part IV, sections 92-96.

2. Final Report. Conference of Inspectors of Schools in the Far Eastern and Pacific Areas of the Commonwealth, 5-15 August, 1969, Singapore, p. 26.

3. Federation of Malaya, Annual Report of the, 1956. Government Printer, Kuala Lumpur, 1957, p. 234.

Very little research has been done on the functions of Inspectors of Schools in Malaysia. What information and reports there are are based largely on Inspectors' personal observations and comments, expressed in the form of papers presented by the Chief Inspector of Schools at occasional conferences. Significant as these may be, they still present only one side of the picture because, apparently, little effort has so far been made to obtain any views from teachers. Inspectoral reports do raise questions, for example, as to whether Malaysian practice encourages conformity instead of the initiative needed to meet changing conditions. On the other hand, developments in supervisory practices in other countries need not necessarily be applicable in the local context.

The Study

This study seeks to obtain an insight into the present functions and powers of Inspectors of Schools as perceived by Inspectors themselves and also by teachers. Conceptualisation of the Inspector in this study is aided by role theory, while recourse will also be made to the social sciences, where necessary. The study shall attempt to show, through a survey questionnaire, how the wide functions of the Inspector, as perceived by the Inspectorate itself, operate in

the schools of to-day. The evaluation of school inspection by teachers themselves is seldom put on record. The study shall, by means of another survey questionnaire, evaluate the attitudes of primary and secondary teachers towards inspection and teachers' views and suggestions will be solicited on how the inspectoral visit could be made more useful to them.

The following questions have been designed to provide direction for the study:

1. (a) Does the Inspector of Schools perceive his role as being primarily that of giving advice to teachers?
(b) Do teachers perceive the Inspector's role as primarily that of giving advice to them?
2. (a) What leadership activities in supervision do Inspectors perceive themselves to be involved in at present?
(b) What leadership activities in supervision do teachers perceive Inspectors to be involved in at present?
3. (a) What leadership activities in supervision would Inspectors themselves like to be involved in?
(b) What leadership activities in supervision would teachers like Inspectors to be involved in?
4. (a) What are Inspectors' perceptions of problems and hindrances preventing Inspectors from achieving their ideal as Inspectors?
(b) What are teacher perceptions of problems and hindrances preventing Inspectors from achieving their ideal as Inspectors?

5. Attitudes of Teachers Towards Inspection.

- (a) Is there any increase in diffidence in asking for advice from Inspectors of Schools as teachers get older?
- (b) Are attitudes to inspection the same or different among primary and secondary school teachers?
- (c) What percentage of teachers regard the Inspectors' visits as being educationally valuable?
- (d) What are teacher suggestions and remarks whereby the Inspectors' visits could be made more beneficial?

Significance of the Study

As a distinct profession, supervision is a comparative newcomer among educational occupations but a rapidly growing one.¹ This profession is especially important in these times for Inspectors of Schools and educational supervisors are change agents in schools. The major task of school inspection is said to be the facilitation of growth and development in teachers and pupils. Supervision is a service activity that exists to help teachers to grow professionally

1. The Federal Inspectorate of Schools, Malaya, was established on 1st October, 1956 with the appointment of an acting Chief Inspector and twelve seconded specialist officers.

and do their jobs better.¹ A crucial responsibility of Inspectors of Schools is "the maintainance of the qualitative line in respect of standards in the educational output."²

It is now generally recognised that the School Inspector is primarily an educational advisor and leader, charged with the responsibility not of finding fault but of giving practical help and guidance. Modern supervision is democratic, not bureaucratic or autocratic. Direction and regimentation have to be replaced by wise and constructive suggestion and expert advice.

School inspection and supervision is growing and changing rapidly in response to two major forces. These forces are exerted by social-cultural conditions and by emerging theory and knowledge in the education profession.³

a) Social-cultural influences

Ways of living in a country change rapidly. Many educationists would, in fact, attribute many of the social changes now evident to a

1. Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1950, p. 5.
2. Wong, Ruth, "The Problems of Education in a Multilingual Society", in Final Report. Conference of Inspectors of Schools in the Far Eastern and Pacific Areas of the Commonwealth, Singapore, 1969. p. 8.
3. Burnham, Reba M., & King, Martha L., Supervision in Action, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, 1961. p. 27.

long-established policy in the field of education extending its benefits to all sections of the community. The rapid growth and increased mobility of the population in most countries since World War II have produced many problems. Some of these relevant in the educational scene in Malaysia are rising school enrolments, behaviour problems resulting from pupils' difficulty in adjusting to new environments, a shortage of teachers available especially in science and mathematics,¹ inadequate school facilities and curricula offerings that fail to meet the needs of pupils. Is there, then, an inevitable sacrifice in standards resulting from our rapid expansion of the educational system to make up for past deficiencies?

b) Influence of Theory and Research

The character of educational inspection and supervision has been shaped significantly by the accumulation of professional knowledge in education and related fields. Concepts of dynamic leadership, concepts of role, concepts of group behaviour and concepts of child development and learning have produced important changes in supervisory practice.² Especially pertinent in the interpretation of current trends

1. Onn, Hussein, "Education in Malaysia". Talk given by the Minister of Education at Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, 18 Feb., 1971. Ministry of Information, 1971.

2. Burnham & King, op. cit., p. 29.

in supervision are theory and research related to leadership and role expectation.

Inasmuch as Inspectors of Schools in Malaysia occupy responsible positions, have high status in their departments and exercise considerable influence through their professional leadership in the schools, they may expect to find conflicting expectations among teachers for their role. The Inspector's own perceptions of his role is vitally important; the manner in which the Inspector sees his role will determine to an extensive degree the leadership behaviour he exhibits in the performance of his task. Also, if it could be empirically established, as this study seeks to do, what teacher expectations are of the Inspectoral role and function, the process of educational inspection, as is desired, would be greatly enhanced.

Definitions of Terms Used

Administration: is (i) the carrying out of policies that have been determined and accepted (ii) the direction of efforts of people working together in their reciprocal relations so that the ends of the organisation may be accomplished (iii) the maintenance of the organisation. Fayol's analysis of the administrative process into the five functions

of planning, organising, commanding, co-ordinating and controlling, and Gullick's restatement of these functions as planning, organising, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting and budgetting, are attempts to break down the administrative activity into its component parts.¹

Inspection: that specific occasion when an educational establishment is examined and evaluated as a place of learning in such a way that if occasion demands, advice may be given for its improvement and that advice embodied in a report.²

Supervision: a process of more personal guidance based on inspectorial visit when attention is directed to some aspects of teachers' work and effecting desired change through providing advice.³

Assessment: the process by which a person's work is considered in relation to a scale of values and judged to be placed at some point on that scale; it arises out of the process of inspection but goes beyond it.⁴

-
1. Walton, J. Administration and Policy Making in Education, Baltimore, The John Hopkins Press, 1959. p. 56.
 2. and 3. Report of UNESCO Educational Planning Mission to Tanganyika, 1962. UNESCO, Paris, paras. 242 & 243. In Dodd, W.A. Primary School Inspection in New Countries, Oxford University Press, London, 1968. (Introduction).
 4. Ball, D.G., Cunningham, K.S., and Radford, W.C., Supervision and Inspection in Primary Schools. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1961. p. 151.

Administrator (in education): covers all persons, whatever their titles, who are concerned, directly or indirectly, with the finance or administration of education, the employment and payment of teachers, the building of schools and provision of equipment; it embraces such persons as the officials of the Federal and State governments and Managers or Governors of Boards of Schools.

Local education authority: the arm of the Ministry of Education at State level i.e. the State Education Department, headed by the Director of Education.

"Miniature" or "informal" visit: that occasion when an Inspector of Schools, who may also be a subject specialist, "drops" in to advise the head and teachers on any problem they may bring to his attention. The main aim is to stimulate interest in new educational developments. At the end of the visit, a report is sent to the head of the school recording merits of the school and suggestions for improvement. The report is not sent to the Director of Education.

"Formal" or "full" inspection: a formal inspection consists of a team of Inspectors visiting a school for several days enquiring into every aspect of its work - its history, organisation and administration, equipment, intra- and extra-curricula activities, staffing position and school-community relationship. At the end of the visit, a report, the joint effort of the panel of inspectors, is rendered to the Minister of Education, through the Chief Education Adviser.

Role: many definitions of the term exist in the social science literature. However, role may be defined as "a set of expectations or standards applied to the behaviour of incumbents of a particular position".¹

Role theory: Briefly, such a theory stipulates that a school system is a miniature society in which administrators, supervisors, teachers and pupils represent positions or offices within the system. Certain rights and duties are associated with each position. The actions appropriate to the positions are defined as roles.² It should be emphasised that a role is linked with the position, not with the person who is temporarily occupying the position. A person in a particular position learns to expect certain actions of others and others expect a given behaviour of him. The position of an Inspector of Schools, can be described in terms of the actions expected of him and the actions he expects of others, teachers for example. One cannot enact the Inspectoral role if he lacks the necessary role expectations. An implication of role theory is that one is successful in inspection to the extent that one fulfils the role expectations of the teachers and self-perceptions of that role.

-
1. Gross, Neil, Mason, Ward, S. & McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1958. p. 60.
 2. Sarbin, Theodore R., "Role Theory", in Gardner Lindzey (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology: I, Cambridge, Mass., Addison-Wesley, 1954, pp. 223-255.

Role network: this refers to the definition of the Inspector's job by those in the orbit of his role. These are individuals who are the source of the rewards and sanctions to which the administrator is exposed and who, in consequence, may influence his behaviour.¹

Leadership (in education): A useful definition of leadership is given by Cartwright and Zander:

Leadership is viewed as the performance of those acts which help the group achieve its objectives ... Leadership consists of such actions by group members as those which aid in setting group goals, moving the group towards its goals, improving the quality of the interactions among the members, building the cohesiveness of the group, or making resources available to the group. In principle, leadership may be performed by one or many members of the group.²

Formal organisation: "an ensemble of individuals who perform distinct but interrelated and co-ordinated functions in order that one or more tasks can be completed".³ An 'organisation' may be seen as embracing a formal structure, a formal process - that is administration, and a

-
1. Gross, Neil and Herriott, Robert E., Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1965, p. 92.
 2. Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin (eds.). Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 1st edition, Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson & Co., 1953, p. 538. See also Murray G. Ross and Charles E. Hendry, New Understandings of Leadership: A Survey and Application of Research, New York, Association Press, 1957, Chap. I.
 3. Griffiths, Daniel E., Administrative Theory, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959, p. 77.

culture; organisation also refers to the process synonymous with administration.¹

Survey of Related Literature

Educational inspection and supervision, as has been said, is a comparative newcomer among educational occupations but a rapidly growing one. The major task of supervision is the facilitation of growth and development in teachers and pupils. It has the crucial task of feeding into the bloodstream of education the best information and practices available. In the educational field, administration, supervision and leadership are passing through a period of transition, moving from the conception of arbitrary authority to one of functional unity.² Where formerly the emphasis in the supervisor's work was on authoritarian control, prescription and enforcement, it is now on persuasive leadership, consultation and guidance ... and the change in question appears to be universal.³

-
1. Hoyle, Eric, "Organisation Theory and Educational Administration", in Baron, George and Taylor, William. Educational Administration and the Social Sciences, The Athlone Press, London, 1969, pp. 38-39.
 2. Ball, Cunningham and W.C. Radford, op. cit., p. 186.
 3. Ben Morris, "School Inspection and Supervision", Education Abstracts, UNESCO, May, 1956. Vol. VIII, No. 5, p. 3.

This is one of two main impressions received from a review of the literature on educational inspection and supervision. The other is of the enormous complexity and diversity of tasks persons called inspectors are called upon to perform.¹ The expansion of educational services in most countries of the world has naturally tended greatly to increase the scope and number of the inspector's duties. Differences in the organisation of education, between centralised systems and decentralised ones, have a considerable influence on an inspector's personal place within a particular system. There are federal inspectors and local (State) inspectors, primary and secondary inspectors, general inspectors and inspectors of special subjects and there are also hierarchical distinctions within and between these types.

One common factor amid this variety of place and circumstance is the changing conception of his role as stated. Generally speaking, however, the chief effect to date of the change has been to face inspectors with the task of filling two different roles - that of inspection (assessment) and guidance (advisory) - which in certain respects appear at first sight mutually incompatible. Can inspectors continue to remain representatives of public authority with power in many cases over the professional lives of teachers and at the same time act as guides, philosophers and friends to teachers? The dilemma

1. Ben Morris: Ibid., p. 3.

is undoubtedly felt keenly by inspectors themselves, as was made plain at the international conference of Inspectors of Schools at Chichester, England in 1955.¹

The manner in which the duties of Inspectors of Schools are carried out in practice, both as regards the efficiency of the procedure used and the kinds of relationships built up with teachers is clearly of the greatest importance. Attempts both official and unofficial to set out working rules for guidance of inspectors in particular areas have already been made - these vary from precise and detailed instructions for carrying out the job² to discussions of the principles and philosophy of inspection.³ A notable tendency, particularly in North America is

1. International Conference for Inspectors of Schools, Chichester, England, 1955. Various papers. London Education Fellowship, 1955. Processed.
2. Sudan. Ministry of Education. Province Education Officer's Handbook [Khartoum]. 130 p. Processed.
3. These references include
 - a) Australian National Co-operating Body for Education. Compulsory Education in Australia. Paris, UNESCO, 1951. 189 p. (Studies on compulsory education III).
 - b) Astle, F.R., "Supervision of the Small School", In: The Forum of Education, Vol. VII, No. 1, August, 1948. pp. 40-43. Sydney Teachers' College.
 - c) Butts, Freeman J., Assumptions Underlying Australian Education, Melbourne, Australian Council for Educational Research. 1955. 80 p. pp. 63-65.

for emphasis to be increasingly placed on the need for techniques of inspection.¹

The evaluation of inspection by teachers themselves is seldom put on record. A series of research studies made in a number of countries has shed light on the reciprocal role expectations of teachers and supervisors in the improvement of instruction. In these studies, discussed below, the satisfaction of teachers with the school system has been found to depend upon the extent to which they perceived that the roles of supervisors/inspectors meet their expectations. Conversely, those higher in the schools' hierarchy judge teachers in terms of how well they conform to their expectations of the teachers' role. Respective roles must complement each other if the objectives of the schools are to be accomplished.

Expectations for supervisors as revealed by research on existing practice in

A. United States of America

- (1) Four hundred teachers in California replied to Fielstra's questionnaire, in which they rated their beliefs about supervisory roles. Primarily, they saw their tasks as "service, co-ordination and co-operative action" and secondly, as "direction and guidance".

1. Ayer, Fred C. Fundamentals of Instructional Supervision. New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954. 523 p. (Exploration series in education).

Inspection and rating of teachers was rejected as a supervisor's role.¹

- (2) Campbell² found evidence in support of the hypothesis that teachers whose wants and needs are in agreement with their supervisor's expectations express significantly higher job satisfaction than teachers whose wants were in conflict with the supervisor's definition of the teacher's role. He theorised that maximum goal achievement should result when the supervisor's expectations for teacher behaviour are identical with the wants and needs of the teachers. Campbell also noted a wide disparity between what the supervisor said he expected his teachers to do and what the teachers said the supervisor expected of them.
- (3) Ziff's study³ of supervisors representing all geographical areas of the US found that they rejected administrative acts and authority as such. Supervisors often

-
1. Fielstra, Clarence, "Concepts and Purposes of Supervision held by Educational Leaders in California Public Schools", California Journal for Instructional Improvement, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 16-18, October 1968.
 2. Campbell, Merton V., "Self-role conflict among teachers and its relationship to satisfaction, effectiveness and confidence in leadership", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.
 3. Ziff, Norman, "Role of the General Secondary School Supervisor", Educational Leadership, Vol. 16, No. 8, May, 1959, pp. 500-501.

prefer advising and guiding to the limitation of action and the making of policy decisions. Popularly, supervisors are seen as "those who justify themselves as they are able to influence fellow executives at all levels by virtue of their factual or technical mastery, consultative skill, advisory persuasiveness - in short, by their educational effectiveness". A demand for the exercise of authority is a confession of weakness.¹

- (4) A study of supervision in Ohio was initiated by the Research Committee of the Ohio Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.² Through discussions and by answering a questionnaire, some two hundred supervisors provided information about their practices and expressed their judgements on what they believed to be desirable practices. The purpose of the study was to develop a statement of beliefs about the role of the supervisor which would give guidance to administrative and supervisory personnel throughout the State.

1. Tead, Ordway. The Art of Administration, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1951, p. 104.

2. Report of the Research Committee of the Ohio Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. The Role of the Supervisor in Ohio's Schools. (Columbia: Ohio Education Association, February, 1959. Committee members were Chester O. Mathews, Chairman, Herbert L. Coon, Hortensia Dyer, Phila Humphreys and Robert D. Miner).

A check list was then prepared which dealt with the activities and the operational philosophy of supervisors. In the first part of the list, the supervisor was asked to indicate the amount of time he gave to each of the various activities. He was then asked to indicate how he thought his time should be spent. The second part of the check list referred to 'operational philosophy' of supervision. The supervisor was asked to check statements which described how various problems were solved in his district and to indicate how he thought they should be solved. The statement of beliefs that resulted from the study gave the following definition of a supervisor:

The supervisor is assigned to work full time with teachers and principals in a continuous programme of curriculum improvement. His training and experience are such that he is able to release potential leadership and involve all concerned in achieving common goals such as:

Co-operative staff relationships.

School and classroom environments are conducive to learning.

More effective use of activities and materials in planning learning experiences.

Adequate evaluation of the growth and development of children and youth.

Parent and community understanding and
co-operation.

Such a study, the Research Committee pointed out, should
motivate supervisors to study and improve their practices.

B. United Kingdom. References are made to:

- (1) Select Committee (1968). Report on Education and Science,
Part One, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, H.M.S.O. Major
findings and recommendations are:-

The overall conclusion reached by the Select
Committee of the House of Commons is that HMI's are a
remarkable and useful body of men, who need their functions
redefined. The Committee recommends cutting down their
numbers, dropping completely the old-fashioned full
inspections, giving more emphasis in their recruitment
and training to an awareness of the social implications
of education, providing for periodic return to work in the
classroom and urging far greater co-operation with local
inspectors, the Schools Council and everyone else in the
field of educational innovation. Although they have
complete independence in their advice on the content and
method of education; in matters of policy, they are
used, for want of anyone else, as regional and local
officers of the DES (Department of Education and Science).

In further education, their power to make or break colleges is enormous - they perform, in a little understood way, all the functions that the Universities Grants Committee exercises in the universities sector. Until the quality and numbers of local inspectors have been upgraded, there are not many areas in which the more routine functions can yet be handed over. But there is no reason why a start should not be made.

- (2) International Conference of Inspectors of Schools, Chichester, England, 1955. [Various papers] London. New Education Fellowship, 1955. Processed.

Papers presented at the Conference (Theme - The correct relationship in inspection between authority and guidance) are contained in

"School inspection and supervision", special issue of: The New Era in Home and School, Vol. 36, No. 9, November, 1955. London. New Education Fellowship.

In addition to a general comparative survey entitled "Inspection as leadership through guidance", by Ben Morris, this issue carries four articles on inspection in France, the Philippines, Canada and New Zealand. The titles and authors of the articles are: "The inspection of schools in France", by Louis Francois; "Leadership in Phillipine community schools", by Pedro T. Orata; "A Canadian

experiment in education for supervision and administration", by George E. Flower; "Changing role of the inspectorate: a New Zealand view", by D.G. Ball and A.E. Campbell. The extent of the articles varies, some providing a historical statement on the development of inspection, while others analyse the role of the inspector with regard to changes in the concept of educational aims. The issue also contains a brief report by J.C.L. Ackermans on the New Education Fellowship Conference, attended by inspectors from thirteen different countries.

C. Australia

Bibliographical references to research studies made on the role of the school inspector are found in

- (1) Cunningham, K.S. and Morey, Elwyn A. Children need teachers; a study of the supply and recruitment of teachers. Melbourne, Australian Council for Educational Research, 1947.

Chapter VII of the study reports the results of a questionnaire prepared by the ACER and sent to a sample of Australian teachers in 1938. Section IV of this chapter (pp. 146-151) consists of two sets of questions concerning the attitudes of primary and secondary teachers towards inspection. The first set of questions deals with

the freedom with which teachers ask for advice on matters of teaching methods, problem children, school organisation and relations between teachers and parents. The second set asked whether they considered the inspector's visit of any value in conveying new ideas, estimating success of work, inspiring to experiment and helping with difficulties. After tabulating the results, it was found that

1. more primary teachers asked for advice than secondary teachers but on the whole only a little more than half of these teachers considered the inspector's visit of any value.
2. analysis by age group revealed that there is an increase of diffidence in asking advice as the teachers get older, particularly in the case of male teachers.
3. 20% of all replies from teachers indicated that the major weakness of the present inspectorial system was that inspectors are unable to remain sufficiently long in a school to give full value of their experience to teachers.
4. 20% of all replies indicated that teachers desired a change of emphasis from the assessment function to that of suggestion and advice.

At the end of the section there are numerous suggestions and remarks made by the teachers on how the inspector's visit could be made more useful to them.

- (2) Australian National Co-operating Body for Education. Compulsory Education in Australia, Paris, UNESCO, 1951, 189p.

Chapter VI (pp. 73-81) gives an account of the way in which Education Departments of Australia are charged with the responsibility of providing adequate education for pupils within the range of compulsory schooling, supervision and inspection of primary education. An indication is also given of the way in which activities of the supervisor and inspector can function as an integral part of the school organisation and classroom procedure.

Apart from routine duties of inspecting records, teachers' programmes, pupils' work etc., inspectors are also responsible for the assessment of teachers, which influences their advancement in the service. Some methods used by inspectors to raise educational standards are described. These include the showing of samples of good work to teachers and pupils, discussions with teachers about their school and about new materials and methods; group meetings with teachers of small schools from the same district and the distribution of bulletins about educational achievements in the districts.

D. Canada

- (1) C.E.A. - Kellogg Project in Educational Leadership. Quebec a l'affiche; rapport d'une conference sur la direction de l'enseignement dans l'inspectorat tenue a Quebec du 25 au 29 October 1954. Ontario, Association Canadienne d'education, 1954. 119 p. Processed.

This report reproduces, in parallel texts in English and French, seven addresses delivered by the consultants to a conference on school inspection. In Quebec, as in some other Canadian provinces, the inspector is being gradually relieved of many administrative duties and is, therefore, able to devote more and more of his time to counselling, guiding and inspiring the teachers. Also, the inspector undertakes the task of explaining teachers' views of the administration as well as conveying the administration's directives to teachers.

The reports of the study groups are unanimous in stressing that an understanding of the pupils, of the teachers and of the environment is of primary importance to the successful accomplishment of the inspector's role.

- (2) MacArthur, R.S. The Superintendency - Leadership in Action. Toronto. The Canadian Education Association. 1955, 25 p. Processed.

A report on the 1955 short-course for Canadian

Superintendents organised jointly by the University of Alberta and the Canadian Education Association - Kellogg Project in Educational Leadership. Among the ideas that had general support through the course were the importance of regular exchange of ideas, the need for improvement of instruction by increased individual pupil-teacher contacts, by the continuous evaluation of achievement and by the improvement of school-community relations. The position of the Superintendent in modern education was regarded by the participants as a strategic one with the evolution of his role and its divorce from the functions of the traditional inspector; he has assumed the responsibility for stimulating and co-ordinating the creative abilities of the teaching profession and guiding them in serving the school system.

E. New Zealand. Reference is made to:-

Ball, D.G. and Campbell, A.E., "Changing role of the inspectorate: a New Zealand view". In: The New Era in Home and School. Vol. 36, No. 9, November, 1955. pp. 189-192.

F. Malaysia

In Malaysia, very little research has been done on the function of Inspectors of Schools. The available literature

on Inspector role takes the form of:

- (1) Government publications and documents relating to the establishment of the Inspectorate of Schools. In these, the functions of inspectors are specified.
- (2) Reports on inspection and supervision in schools in Malaysia prepared by the Inspectorate and read at conferences, sometimes international, by the Chief Inspector of Schools, West Malaysia.

Unfortunately, none of the reports has been more than personal impressions, written as a result of personal observations. Significant as these may be, they still present only one side of the picture because apparently no attempt has been made to obtain views from teachers. In particular, reference is made to:

1. Final Report. Conference of Inspectors of Schools in the Far Eastern and Pacific Areas of the Commonwealth; Singapore, 5th-15th August, 1969.

The papers presented and discussed at the Conference were:

- (a) The development of an Independent Inspectorate - a Malaysian experience - Mr. Paul Chang.
- (b) The techniques of Primary School inspection and reporting - Mr. H.B. Holst.
- (c) The Inspector's Role in the Administrative System - Mr. T.J. Moore.

- (d) The Inspector and Curriculum Reform - Mr. N.H. Campbell.
- (e) The Organisation and Function of Her Majesty's Inspectorate - Mr. A.W. Jefferey.
- (f) Regional Co-operation of Inspectors in the Far Eastern and Pacific Areas - Mr. W.B. Russel.

In addition, a symposium was held entitled:

"The Training of Inspectors in the Far Eastern and Pacific Areas of the Commonwealth".

2. Paul Chang, "The Role of the Inspectorate in the Development of Education in Rural Areas - A Malaysian Experience".

CHAPTER II

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The significance of the educational leadership which should be exercised by the school inspector or supervisor in his relationship with teachers has been emphasised in the related literature. The position of an Inspector of Schools can be best described in terms of the actions expected of him and the actions he expects of others. Psychological research and theory have indicated that an individual's behaviour is determined largely by the individual's perceptions of himself and his role and that the expectations of others create, in part, this self-image which directs behaviour.¹ If the actions and personal qualities which constitute this role as perceived by teachers are congruent with the Inspector's own perceptions of what his role should be, then there is a high probability that he will perform according to the role expectations of teachers. One cannot enact the Inspectoral role if the Inspector lacks the necessary role expectations. In the event that role expectations are incongruent, the Inspector may give priority to some obligations over others. He may, for example,

1. Carolyn Guss, "How is Supervision Perceived?" Educational Leadership, Vol. 19, No. 2, November 1961, p. 99.

heed his responsibility to the Ministry of Education before meeting demands of teachers.

To investigate empirically the problem of role expectations, it is necessary, first, to specify the assumptions that are to be made in connection with the study, second, to specify what the selected samples out of the population of Inspectors and teachers will be; third, to obtain data on the expectations held by teachers and Inspectors themselves for incumbents of the inspectorial position and fourth, to obtain measures of the degree of consensus on their role expectations. For investigation of conformity to expectations, the survey questionnaire instrument for both Inspectors and teachers will be used. Data on a wide range of role behaviour as well as on behavioural expectations will then be obtained.

Assumptions

It is assumed that Inspectors of Schools are needed and that, without them, schools would be less effective. The vast increase in national expenditure on education in Malaysia makes a strong case for some form of inspection. An assumption is also made in connection with the method used in the collection of information from Inspectors and teachers. It is assumed that the respondents to the questionnaires were frank and objective in answering all questions. It is further assumed that many of the concepts of the Inspectorial role and functions, as described in the literature on educational inspection and supervision, are applicable to the Inspector's role in Malaysia.

Population and Sample

Consideration was given to all Inspectors of Schools, male and female, at the Federal Inspectorate of Schools, Kuala Lumpur, and to those Federal Inspectors attached to State Education Departments as the population. In view of the small size of the population of Inspectors of Schools (40 as at 1st December, 1973) and in order to serve an adequate number of cases for purposes of analysis, the sample size was set at 38, excluding the Chief Inspector and Deputy Chief Inspector of Schools. Completed questionnaires were returned by 28 Inspectors (74% of the population).

Sample of Teachers.

The research design for selecting the teacher sample from the population of teachers in the state of Negri Sembilan, West Malaysia, was more elaborate and complex. This is in part a reflection of the policy of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools, which uses the following criteria in the inspection of schools (in any state):¹

1. Conference of Inspectors of Schools in the Far Eastern and Pacific Areas of the Commonwealth, Report of the. Singapore, 1969. p. 22.

Determinants	Number of Schools
Language medium	50% National Schools (Malay medium)
	25% National Type Schools (English medium)
	15% National Type Schools (Chinese medium)
	10% National Type Schools (Tamil medium)
Geographical distribution	40% urban
	60% rural
Level of instruction	40% secondary
	60% primary
Balance between general and "special" advice	40% general
	60% special

A complete coverage of all determinants and type of school inspected would have stretched the scope of the study too far afield. It is to be noted that the emphasis of the inspectoral work at present is on National and National Type (English medium) schools and hence, for the purposes of this study, only these two types of schools were considered. However, the other two determinants - geographical distribution (urban/rural) and level of instruction (primary/secondary) - were strictly observed.

To obtain the sample of teachers, a list of schools (by type of school and geographical location) was obtained from the Education Department, Negri Sembilan. Within the determinants set by the Inspectorate, consideration in the selection of schools, from which the teacher sample was drawn, was given to the central locality of these schools in each district, thus making it convenient to visit these schools. Also, schools which had been visited by Inspectors within the last three years were given preference in the selection of school sample over other schools not inspected at all in the same period. Information on visits made to schools in Negri Sembilan in the said period was obtained from the Records Office of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools. Table 1 shows the representativeness of the teacher sample from these schools.

A total of 330 Primary and Secondary teachers in both Malay and English medium schools were selected to complete the questionnaire. Table 2 shows the number of completed questionnaires returned by teachers and percentage of returns for each category of teachers. An overall 73.9% return of completed questionnaires from teachers was secured.

The list of schools, both primary and secondary, from which the sample of teachers was drawn, appears in Appendix D.

Table 1. The Representativeness of the Teacher Sample on the Criteria of Type of School and Geographical Location.

Type of School in Selected sample	Number of Schools in the state	Geographical location of schools in selected sample			Sample size as a % of population	Number and Percentage of Teachers included in the study sample		
		urban	rural	total		Number of teachers in study sample	Number of teachers employed in the state	Percentage
PRIMARY (a) National (Malay medium) (b) National Type (English medium)	137	6	16	22	16%	120	1210	10%
	19	5	7	12	63%	80	515	15.5%
	156	11	23	34	21.8%	200	1725	11.6%
SECONDARY (a) National (Malay medium) (b) National Type (English medium)	25	3	5	8	32%	80	366	21.9%
	39	5	7	12	30.8%	50	998	5.0%
	64	8	12	20	31.0%	130	1364	9.5%
TOTAL	220	19	35	54	24.5%	330	3089	10.6%

Table 2. Distribution of Teachers Completing Questionnaires by Type of School and Language Medium

Type of School in Selected Sample	Number and Percentage of Teachers Completing Questionnaire		
	Number of teachers given questionnaires	Number of teachers who completed questionnaires	Sample size as percentage of teacher population
<u>PRIMARY</u>			
(a) National (Malay medium)	120	70	58.3%
(b) National Type (English medium)	80	62	77.5%
	200	132	66.0%
<u>SECONDARY</u>			
(a) National (Malay medium)	80	66	82.5%
(b) National Type (English medium)	50	46	92.0%
	130	112	86.2%
TOTAL and PERCENTAGE	330	244	73.9%

In the selection of teachers, consideration was given to the following factors:

- (1) A balance was kept between male and female teachers in both primary and secondary Malay and English medium Schools.
- (2) Teachers selected had different levels of academic qualifications.
- (3) Teachers selected had different levels of professional training and qualifications.

(4) Questionnaires were completed by teachers with varying teaching experience.

✓ Distribution of teachers by race, age, sex and qualifications appear in Appendix E

A consequence of the sampling procedure is that despite a heavier sampling ratio for Inspectors, the total number of cases of Inspectors (38) is small compared to teachers (244). This could place restrictions on the number of controls that can be used in the analysis of qualitative data.

The Instrument

In order to carry out the primary purposes of the study, information was collected from two main sources: Inspectors themselves and teachers in Malay and English medium primary and secondary schools. The specific research instrument that was used to ascertain Inspector/teacher perceptions of the inspectorial role was the survey questionnaire for both Inspector and teacher samples. The questionnaires or Soalselidik Soalselidik appear in Appendix A (for Inspectors of Schools), Appendix B (for Teachers in Malay medium primary and secondary schools) and in Appendix C (for teachers in English-medium primary and secondary schools).

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire, though identical for both Inspectors and teachers, differ in certain sections for each respondent. The questionnaire for teachers has the following sections:

- A. The section of the questionnaire on Personal and Educational Background - to obtain factual data about teachers.
- B. The section of the role questionnaire used in ascertaining from teachers their evaluations of many aspects of the Inspector's job.
- C. The section of the questionnaire used to obtain ratings of the guidance functions of Inspectors of schools.
- D. The section of the questionnaire used to ascertain the significance of problems and hindrances involved in inspection.
- E. The section of the questionnaire used to obtain attitudes of primary and secondary teachers towards inspection and their suggestions and remarks to improve the supervisory function.

The questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools contains the following sections:

- A. The section of the questionnaire on Personal and Educational Background to obtain factual data about Inspectors of Schools.
- B. The section of the questionnaire used to ascertain from Inspectors their evaluations of many aspects of the Inspector's job.
- C. The section of the questionnaire used to obtain job satisfaction of Inspectors of Schools.

D. The section of the questionnaire used to ascertain the significance of problems and hindrances involved in inspection.

The headings were selected and questions framed only after a through study of the literature on educational inspection and role of Inspectors of schools and supervisors. Ideas for the construction of the questionnaire came from a number of sources.¹ The questionnaire was changed and modified several times as a result of constructive suggestions by several faculty members and persons closely associated with educational inspection in Malaysia.

1. References to these sources are:

- (a) Ziff, Norman, "Role of the General Secondary School Supervisor", Educational Leadership, Vol. XVI, No. 8, May 1959, pp. 500-502, p. 516.
- (b) Gross, Neil and Herriott, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1965. pp. 169-181.
- (c) Gross, Neil, Mason, Ward S. and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958. Appendix A and Appendix B, pp. 329-353.
- (d) Mukherjee, Gaitri Hena. The Principal's Staff Leadership Role - A Survey of Principal and Teacher Expectations in Selected Petaling Jaya and Kuala Lumpur Schools. Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation, University of Malaya, 1970. Appendix D, pp. 86-89.
- (e) Cunningham, K.S. and Morey, Elwyn A. Children need teachers; a study of the supply and recruitment of teachers. Melbourne, Australian Council for Educational Research, 1947. (ACER Series, No. 62), Ch. VII, pp. 146-151.
- (f) Institute of Superintendents of Schools (1959) The Functions of a Superintendent of Schools, Education Department, Western Australia.

The Time Schedule for the Study

This was as follows:

1. Permission to carry out the study and administer questionnaires to Inspectors of Schools and in schools in Negri Sembilan was sought from the Director, Educational Planning and Research Division, Ministry of Education on 13th October, 1973. Permission was granted by the Chief Education Adviser, through the EPRD, on 16th October, 1973.
2. Permission to go into the listed primary and secondary schools in Negri Sembilan was made to the Director of Education, Negri Sembilan on 18th October, 1973 and permission was granted by him on 19th October, 1973.
3. A pretest was conducted between 15th and 20th October, 1973 at Sekolah Dato Abdul Razak, Seremban involving fifteen teachers. A pretest for Inspectors of Schools had been carried out in the first week of October, 1973.
4. The final form of the questionnaire, in both languages, was administered to teachers in Negri Sembilan between 22nd and 24th October, 1973 and on 30th and 31st October, 1973.
5. Of the 330 teachers requested to complete the questionnaire, 244 responded by returning the completed questionnaires before Schools closed for the year on 9th November, 1973.

6. Inspectors of Schools were involved in public examinations - the Cambridge School Certificate and Higher School Certificate examinations. Replies from them were received by 30th November, 1973.

Administration of Questionnaire

The questionnaire for both Inspectors of Schools and teachers was administered in the following manner. The Director of Education, Negri Sembilan had provided the researcher with a letter of introduction to heads of schools listed in the teacher sample. The heads co-operated most readily and most of them undertook to distribute the questionnaires to other teachers themselves. A few heads assigned the task of selection of teachers to fill in the questionnaires to their senior assistants. The heads of schools or senior assistants, as the case may be, were briefed on the nature of the study to be undertaken and the researcher would then cover all sections of the questionnaire, pointing out what was required of the teachers. Because the period of visits to schools coincided with many schools' preparation for speech day and end of year examinations, it was not possible to get teachers selected together to discuss the questionnaire. Problems raised were noted down and this facilitated smoother administration of the questionnaires in other schools. The respondents were asked to leave those sections and questions they found difficult for the next visit of the researcher.

However, teachers readily answered the questionnaire unaided and it was only left for the researcher to collect the completed questionnaires from schools in the last two weeks of the school term. The teachers were assured that strict anonymity would be maintained and they were requested to complete all sections of the questionnaire.

Similarly, the Chief Inspector of Schools was briefed on the purpose of the visit and the objective of the study. He then instructed the Senior Inspector to deal with the matter. Forty copies of the questionnaire were left with the Senior Inspector for distribution to all Inspectors of Schools, excluding the Chief and Deputy Chief Inspector of Schools. The questionnaires were given in on 20th October, 1973. Of the 38 Inspectors given the questionnaires to complete, 28 returned the completed questionnaires.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter seeks to provide information for an analysis of the various aspects of the leadership role of Inspectors of Schools in his relationship with primary and secondary school teachers. The views of Inspectors and teachers on the effectiveness of the Inspector's functions and characteristics of his work load and on problems relating to educational inspection are also presented in detail.

Information obtained from Inspectors of Schools and teachers is presented and discussed in relation to the five questions set forth in Chapter I under the sub-heading, "The Study". This information is organised under general headings which correspond with the main headings in the questionnaires for Inspectors and teachers and as far as possible with concepts from the related literature. Discussion of each question will include: (1) a restatement of the question; (2) a description of the statistical treatment of the data relating to the question; (3) presentation of the data; (4) a discussion of significant features revealed in the data, which will include comparisons made in respondents' (Inspectors and teachers) answers to the various questions asked in Chapter I; and (5) any other relevant comments.

Question 1

- a. Does the Inspector of Schools perceive his role as being primarily that of giving advice to teachers?
- b. Do teachers perceive the Inspector's role as primarily that of giving advice to them?

Data in answering these questions were gathered from Section B of the questionnaire for Inspectors and Sections B and C of the questionnaire for teachers. These relate to the functions and tasks of the Inspector, his work load and distribution of his time/effort, Inspectors' and teachers' views on the present and desired allocation of time/effort for each of the eight responsibility areas enumerated. The new emphasis on persuasive leadership, consultation and guidance of Inspectors of Schools and supervisors has already been discussed in Chapter I. Of the eight responsibility areas listed for the Inspector, responsibility area III - the advisory and guidance function - is deemed to be directly related to the Inspector's role in providing leadership to teacher groups.

In broad terms, an Inspector's responsibility may be divided into three major functions:

1. The Administrative Function.
2. The Assessing Function.
3. The Advisory Function.¹

1. "Functions of Superintendents of Schools", Monograph. Institute of Superintendents of Schools, Education Department, Western Australia, 1959.

In the light of the new advisory role of Inspectors and supervisors, is there a consensus of opinion among Inspectors of Schools in Malaysia and teachers that the advisory function should take precedence over the administrative and assessing functions?

Section B.2. of the questionnaire for Inspectors and teachers sought to provide information for an analysis of the importance of the advisory function of Inspectors in relation to the administrative and assessing functions. It was felt that the leadership role of the Inspector could be best described in terms of the respondents' perceptions of the order of importance of the three listed functions. It is imperative that perceptions of Inspectors and teachers be congruent as far as the advisory role of Inspectors is concerned for a more meaningful analysis of the other aspects of the Inspector's functions. Inspectors and teachers were asked to rank the administrative, assessing and advisory functions in order of importance. Their responses are presented in Table 3.

Inspectors of Schools were almost unanimous (96.42%) that the advisory function is the most important; however, one Inspector felt that the assessment function is the most important. Seventeen Inspectors rated the assessment function as the next most important one while 18 (64%) viewed the administrative function to be the least important. Teachers, too, agreed that the Inspector's advisory role is the most important function - agreement on this varied from 57% for Secondary School (Malay medium) teachers to 74% for Secondary

Table 3. Inspector and Teacher Responses of the Order of Importance Attached to Inspector's Administrative, Assessment and Guidance Functions.

Function	Inspectors	Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers			Primary School (English medium) Teachers			Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers			Secondary School (English medium) Teachers					
		Rank order of importance of function														
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3			
1 Administration	Number	0	10	18	12	18	40	14	24	24	17	19	30	6	17	23
	Per cent	0.00	35.71	64.28	17.14	25.71	57.14	22.58	38.70	38.70	25.75	28.78	45.45	13.04	36.95	50.00
2 Assessment	Number	1	17	10	16	19	25	10	17	35	11	26	29	6	20	20
	Per cent	3.57	60.71	35.71	22.85	41.42	35.71	16.12	27.41	56.45	16.66	39.39	43.93	13.04	43.47	43.47
3 Advisory and Guidance	Number	27	1	0	42	23	5	38	21	3	38	21	7	34	9	3
	Per cent	96.42	3.57	0.00	60.00	32.85	7.14	61.29	33.87	4.83	57.57	31.81	10.60	73.91	19.56	6.32

School (English medium) teachers. Three groups of teachers - Primary School (Malay medium), Secondary School (Malay and English medium) - rated the assessment and administrative functions as being the second and third most important, respectively. In the opinion of Primary School (English medium) teachers, the administrative function is more important than the assessment function. There is consensus of agreement, therefore, among Inspectors and the majority of teachers that the advisory function is the most important of functions listed for the Inspector.

If the advisory function is perceived to be the most important function by Inspectors and teachers, what are Inspectors' and teachers' perceptions of the allocation of Inspector's time/effort to providing advice and guidance to teachers at the present time? In Section B.3. of the questionnaire for both Inspectors and teachers, eight responsibility areas of Inspectors of Schools were listed, including the advisory and guidance function. Inspectors and teachers were asked to state the percentage of time/effort that Inspectors devote to each area of responsibility at the present time. The data obtained from this section of the questionnaire was treated to obtain the frequencies of responses as the respondents rated each responsibility area, according to seven response categories: above 24%, 20-24%, 15-19%, 10-14%, 5-9%, 1-4% and 0%. Frequencies of responses for the advisory and guidance function are reported in Table 4 as percentages of the total number of responses for each of the two groups of respondents, Inspectors and teachers.

Table 4. Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Providing Advice and Guidance to Teachers at the Present Time as Perceived by Inspectors of Schools and Teachers.

	Advisory and Guidance Function		Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	Inspectors	Number	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
		Per cent	92.85	3.57	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers	Number	16	19	7	8	4	1	1	14
		Per cent	22.85	27.14	10.00	11.42	5.71	1.42	1.42	20.00
3	National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers	Number	7	5	2	12	3	0	0	33
		Per cent	11.29	8.06	3.22	19.35	4.83	0.00	0.00	53.22
4	National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers	Number	14	9	2	16	0	0	5	20
		Per cent	21.21	13.63	3.03	24.24	0.00	0.00	7.57	30.30
5	National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers	Number	13	8	1	9	2	0	1	12
		Per cent	28.26	17.39	2.17	19.56	4.34	0.00	2.17	26.08

From the information in Table 4, 26 Inspectors (92.85%) believed they devoted more than 24% of their present time/effort to providing guidance to teachers. Only one Inspector felt he devoted less than 15% of his time/effort to this function.

In the case of National Primary School (Malay medium) teachers, exactly half of them felt the Inspector devoted 20% or more of his time to giving them guidance; 14 (20%) were unable to ascertain what fraction of the Inspector's time/effort was devoted to the guidance function. Allocation of Inspector's time/effort to giving guidance to teachers was perceived to be lowest by Primary School (English medium) teachers - only 12 teachers (19%) thought the Inspector devoted 20% or more of his time/effort to the advisory role. The number of "no responses" in this teacher group, 33 or 53%, is the highest of the four groups of teachers. Approximately 1/3 of National Secondary School (Malay medium) teachers thought the Inspector devoted 20% or more of his time/effort to the advisory function; 5 teachers thought the Inspector did not devote any fraction of his time/effort to this function at all. "No responses" from this group of teachers totalled 20 (30%). Of the 46 English medium Secondary School teachers responding, 13 (28%) believed the Inspector devoted more than 24% of his time/effort to the advisory role while eight felt the Inspector devotes only 20-24% of his time to this function. The number of no responses, 12 or 20%, is again significant.

While 96.42% of Inspectors believed they are at present devoting at least 20% of their time/effort to providing advise and

guidance to teachers, only 91 teachers (37%) perceived them to be so involved. Another significant feature of the responses to this section of the questionnaire was that a total of 79 teachers (32%) could not say what fraction of the 100% of the Inspector's time/effort was devoted to the advisory function.

Next, Inspectors and teachers were asked how they would like the Inspector to devote his time/effort to the advisory and guidance function, if circumstances were ideal. For this purpose, Section B.3. (b) was drawn up and the responses tabulated in Table 5. It was found that 26 Inspectors (one less than the number in Table 4) desired an allocation of a minimum 20% time/effort to be devoted to their guidance role, while the Inspector who devoted 14% of his time/effort to the guidance function, desired to maintain the same allocation of his time/effort to providing guidance to teachers. One Inspector declined to give any allocation of his time/effort to any of the eight responsibility areas listed. He wrote

It is difficult to enter figures as required because of overlap in meaning, etc. I would like to have more time for reading to follow-up problems that we meet in schools and to attempt to solve them and to be much more effective in Bahasa Malaysia.

Teachers' pattern of responses to this section follows that established in Table 3 - i.e. there was an all-round feeling among teachers that the Inspector should increase the allocation of his time/effort to providing teachers guidance and advise. 78% of National Primary School (Malay medium) and National Type Secondary School

Table 5. Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Providing Guidance and Advice to Teachers as Perceived by Inspectors and Teachers.

Advisory and Guidance Function		Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1 Inspectors	Number	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Per cent	39.28	3.57	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.57
2 National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers	Number	42	13	6	2	4	0	0	3
	Per cent	60.00	18.57	8.57	2.85	5.71	0.00	0.00	4.29
3 National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers	Number	31	13	3	6	0	0	0	9
	Per cent	50.00	20.96	4.83	9.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.51
4 National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers	Number	26	10	5	6	7	0	0	12
	Per cent	39.39	15.15	7.57	9.09	10.60	0.00	0.00	18.18
5 National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers	Number	29	7	2	4	0	0	0	4
	Per cent	63.04	15.21	4.34	8.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.69

(English medium) teachers wished to see the Inspector devote 20% or more of his time/effort to giving them guidance, while the percentages for Malay medium Secondary School and National Type Primary School (English medium) teachers were 54% and 71% respectively. With the increase in percentage distribution of teachers who desire more than 20% allocation of Inspector's time/effort, there is a fairly substantial decrease in middle categories - columns 3 (15-19%) and 4 (10-14%). The number of "no responses" is lowest for Primary School (Malay medium) teachers (3 or 4%) and highest for National Secondary (Malay medium) teachers, (12 or 18%). When Table 4 and 5 are compared, the number of teachers who think more than 20% of the Inspector's time/effort should be directed towards providing advice and guidance to teachers shows an increase of 32.79%, compared with a decrease of 3.57% for Inspectors of Schools.

The next concern was to establish the degree of importance attached to the Inspector's advisory and guidance responsibility area in relation to his other responsibility areas as perceived by Inspectors and teachers. Section B.3. (a) of the questionnaire for both Inspectors and teachers provided the information for an analysis of the relative importance of the Inspector's advisory role. The respondents, Inspectors and teachers, were asked to state the amount of time/effort Inspectors devoted to each responsibility area at the present time and also their preferred allocation of the Inspector's time/effort. The frequencies of responses to each response category of percentage of time/effort

were then obtained. These categories were (1) above 24%; (2) 20-24%; (3) 15-19%; (4) 10-14%; (5) 5-9%; (6) 1-4%; and (7) 0%. The frequencies are reported as percentages of the total number of respondents for each of the five respondent groups. Data was treated to obtain mean weights for each responsibility area and these were used to rank the areas of responsibilities of the Inspector of Schools in Tables 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

In Table 3, Inspectors of Schools had listed the advisory and guidance function as being the most important, with the assessment function mentioned next in importance and the administrative function the least important. In the allocation of their time/effort, responses from Inspectors confirmed the same order of placement of the three responsibility areas listed. Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education took fourth place. Inspectors spent least effort and time to establishing community relations, placed eighth, and research (in seventh place).

National Primary School (Malay medium) teachers also perceived that the Inspector devoted most of his time/effort at the present time to providing teachers with guidance (Table 7). The administrative and assessment functions were relegated to third and fourth places, respectively, below duties as an Education Officer of the Ministry of Education. Research was placed fifth on this list. Two responsibility areas - providing material and equipment and promoting self-growth - took a joint sixth place, while the establishment of community relations

Table 6. Inspectors' Allocation of Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	6.86	Advisory and guidance function	26 92.85%	1 3.57%	0 0.00%	1 3.57%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%
2	4.21	Assessment	4 14.28	3 10.71	6 21.42	6 21.42	5 17.85	0 0.00	3 10.71	1 3.57
3	3.86	Administration	1 3.57	1 3.57	5 17.85	10 35.71	10 35.71	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57
4	3.29	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	1 3.57	2 7.14	0 0.00	8 28.57	12 42.85	1 3.57	3 10.71	1 3.57
5	3.11	Self-growth	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	12 42.85	11 39.28	2 7.14	2 7.14	1 3.57
6	2.82	Material and equipment	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	6 21.42	15 53.57	4 14.28	2 7.14	1 3.57
7	2.50	Research	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57	3 10.71	13 46.42	4 14.28	6 21.42	1 3.57
8	1.75	Community relations	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57	7 25.00	5 17.85	14 50.00	1 3.57
9	0.07	Miscellaneous duties	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57	0 0.00	27 96.42

Table 7. Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	4.40	Advisory and guidance function	16 22.85%	19 27.14%	7 10.00%	8 11.42%	4 5.71%	1 1.42%	1 1.42%	14 20.00%
2	3.66	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	15 21.42	6 8.57	4 5.71	9 12.85	17 24.28	1 1.42	4 5.71	14 20.00
3	3.61	Administration	9 12.85	10 14.28	5 7.14	21 30.00	4 5.71	3 4.28	3 4.28	15 21.43
4	3.59	Assessment	8 11.42	12 17.14	4 5.71	21 30.00	4 5.71	1 1.42	5 7.14	15 21.43
5	3.11	Research	3 4.28	5 7.14	10 14.28	17 24.28	13 18.57	2 2.85	6 8.57	14 20.00
6	2.67	Material and equipment	0 0.00	2 2.85	9 12.85	14 20.00	20 28.57	3 4.28	8 11.42	14 20.00
6	2.67	Self-growth	0 0.00	3 4.28	4 5.71	21 30.00	19 27.14	0 0.00	8 11.42	15 21.43
8	2.27	Community relations	1 1.42	4 5.71	1 1.42	11 15.71	21 30.00	0 0.00	16 22.85	16 22.85

Table 8. Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	2.68	Administration	14 22.58%	3 4.83%	6 9.67%	5 8.06%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	34 54.83
2	2.35	Advisory and guidance function	7 11.29	5 8.06	2 3.22	12 19.35	3 4.83	0 0.00	0 0.00	33 53.22
3	2.24	Assessment	3 4.83	9 14.51	4 6.45	10 16.12	1 1.61	0 0.00	1 1.61	34 54.83
4	2.13	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	2 3.22	5 8.06	8 12.90	9 14.51	4 6.45	0 0.00	0 0.00	34 54.83
5	1.65	Material and equipment	1 1.61	1 1.61	2 3.22	9 14.51	14 22.58	0 0.00	1 1.61	34 54.83
6	1.40	Research	0 0.00	1 1.61	0 0.00	10 16.12	10 16.12	4 6.45	3 4.83	34 54.83
6	1.40	Community relations	1 1.61	0 0.00	0 0.00	9 14.51	11 17.74	4 6.45	3 4.83	34 54.83
8	1.29	Self-growth	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 1.61	4 6.45	16 25.80	4 6.45	3 4.83	34 54.83

Table 9. Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	3.74	Administration	9 13.63%	20 30.30%	1 1.51%	11 16.66%	5 7.57%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	20 30.30%
2	3.50	Advisory and guidance function	14 21.21	9 13.63	2 3.03	16 24.24	0 0.00	0 0.00	5 7.57	20 30.30
3	3.32	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	5 7.57	11 16.66	5 7.57	18 27.27	7 10.60	0 0.00	0 0.00	20 30.30
4	3.02	Assessment	4 6.06	5 7.57	6 9.09	18 27.27	13 19.69	0 0.00	0 0.00	20 30.30
5	2.69	Research	0 0.00	0 0.00	11 16.66	19 28.78	15 22.72	1 1.51	0 0.00	20 30.30
6	2.39	Self-growth	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 6.06	18 27.27	20 30.30	3 4.54	0 0.00	20 30.30
7	2.14	Community relations	0 0.00	1 1.51	3 4.54	13 19.69	18 27.27	3 4.54	8 12.12	20 30.30
8	1.98	Material and equipment	0 0.00	0 0.00	5 7.57	12 18.18	13 19.69	3 4.54	13 19.69	20 30.30

Table 10. Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area at the Present Time in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	4.07	Advisory and guidance function	13 28.26%	8 17.39%	1 2.17%	9 19.56%	2 4.34%	0 0.00%	1 2.17%	12 26.08%
2	4.02	Administration	12 26.08	6 13.04	5 10.86	9 19.56	1 2.17	0 0.00	1 2.17	12 26.08
3	3.35	Assessment	2 4.34	7 15.21	9 19.56	11 23.91	2 4.34	1 2.17	1 2.17	13 28.26
4	2.67	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	1 2.17	2 4.34	3 6.52	16 34.78	6 13.04	2 4.34	3 6.52	13 28.26
5	2.50	Research	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 8.69	18 39.13	5 10.86	2 4.34	4 8.69	13 28.26
6	2.39	Self-growth	1 2.17	1 2.17	1 2.17	16 34.78	6 13.04	2 4.34	6 13.04	13 28.26
7	2.26	Material and equipment	1 2.17	0 0.00	3 6.52	9 19.56	12 26.08	2 4.34	6 13.04	13 28.26
8	2.02	Community relations	0 0.00	1 2.17	1 2.17	10 21.73	9 19.56	2 4.34	11 23.91	12 26.08

was viewed to receive the least time/effort of Inspectors. Approximately 80% of teachers in this group responded by filling in responses to each responsibility area.

As a group, teachers from National Type Primary Schools (English medium) did not perceive Inspectors to be devoting most of their time/effort to the advisory and guidance responsibility area, (Table 8). They viewed the Inspector's primary occupation to be in administrative duties, while the advisory function was placed second. For these teachers, assessment came third and duties as an Education Officer, fourth. Providing teachers with material and equipment was viewed as being next in importance. Research and community relations were placed jointly in sixth place. Self-growth of Inspectors was perceived to receive the Inspectors least time/effort. Incidentally, this group of teachers had the highest number of "no responses", $\frac{3}{4}$ or 55%, when compared with other groups.

The administrative function was placed first and the advisory and guidance function second by National Secondary School (Malay medium) teachers - and this was also the perception of teachers in English medium Primary schools. Unlike this latter group, Malay secondary school teachers viewed the assessment function as occupying less time/effort of Inspectors, being placed fourth after duties as an Education Officer. Research and self-growth took fifth and sixth places, respectively. The group believed Inspectors devoted more of their time/effort to establishing community relations than to the material and equipment responsibility area.

The last group, the teachers in National Type Secondary School (English medium), believed Inspectors to be devoting most of their time/effort to the advisory and guidance function (as did Inspectors themselves and Malay-medium Primary School teachers). The administrative and assessment functions were placed next in order of Inspector's time/effort allocation. These teachers saw the Inspector devote more time to his duties as an Education Officer of the Ministry, placed fourth, than to research, fifth and self-growth, sixth. Providing material and equipment and establishing community relations took seventh and eighth places, respectively. The number of "no responses" to allocation of time/effort to each responsibility area, 13 or 28%, is the second lowest of all groups of teachers.

While Inspectors were convinced they devoted most of their time/effort to their leadership role in providing guidance to teachers, the four teacher groups were divided in their perceptions of time/effort allocation to the advisory and guidance responsibility area by Inspectors. A total of 128 teachers (52%), made up of 62 English medium Primary School teachers and 66 Secondary Malay medium School teachers, did not perceive the Inspectors of Schools to be devoting most of their time/effort to the advisory and guidance responsibility area. While Inspectors perceived themselves to devote most of their time/effort, after the Advisory function, to the Assessment function, teachers as a group unanimously rejected the Assessment function as the first priority of Inspectors of Schools. Malay medium Primary and Secondary

School teachers viewed it to merit fourth placing while English medium Primary and Secondary teachers placed this responsibility area in third position. This being so, what change is preferred by Inspectors and teachers in the allocation of Inspector's time/effort to the guidance function? A comparison of Tables 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 with Tables 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 will indicate the extent to which the advisory and guidance responsibility area is not receiving enough of the Inspector's time/effort at the present time.

A comparison of Tables 11 and 6 reveals that Inspectors' perceptions of the rank order of importance of the advisory and guidance function, the assessment and administrative functions remain unchanged. Inspectors desired to promote self-growth after this. Duties as an Education Officer of the Ministry were considered to merit more time/effort than doing research, which was placed sixth. Providing material and equipment and establishing community relations were considered to be areas which should occupy the least of their time and effort. The same Inspector declined to state preferred allocation of his time/effort to each responsibility area.

All groups of teachers agreed the Inspector ought to devote the most of his time/effort to the advisory and guidance function (Tables 12-15). A total of 171 teachers (70%) desired a 20% or more allocation of Inspector's time/effort to providing them with guidance. Primary school (Malay medium) teachers felt the Inspector ought to devote more of his time/effort to providing them with material and

Table 11. Inspectors' Preferred Allocation of their Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	6.61	Advisory and guidance function	25 89.28%	1 3.57%	0 0.00%	1 3.57%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	1 3.57%
2	4.36	Assessment	4 14.28	5 17.85	5 17.85	6 21.42	4 14.28	0 0.00	3 10.71	1 3.57
3	3.57	Administration	0 0.00	5 17.85	1 3.57	8 28.57	8 28.57	4 14.28	1 3.57	1 3.57
4	3.54	Self-growth	0 0.00	2 7.14	2 7.14	12 42.85	8 28.57	2 7.14	1 3.57	1 3.57
5	3.00	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	0 0.00	2 7.14	0 0.00	8 28.57	11 39.28	1 3.57	5 17.85	1 3.57
6	2.79	Research	1 3.57	0 0.00	0 0.00	8 28.57	9 32.14	3 10.71	6 21.42	1 3.57
7	2.61	Material and equipment	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57	7 25.00	14 50.00	3 10.71	2 7.14	1 3.57
8	2.21	Community relations	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57	14 50.00	4 14.28	8 28.57	1 3.57
9	0.07	Miscellaneous duties	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57	0 0.00	27 96.42

Table 12. Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	6.03	Advisory and guidance function	42 60.00%	13 18.57%	6 8.57%	2 2.85%	4 5.71%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	3 4.28%
2	4.23	Material and equipment	8 11.42	8 11.42	8 11.42	30 42.85	9 12.85	1 1.42	3 4.28	3 4.28
3	4.04	Administration	2 2.85	14 20.00	6 8.57	28 40.00	13 18.57	0 0.00	4 5.71	3 4.28
4	3.94	Assessment	3 4.28	8 11.42	8 11.42	31 44.28	12 17.14	2 2.85	3 4.28	3 4.28
5	3.73	Research	2 2.85	8 11.42	9 12.85	24 34.28	14 20.00	6 8.57	4 5.71	3 4.28
6	3.29	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	3 4.28	4 5.71	4 5.71	21 30.00	23 32.85	0 0.00	12 17.14	3 4.28
7	3.24	Self-growth	1 1.42	1 1.42	3 4.28	27 38.57	25 35.71	6 8.57	4 5.71	3 4.28
8	3.11	Community relations	0 0.00	3 4.28	7 10.00	22 31.42	19 27.14	4 5.71	12 17.14	3 4.28

Table 13. Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	5.39	Advisory and guidance function	31 50.00%	13 20.96%	3 4.83%	6 9.67%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	9 14.51%
2	4.26	Administration	8 12.90	15 24.19	5 8.06	20 32.25	4 6.45	0 0.00	1 1.61	9 14.51
3	3.76	Assessment	1 1.61	9 14.51	11 17.74	24 38.70	7 11.29	0 0.00	0 0.00	10 16.12
4	3.42	Research	0 0.00	8 12.90	2 3.22	30 48.38	11 17.74	0 0.00	1 1.61	10 16.12
5	3.11	Material and equipment	0 0.00	3 4.83	1 1.61	27 43.54	20 32.25	1 1.61	0 0.00	10 16.12
6	3.06	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	0 0.00	5 8.06	2 3.22	22 35.48	19 30.64	1 1.61	3 4.83	10 16.12
7	2.84	Community relations	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 3.22	24 38.70	22 35.48	0 0.00	4 6.45	10 16.12
8	2.81	Self-growth	0 0.00	3 4.83	2 3.22	15 24.19	26 41.93	2 3.22	4 6.45	10 16.12

Table 14. Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	4.73	Advisory and guidance function	26 39.39%	10 15.15%	5 7.57%	6 9.09%	7 10.60%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	12 18.18%
2	3.44	Assessment	3 4.54	8 12.12	5 7.57	23 34.84	13 19.69	0 0.00	2 3.03	12 18.18
3	3.39	Research	3 4.54	5 3.57	10 15.15	15 22.72	21 31.81	0 0.00	0 0.00	12 18.18
4	3.38	Material and equipment	7 10.60	7 10.60	4 6.06	15 22.72	15 22.72	1 1.51	5 7.57	12 18.18
5	3.30	Administration	6 9.09	4 6.06	2 3.03	26 39.39	11 16.66	0 0.00	5 7.57	12 18.18
6	3.12	Community relations	1 1.51	10 15.15	3 4.54	17 25.75	16 24.24	1 1.51	6 9.09	12 18.18
7	2.92	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	0 0.00	5 7.57	4 6.06	16 24.24	25 37.87	0 0.00	4 6.06	12 18.18
8	2.68	Self-growth	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 4.54	19 28.78	26 39.39	2 3.03	4 6.06	12 18.18

Table 15. Preferred Allocation of Inspector's Time/Effort to Advisory and Guidance Responsibility Area in Relation to Other Areas of Responsibility as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Area of responsibility	Above 24%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	5-9%	1-4%	0%	No Response
1	5.89	Advisory and guidance function	29 63.04%	7 15.21%	2 4.34%	4 8.69%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	4 8.69%
2	4.11	Administration	6 13.04	6 13.04	3 6.52	17 36.95	9 19.56	0 0.00	1 2.17	4 8.69
3	3.93	Assessment	2 4.34	6 13.04	5 10.86	20 43.47	8 17.39	1 2.17	0 0.00	4 8.69
4	3.69	Material and equipment	2 4.34	4 8.69	5 10.86	18 39.13	11 23.91	0 0.00	2 4.34	4 8.69
5	3.54	Research	0 0.00	2 4.34	6 13.04	20 43.47	13 28.26	1 2.17	0 0.00	4 8.69
6	3.26	Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	0 0.00	3 6.52	2 4.34	20 43.47	11 23.91	3 6.52	3 6.52	4 8.69
7	3.07	Self-growth	0 0.00	2 4.34	2 4.34	13 28.26	18 39.13	6 13.04	1 2.17	4 8.69
8	2.78	Community relations	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 4.34	13 28.26	17 36.95	5 10.86	5 10.86	4 8.69

equipment, a view which was shared by Secondary Malay medium teachers. Both these groups pushed duties as an Education Officer of the Ministry to sixth and seventh places, respectively. Teachers in English medium Primary and Secondary schools had an identical response pattern to each responsibility area, both groups viewing the Inspector's primary concern to be in the advisory and guidance responsibility area.

All the Inspector and teacher groups were unanimous in their perceptions of what the chief concern of Inspectors should be, viz., that of providing advice and guidance to teachers.

Views of teachers were further sought on the leadership behaviour of Inspectors of Schools. Section C of the questionnaire for teachers required them to state their responses to 10 questions about the professional leadership given them by Inspectors of Schools. Five response categories were listed: A - Always; B - Frequently; C - Occasionally; D - Almost never; E - Never. The frequencies are reported in Tables 16, 17, 18 and 19 as percentages of the total number of respondents for each of the four groups of teachers. The information was treated to obtain mean weight for each statement relating to a kind of leadership behaviour of Inspectors. For three groups of teachers - from National Primary (Malay medium), National Type Primary (English medium) and National Type Secondary (English medium) schools, the kind of leadership behaviour perceived to be most frequently engaged in is "gives teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity". The statement about leadership behaviour - "gives teachers

Table 16. Responses of National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers to 10 Questions About the Professional Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools.

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying;				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
1	4.00	Gives teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity.	23 32.85%	28 40.00%	15 21.42%	4 5.71%	0 0.00%
2	3.96	Gives teachers the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students.	26 37.14	21 30.00	17 24.28	6 8.57	0 0.00
3	3.71	Brings to the attention of teachers educational literature that is of value to them in their jobs.	16 22.85	26 37.14	21 30.00	6 8.57	1 1.42
4	3.56	Reprimands teachers whose educational ideas disagrees with his own.	18 17.14	28 40.00	20 28.57	7 10.00	3 4.28
5	3.40	Has constructive suggestions to offer teachers in dealing with their major problems.	15 21.42	18 25.71	24 34.28	6 8.57	7 10.00
6	3.37	Utilises research evidence when considering solutions to educational problems.	10 14.28	20 28.57	26 37.14	14 20.00	0 0.00
7	3.16	Takes a strong interest in my professional development, status and conditions of service.	7 10.00	15 21.42	32 45.71	14 20.00	2 2.85

Table 16 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying:				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
8	3.00	Helps teachers to understand the sources of important problems they are facing.	7 10.00	21 30.00	18 25.71	13 18.57	11 15.71
9	2.94	Treats teachers as professionals.	7 10.00	14 20.00	23 32.85	20 28.57	6 8.57
10	2.54	Discourages teachers who want to try out new educational ideas.	2 2.85	10 14.28	23 32.85	24 34.28	11 15.71

Table 17. Responses of National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers to 10 Questions About the Professional Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools.

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying:				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
1	3.85	Gives teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity.	19 30.64%	22 35.48%	16 25.80%	3 4.83%	2 3.22%
2	3.77	Gives teachers the feeling they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students.	18 29.03	17 27.41	22 35.48	5 8.06	0 0.00

Table 17 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying:				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
3	3.69	Has constructive suggestions to offer teachers in dealing with their major problems.	21 33.87	12 19.35	21 33.87	5 8.06	3 4.83
4	3.63	Helps teachers to understand the sources of important problems they are facing.	18 29.03	17 27.41	15 24.19	10 16.12	2 3.22
5	3.32	Treats teachers as professionals.	15 24.19	8 12.90	25 40.32	12 19.35	2 3.22
6	3.31	Brings to the attention of teachers educational literature that is of value to them in their jobs.	12 19.35	13 20.96	21 33.87	14 22.58	2 3.22
7	3.19	Utilises research evidence when considering solutions to educational problems.	3 4.83	17 27.41	32 51.61	9 14.51	1 1.61
8	2.87	Takes a strong interest in my professional development, status and conditions of service.	7 11.29	8 12.90	24 38.70	16 25.80	7 11.29
9	2.69	Reprimands teachers whose educational ideas disagree with his own.	0 0.00	16 25.80	22 35.48	13 20.96	11 17.74
10	2.26	Discourages teachers who want to try out new educational ideas.	1 1.61	10 16.12	13 20.96	18 29.03	20 32.25

Table 18. Responses of National Secondary School (Malay medium)
Teachers to 10 Questions About the Professional
Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools.

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying:				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
1	3.79	Reprimands teachers whose educational ideas disagree with his own.	19 28.78%	23 34.84%	16 24.24%	7 10.60%	1 1.51%
2	3.55	Brings to the attention of teachers educational literature that is of value to them in their jobs.	4 6.06	31 46.96	28 42.42	3 4.54	0 0.00
3	3.47	Gives teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity.	13 19.69	20 30.30	24 36.36	3 4.54	6 9.09
4	3.36	Gives teachers the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students.	6 9.09	24 36.36	25 37.87	10 15.15	1 1.51
5	3.32	Has constructive suggestions to offer teachers in dealing with their major problems.	13 19.69	16 24.24	21 31.81	11 16.66	5 7.57
6	3.12	Helps teachers to understand the sources of important problems they are facing.	6 9.09	25 37.87	16 24.24	9 13.63	10 15.15
7	3.11	Treats teachers as professionals.	8 12.12	19 28.28	16 24.24	18 27.27	5 7.57
8	3.00	Takes a strong interest in my professional development, status and conditions of service.	3 4.54	22 33.33	23 34.84	8 12.12	10 15.15

Table 18 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying:				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
9	2.91	Utilises research evidence when considering solutions to educational problems.	1 1.51	17 25.75	31 46.96	9 13.63	8 12.12
10	2.65	Discourages teachers who want to try out new educational ideas.	2 3.03	8 12.12	32 48.48	13 19.69	11 16.66

Table 19. Responses of National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers to 10 Questions About the Professional Leadership Given Them by Inspectors of Schools.

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying:				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
1	3.83	Gives teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity.	18 39.13%	9 19.56%	13 28.26%	5 10.86%	1 2.17%
2	3.37	Gives teachers the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students.	6 13.04	17 36.95	16 34.78	3 6.52	4 8.69

Table 19 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Statements	Number and per cent of teachers saying:				
			Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Almost never	Never
3	3.09	Has constructive suggestions to offer teachers in dealing with their major problems.	4 8.69	10 21.73	21 45.65	8 17.39	3 6.52
4	2.93	Helps teachers to understand the sources of important problems they are facing.	5 10.86	9 19.56	17 36.95	8 17.39	7 15.21
5	2.91	Treats teachers as professionals.	6 13.04	8 17.39	15 32.60	10 21.73	7 15.21
6	2.83	Brings to the attention of teachers educational literature that is of value to them in their jobs.	2 4.34	9 19.56	18 39.13	13 28.26	4 8.69
7	2.80	Reprimands teachers whose educational ideas disagree with his own.	2 4.34	11 23.91	18 39.13	6 13.04	9 19.56
8	2.76	Utilises research evidence when considering solutions to educational problems.	0 0.00	9 19.56	23 50.00	8 17.39	6 13.04
9	2.43	Takes a strong interest in my professional development, status and conditions of service.	2 4.34	6 13.04	16 34.78	8 17.39	14 30.43
9	2.43	Discourages teachers who want to try out new educational ideas.	1 2.17	6 13.04	18 39.13	8 17.39	13 28.26

the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students" was placed second by all groups of teachers, except by Malay medium Secondary School teachers, who perceived this statement to merit fourth position. Teachers in English medium Primary and Secondary schools listed the leadership behaviour - "reprimands teachers whose educational ideas disagree with his own" - quite low in the order, ninth and seventh, respectively. But with teachers in Malay medium Primary and Secondary schools, this leadership behaviour of Inspectors was viewed more seriously and accordingly appeared higher in their lists - Primary School teachers giving it fourth place and strikingly, Secondary School teachers, first. Oddly enough for Secondary School (Malay medium) teachers, the leadership behaviour - "discourages teachers who want to try out new educational ideas" - appeared last in order of frequency of responses. Yet 50% of this same group felt the Inspector frequently "gave teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity". "Treatment of teachers by Inspectors as fellow professionals" was placed higher in the order by English medium Primary and Secondary School teachers than by teachers in Malay medium schools.

In summary, evidence from Tables 3 to 19 shows that both Inspectors and teachers do perceive the leadership role of Inspectors in providing advice and guidance to teachers to be the most important Inspectoral function. While Inspectors contend that they were in fact devoting the most of their time/effort to providing this

leadership role, teachers' perceptions differed. National Type Primary School (English medium) and National Secondary School (Malay medium) teachers felt the Inspector was not devoting the major part of his time/effort to providing the guidance leadership role as these teachers would desire. The majority of Inspectors and teachers alike preferred the Inspector to devote at least 20% of his time/effort to the advisory and guidance responsibility area in relation to other responsibility areas. Also, all teacher groups perceived the Inspector to be primarily concerned with providing the type of leadership climate that his role network want, although Malay medium Primary and Secondary School teachers felt quite seriously that Inspectors reprimanded teachers whose educational ideas did not agree with Inspectors'.

Question 2

- a. What leadership activities in supervision do Inspectors perceive themselves to be involved in at present?
- b. What leadership activities in supervision do teachers perceive Inspectors to be involved in?

This question aimed at finding out the extent to which Inspectors and teachers perceived the Inspector was involved in, at the present time, in specific leadership activities.

Section B.1., part III was drawn up to provide this information. Nine leadership activities that Inspectors were considered to be involved

in when working with teachers were listed. The respondents, both Inspectors and teachers, were asked to state their perceptions of the degree of involvement by the Inspector in each of the activities according to four response categories: major involvement, moderate involvement, slight involvement and no involvement.

As in the case of previous questions, data was treated to obtain frequencies of responses for each category of involvement for the Inspector and teacher groups. These responses are reported as percentages of the total number of respondents for each of the groups. Further, the mean weight for each leadership activity was derived to rank the leadership activities of Inspectors in order of involvement. Tables 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 present this information in respect of the two groups' perceptions of the Inspector's actual involvement in these leadership activities.

Inspectors perceived themselves to be involved in activities which aim at improving the quality of teaching. They rate "getting teachers to adopt new and better methods" to be the activity they are most involved in at present, followed by "providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source". Twenty-one Inspectors (75%) also perceived the activity - "advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers" as important and rated it third in order of involvement. "Giving sympathetic guidance to beginning teachers" and "developing team work among members of school staffs" were viewed next in order of involvement (Table 20). The leadership activities

Table 20. Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by Inspectors of Schools.

Rank	Mean wt.	Activity	Major involvement	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement	No response
1	4.00	Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	28 100.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%
2	3.71	Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	20 71.42	8 28.57	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00
3	3.64	Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	21 75.00	4 14.28	3 10.71	0 0.00	0 0.00
4	2.93	Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	10 35.71	7 25.00	10 35.71	1 3.57	0 0.00
5	2.75	Developing team work among members of school staffs.	6 21.42	13 46.42	5 17.85	4 14.28	0 0.00
6	2.57	Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	3 10.71	15 53.57	5 17.85	5 17.85	0 0.00
7	2.11	Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	2 7.14	5 17.85	15 53.57	6 21.42	0 0.00
8	2.04	Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	5 17.85	1 3.57	13 46.42	8 28.57	1 3.57
9	1.57	Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	2 7.14	1 3.57	8 28.57	17 60.71	0 0.00

considered to get Inspector's least time/effort were "carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)", placed seventh, "delegating responsibilities to head teachers", placed eighth and "establishing liason with teacher-training colleges", placed ninth. 17 Inspectors (61%) stated that they were in no way involved in establishing contact with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.

Perceptions of National Primary School (Malay medium) teachers of the degree of involvement of Inspectors in leadership activities (Table 21) showed a remarkable agreement with Inspector's own perceptions. For this group of teachers, placings of five leadership activities matched Inspectors' rank placing of the same five leadership activities. They perceived the Inspectors' time/effort to be directed mainly towards (1) "providing them (teachers) information and useful ideas in education from whatever source", (2) "getting teachers to adopt new and better methods", (3) "advising and helping teachers faced with problems", (4) "developing team work among school staff members", and (5) "giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers". As with the perceptions of Inspectors, three activities - "carrying out project work", "delegating responsibilities to head teachers", and "establishing liason with teacher-training colleges" - were perceived by these teachers to receive the Inspector's least time/effort. In fact, 23 teachers (33%) have no way of knowing if Inspectors liase with teacher-training colleges at all.

Table 21. Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Activity	Major involvement	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement	No response
1	2.90	Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	20 28.57%	28 40.00%	19 27.14%	1 1.42%	1 1.42%
2	2.80	Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	16 22.85	35 50.00	11 15.71	5 7.14	3 4.28
2	2.80	Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	17 24.28	33 47.14	13 18.57	3 4.28	4 5.71
4	2.60	Developing team work among members of school staffs.	18 25.71	20 28.57	20 28.57	10 14.28	2 2.85
5	2.19	Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	12 17.14	20 28.57	17 24.28	11 15.71	10 14.28
5	2.19	Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	12 17.14	20 28.57	17 24.28	11 15.71	10 14.28
7	2.07	Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	5 7.14	20 28.57	25 35.71	15 21.42	5 7.14
8	2.00	Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	10 14.28	15 21.42	23 32.85	9 12.85	13 18.57
9	1.33	Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	6 8.57	8 11.42	12 17.14	21 30.00	23 32.85

Opinions of National Type Primary School (English medium) teachers coincided with Primary School (Malay medium) teachers' at the upper end of the involvement scale (Table 22). However, teachers in English medium Primary Schools were of the opinion that Inspector's involvement in "carrying out project work" and "developing team work among members of school staffs" received the Inspector's least time and effort - these activities were ranked eighth and ninth, respectively.

National Secondary School (Malay medium) teachers' and National Secondary School (English medium) teachers' perceptions of Inspector's involvement in leadership activities are shown in Table 23 and Table 24, respectively. The total responses to activities indicated, in some cases, remarkable agreement at both ends of the involvement scale. For both groups, "developing team work among members of school staffs" was viewed to have the least involvement of Inspectors. More than 30% of each group of secondary school teachers viewed "carrying out project work" as the activity in which Inspectors had no involvement.

Some activities which Inspectors felt had a considerable share of their time/effort were viewed differently by teacher groups. For example, the activity - developing team work among members of school staffs - was placed fifth by Inspectors while this activity was placed last by secondary school teachers of both language media and English medium Primary School teachers. Similarly, the activity - "carrying out project work" - was ranked seventh by Inspectors of Schools and lower than this position by English medium Primary and Secondary

Table 22. Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities
as Perceived by National Type Primary School
(English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Activity	Major involvement	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement	No response
1	3.19	Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	27 43.54%	22 35.48%	11 17.74%	2 3.22%	0 0.00%
2	2.98	Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	23 37.09	25 40.32	6 9.67	6 9.67	2 3.22
3	2.94	Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	18 29.03	29 46.77	9 14.51	5 8.06	1 1.61
4	2.82	Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	21 33.87	27 43.54	2 3.22	6 9.67	6 9.67
5	2.60	Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	21 33.87	23 37.09	14 22.58	3 4.83	1 1.61
5	2.60	Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	18 29.03	22 35.48	8 12.90	7 11.29	7 11.29
7	2.53	Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	18 29.03	23 37.09	7 11.29	2 3.22	11 17.74
8	2.42	Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	8 12.90	23 37.09	20 32.25	9 14.51	2 3.22
9	2.15	Developing team work among members of school staffs.	7 11.29	15 24.19	24 38.70	12 19.35	4 6.45

Table 23. Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Activity	Major involvement	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement	No response
1	2.68	Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	18 27.27%	23 34.84%	14 21.21%	8 12.12%	3 4.54%
2	2.52	Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	11 16.66	26 39.39	19 28.78	6 9.09	4 6.06
3	2.38	Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	11 16.66	24 36.36	16 24.24	9 13.63	6 9.09
4	2.32	Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	13 19.69	20 30.30	17 25.75	7 10.60	9 13.63
5	2.14	Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	10 15.15	19 28.78	14 21.21	16 24.24	7 10.60
6	1.97	Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	7 10.60	14 21.21	28 42.42	4 6.06	13 19.69
7	1.95	Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	6 9.09	16 24.24	18 27.27	21 31.81	5 7.57
8	1.94	Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	6 9.09	21 31.81	17 25.75	7 10.60	15 22.72
9	1.88	Developing team work among members of school staffs.	3 4.54	17 25.75	22 33.33	17 25.75	6 9.09

Table 24. Extent of Inspector's Involvement in Nine Leadership Activities as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Activity	Major involvement	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement	No response
1	3.09	Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	17 36.95%	19 41.30%	7 15.21%	3 6.52%	0 0.00%
2	2.96	Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	17 36.95	16 34.78	8 17.39	4 8.69	0 0.00
3	2.87	Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	16 34.78	13 28.26	12 26.08	5 10.86	0 0.00
3	2.87	Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	17 36.95	15 32.60	8 17.39	3 6.52	3 6.52
5	2.76	Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	13 28.26	18 39.13	9 19.56	3 6.52	3 6.52
6	2.50	Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to school.	11 23.91	18 39.13	7 15.21	3 6.52	7 15.21
7	2.33	Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	7 15.21	14 30.43	14 30.43	9 19.56	2 4.34
8	1.98	Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	4 8.69	10 21.73	15 32.60	15 32.60	2 4.34
9	1.96	Developing team work among members of school staffs.	3 6.52	10 21.73	17 36.95	14 30.43	2 4.34

School teachers. The leadership activity of Inspectors establishing liason with teacher-training colleges, probably understandably, received the most number of "no responses" from each teacher group, the percentages varying from 15% to 32%.

Question 3

- a. What leadership activities in supervision would Inspectors themselves like to be involved in?
- b. What leadership activities in supervision would teachers like Inspectors to involved in?

Question 2 examined the extent of involvement in leadership activities by Inspectors as perceived by Inspectors and teachers. This question examines the preferred extent of involvement by Inspectors in leadership activities as seen by Inspectors and teachers.

Information required to answer this question was gathered from two groups' responses to Section B.3., Part III of the questionnaire for Inspectors and teachers. The respondents were requested to state the degree of importance held for each leadership activity and the degree of involvement by the Inspector in that activity. Inspectors and teachers were to rate the importance of each activity according to four categories: very important, important, of little importance and not important. Perceptions of Inspector's degree of involvement in the

activity were also to be rated according to four response categories: major involvement, moderate involvement, slight involvement and no involvement. If a leadership activity was rated very important or important and it was perceived that for that particular activity there was slight or no involvement at all, then it was felt the respondent group desired to see greater involvement in that activity listed for the Inspector.

As in the two previous questions, data was treated to obtain frequencies of responses for each category of activity, according to its importance and involvement at the present time. These frequencies are reported as percentages of the total number for each of the two groups of respondents, Inspectors and teachers. Tables 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 present this information in respect to the two groups' perceptions of the degree of importance of activity and degree of actual involvement in the activity at the present time.

Inspectors listed four leadership activities which they perceived as very important or important but for which the degree of involvement at the present time by them was only moderate, slight or nil (Table 25). These activities are: (1) developing team work among members of school staffs, (2) carrying out project work, (3) giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers and (4) establishing liason with teacher-training colleges. Activity (1) was viewed by 27 Inspectors (96.42%) to be very important or important; 9 Inspectors (32%) perceived themselves to be only slightly involved

Table 25. Inspectors' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time.

Activity	Perception of importance of activity		Perception of degree of involvement in activity		
	very important	important	moderate involvement	slight involvement	no involvement
1 Developing team work among members of school staffs.	13 46.42%	14 50.00%	13 46.42%	5 17.85%	4 14.38%
2 Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	4 14.28	20 71.42	5 17.85	15 53.57	6 21.42
3 Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	15 53.57	13 46.42	7 25.00	10 35.71	1 3.57
4 Liase with Teacher-Training Colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	14 50.00	14 50.00	1 3.57	8 28.57	17 60.71

in it or having no involvement in it at all while 13 Inspectors (46%) felt they had only moderate involvement in it. For activity (2), 24 Inspectors (85%) viewed it as very important/important with 21 Inspectors (75%) perceiving themselves to have no involvement in it or only slight. While all 28 Inspectors viewed "giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers" as important, 11 Inspectors (39%) felt they did

not devote enough of their time/effort to this activity. Establishing liason between the Inspectorate and teacher-training colleges was viewed by Inspectors as having their least involvement - 25 Inspectors (89%) would like to see greater involvement in this activity as all of them viewed this activity as very important (50%) or important (50%).

Teachers as a group would like to see more involvement by Inspectors in more leadership activities than perceived by Inspectors. Primary School (Malay medium) teachers viewed as many as seven leadership activities of Inspectors, as important, which had slight or no involvement of Inspector's time/effort (Table 26). Only in two activities - getting teachers to adopt new and better methods and advising and helping teachers in their problems - did these teachers perceive Inspectors to have major involvement. For leadership activity listed number seven - liase with teacher-training colleges - 21 teachers (30%) viewed this activity as not getting any fraction of Inspectors' time/effort although 53% of teachers regarded this activity as very important or important.

Table 27 reveals that teachers in National Type Primary Schools (English medium) viewed five activities as very important/important for which the degree of involvement was only slight or none at all at the present time. Of these activities, one - developing team work among members of school staffs - was viewed by 36 teachers (58%) to have only slight or no involvement of Inspector's time/effort.

Teachers of National Secondary Schools (Malay medium) in the state viewed as many as eight activities which they regarded as

Table 26. National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time.

Activity	Perception of importance of activity		Perception of degree of involvement in activity		
	Very important	Important	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement
1 Providing information and useful ideas from whatever source.	32 45.71%	32 45.71%	28 40.00%	19 27.14%	1 1.42%
2 Developing team work among members of school staffs.	27 38.57	21 30.00	20 28.57	20 28.57	10 14.28
3 Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	15 21.42	28 40.00	20 28.57	25 35.71	15 21.42
4 Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	21 30.00	30 42.85	20 28.57	17 24.28	11 15.71
5 Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	25 35.71	36 51.42	20 28.57	17 24.28	11 15.71
6 Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	13 18.57	31 44.28	15 21.42	23 32.85	9 12.85
7 Liaise with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	9 12.85	28 40.00	8 11.42	12 17.14	21 30.00

Table 27. National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time.

Activity	Perception of importance of activity		Perception of degree of involvement in activity		
	Very important	Important	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement
1 Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	36 58.06%	24 38.70%	22 35.48%	11 17.74%	2 3.22%
2 Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	24 38.70	31 50.00	23 37.09	14 22.58	3 4.83
3 Developing team work among members of school staffs.	10 16.12	24 38.70	15 24.19	24 38.70	12 19.35
4 Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	13 20.96	26 41.93	23 37.09	20 32.25	9 14.51
5 Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	19 30.64	23 37.09	22 35.48	8 12.90	7 11.29

very important/important for which they felt there was either moderate, slight or no involvement of Inspector's time/effort. Only in the activity where Inspectors delegate responsibilities to head teachers did they express satisfaction in the degree of involvement by Inspectors.

58% of teachers said there was only slight or no involvement in two activities - developing team work among staff members and carrying out project work. Of the 69% teachers who viewed establishing liason between teacher-training colleges and the Inspectorate as important, 36% saw this activity receiving little or no time/effort of Inspectors. For this group of teachers, therefore, there was not the extent of involvement in leadership activities as they would like to see.

Frequencies of responses to leadership activities of Inspectors reported in Table 29 for National Type Secondary School (English medium) teachers reveal that the group perceived as satisfactory the extent of involvement by Inspectors in five activities and perceived slight or no involvement by Inspectors in the remaining four. Activity four - delegating responsibilities to head teachers - was viewed by 23 teachers (50%) to have only slight or no involvement whereas 54% had perceived this activity as very important/important. A lesser number of teachers 17 (37%) saw only slight or no involvement from Inspectors in "giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers" - 39 teachers (85%) having found the activity very important or important. Again, a total of 39 teachers found activity one - advising and helping teachers individually in problems posed by them relating to education - very important/important whereas 12 teachers (26%) thought there was only slight or no involvement in it by Inspectors.

From the analysis of teacher responses, the overall picture emerges that English medium Primary and Secondary School teachers

Table 28. National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time.

Activity	Perception of importance of activity		Perception of degree of involvement in activity		
	Very important	Important	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement
1 Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	19 28.78%	31 46.96%	26 39.39%	19 28.78%	6 9.09%
2 Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	22 33.33	26 39.39	24 36.36	16 24.24	9 13.63
3 Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	25 37.87	29 43.93	23 34.84	14 21.21	8 12.12
4 Developing team work among members of school staffs.	13 19.69	25 37.87	17 25.75	22 33.33	17 25.75
5 Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	12 18.18	26 39.39	16 24.24	18 27.27	21 31.81
6 Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	24 36.36	29 43.93	19 28.78	14 21.21	16 24.24
7 Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	27 40.90	28 42.42	20 30.30	17 25.75	7 10.60
8 Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	23 34.84	23 34.84	21 31.81	17 25.75	7 10.60

Table 29. National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Leadership Activities of Inspectors of Schools and the Degree of Involvement in the Activities at the Present Time.

Activity	Perception of importance of activity		Perception of degree of involvement in activity		
	Very important	Important	Moderate involvement	Slight involvement	No involvement
1 Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	25 54.34%	14 30.43%	16 34.78%	8 17.39%	4 8.69%
2 Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	20 43.47	17 36.95	18 39.13	9 19.56	3 6.52
3 Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	27 58.69	12 26.08	13 28.26	12 26.08	5 10.86
4 Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	13 28.26	12 26.08	14 30.43	14 30.43	9 19.56

perceived Inspectors to be involved in more activities for the benefit of teachers than do teachers in Malay medium Primary and Secondary schools. English medium school teachers expressed greater satisfaction in the extent of involvement by Inspectors in activities which they perceived as very important/important. The total number of activities they perceived as having slight or no involvement was nine compared to fifteen activities listed by Malay medium School teachers.

Question 4

- a. What are Inspectors' perceptions of problems and hindrances preventing Inspectors from achieving their ideal in their job?
- b. What are teachers' perceptions of problems and hindrances preventing Inspectors from achieving their ideal in their job as Inspectors?

Sections C and D of the questionnaire for Inspectors and Section D of the questionnaire for teachers sought to provide information for an analysis of the relative significance of problems facing Inspectors as perceived by Inspectors and teachers. Thirteen problems were listed as possibly preventing Inspectors from having sufficient time or means to carry out their responsibilities. The respondents were requested to rank these problems according to four categories: very significant, significant, of little significance, not significant. Provision was made for respondents to list any other problem or problems they viewed significant.

Data was so treated to obtain frequencies of responses for each category of response. The frequencies are reported as percentages of the total number of respondents for each of the two groups, Inspectors and teachers. Data was also treated to obtain mean weights for each problem area and these were used to rank the problem areas of Inspectors of Schools in Tables 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34.

Table 30 shows that the most significant problem perceived by Inspectors of Schools as preventing them from achieving their ideal in

Table 30. Inspectors' Perceptions of the Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors of Schools from Achieving their Ideal in their Job .

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	No response
1	3.86	Too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively.	24 85.71%	4 14.28%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%
2	3.18	Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment (as do HMIS in U.K.)	11 39.28	12 42.85	4 14.28	1 3.57	0 0.00
3	3.04	Lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors.	5 17.85	20 71.42	2 7.14	1 3.57	0 0.00
4	2.82	Insufficient grant from Ministry to carry out work effectively.	8 28.57	9 32.14	9 32.14	2 7.14	0 0.00
5	2.79	Overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Asst. Organisers of Schools, etc.	9 32.14	7 25.00	9 32.14	3 10.71	0 0.00
6	2.61	Lack of support and recognition by the public of the work of Inspectors of Schools.	5 17.85	13 46.42	4 14.28	6 21.42	0 0.00
7	2.54	Limited promotional opportunities - e.g. to serve in other Divisions of the Ministry, Teacher-Training Colleges, etc.	7 25.00	8 28.57	8 28.57	3 10.71	0 0.00
8	2.43	Exact nature of functions of Inspectors not clearly defined.	3 10.71	12 42.85	7 25.00	6 21.42	0 0.00
9	2.39	Too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing.	3 10.71	9 32.14	12 42.85	4 14.28	0 0.00

Table 30 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	No response
10	2.25	Inspectors vested with insufficient executive powers.	2 7.14	9 32.14	11 39.28	6 21.42	0 0.00
11	2.21	The incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers.	2 7.14	8 28.57	12 42.85	6 21.42	0 0.00
12	1.89	Rigid procedure of inspection and reporting.	0 0.00	4 14.28	17 60.71	7 25.00	0 0.00
13	1.82	Difficulty of travel in rural school inspection.	1 3.57	5 17.85	10 35.71	12 42.85	0 0.00
14	0.11	Too many demands made of Inspectors.	0 0.00	1 3.57	0 0.00	0 0.00	27 96.42

their job was "too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively". Although their efforts are supplemented by State functionaries - State Supervisors, Assistant Organisers, etc. - Federal Inspectors of Schools have to inspect about 5,000 schools and deal with 75,000 teachers. In their view, this task is colossal. Two problems, placed second and third, concern Inspector's personal status and advancement in his profession. These were: (1) Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment as do HMIS in U.K., and (2) lack of academic and in-service

training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors. "Insufficient grant from the Ministry of Education", placed fourth, was also viewed as an obstacle to achieving their job ideal. Inspectors desired greater co-ordination of work and effort with State supervisory personnel. This problem was considered significant enough to be placed fifth. A striking feature of frequency of responses was that 15 Inspectors (53%) perceived as very significant/significant the problem - exact nature of functions of Inspectors not clearly defined - which accordingly was ranked eighth. Inspector perceptions of problems considered least significant were:

- (1) difficulty of travel in rural school inspection, ranked thirteenth
- (2) rigid procedure of inspecting and reporting, placed twelfth, and
- (3) the incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers, ranked eleventh.

Responses of National Primary School (Malay medium) teachers are set out in Table 31. This group's primary concern was the very significant problem of "overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Assistant Organisers, etc." Forty teachers (57%) were convinced that the two roles of Inspectors of Schools - to provide guidance and assess teachers - were incompatible. This problem was placed second. Also, 50% of these teachers felt the exact nature of the functions of Inspectors was not clearly defined and so placed this problem ahead of "too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively", which is ranked fourth. This teacher group did not consider problems, placed eleventh and twelfth - "limited promotional

Table 31. Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
1	2.67	Overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Asst. Organisers of Schools, etc.	20 28.57%	25 35.71%	13 18.57%	6 8.57%	6 8.57%
2	2.63	The incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers.	24 34.28	16 22.85	12 17.14	16 22.85	2 2.85
3	2.41	Exact nature of functions of Inspectors not clearly defined.	13 18.57	22 31.42	20 28.57	11 15.71	3 4.28
4	2.38	Too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively.	16 22.85	16 22.85	19 27.14	17 24.28	2 2.85
5	2.29	Too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing.	11 15.71	17 24.28	26 37.14	13 18.57	3 4.28
6	2.21	Lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors.	17 24.28	32 45.71	11 15.71	9 12.85	1 1.42
7	2.13	Lack of support and recognition by the public of the work of Inspectors of Schools.	7 10.00	20 28.57	26 37.14	9 12.85	7 10.00
8	2.10	Insufficient grant from Ministry to carry out work effectively.	10 14.28	19 27.14	16 22.85	18 25.71	7 10.00
9	2.09	Rigid procedure of inspection and reporting.	4 5.71	27 38.57	17 24.28	15 21.42	7 10.00

Table 31 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
10	2.03	Difficulty of travel in rural school inspection.	11 15.71	20 28.57	11 15.71	16 22.85	12 17.14
11	2.00	Limited promotional opportunities - e.g. to serve in other Divisions of the Ministry, Teacher-Training Colleges, etc.	5 7.14	26 37.14	15 21.42	12 17.14	12 17.14
12	1.97	Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment (as do Her Majesty's Inspectors in U.K.)	10 14.28	16 22.85	16 22.85	18 25.71	10 14.28
13	1.76	Inspectors vested with insufficient executive powers.	5 7.14	16 22.85	19 27.14	17 24.28	13 18.57

opportunities" and "the appointment of the Inspector not being autonomous", respectively - as significant as did Inspectors of Schools. Also, these teachers felt Inspectors need not have executive powers to carry out their job. This problem area was placed last in the list of problems.

Three problem areas: (1) too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing, (2) too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively, and (3) rigid procedure of inspection and reporting were placed higher in the significance scale by teachers in National Type Primary Schools (English medium) than was done by Malay

medium Primary School teachers (Table 32). As with the first teacher group, 55% of English medium Primary School teachers felt the exact nature of functions of Inspectors was not clearly defined and placed this problem area at number five. The problem - "overlap in functions of Inspectors and State supervisory staff" - was pushed down to sixth place by this group. The very problems that Inspectors had considered significant were considered not significant by this group and appear

Table 32. Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Type Primary School (English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
1	3.05	Too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing.	31 50.00%	15 24.19%	8 12.90%	4 6.45%	4 6.45%
2	2.84	Too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively.	16 25.80	24 38.70	18 29.03	4 6.45	0 0.00
3	2.42	Rigid procedure of inspection and reporting.	12 19.35	20 32.25	17 27.41	8 12.90	5 8.06
4	2.37	Lack of support and recognition by the public of the work of Inspectors of Schools.	14 22.58	18 29.03	12 19.35	13 20.96	5 8.06
5	2.24	Exact nature of functions of Inspectors not clearly defined.	11 17.74	23 37.09	6 9.67	14 22.58	8 12.90

Table 32 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
6	2.21	Overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Asst. Organisers of Schools, etc.	8 12.90	27 43.54	7 11.29	4 16.12	4 16.12
7	2.08	The incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers.	9 14.51	15 24.19	17 27.41	14 22.58	7 11.29
8	2.05	Lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors.	9 14.51	24 38.70	6 9.67	7 11.29	16 25.80
8	2.05	Difficulty of travel in rural school inspection.	12 19.35	9 14.51	17 27.41	18 29.03	6 9.67
10	1.77	Limited promotional opportunities - e.g. to serve in other Divisions of the Ministry, Teacher-Training Colleges, etc.	8 12.90	11 17.74	21 33.87	3 4.83	19 30.64
11	1.59	Insufficient grant from Ministry to carry out work effectively.	4 6.45	18 29.03	12 19.35	5 8.06	22 35.48
12	1.56	Inspectors vested with insufficient executive powers.	10 16.12	7 11.29	14 22.58	8 12.90	23 37.09
13	1.22	Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment (as do Her Majesty's Inspectors in U.K.)	6 9.67	8 12.90	10 16.12	8 12.90	30 48.38

in tenth place (limited promotional opportunities for Inspectors) and in thirteenth place (Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment as do Her Majesty's Inspectors in U.K.).

National Secondary School (Malay medium) teachers perceived the problem - incompatibility of roles of Inspectors - to be the most significant (Table 33). Almost 67% felt the exact nature of functions of Inspectors are not clearly defined and so placed this area second

Table 33. Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
1	3.00	The incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers.	22 33.33%	27 40.90%	13 19.69%	3 4.54%	1 1.51%
2	2.79	Exact nature of functions of Inspectors not clearly defined.	19 28.78	25 37.87	11 16.66	11 16.66	0 0.00
3	2.77	Lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors.	25 37.87	19 28.78	10 15.15	6 9.09	6 9.09
4	2.67	Too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively.	18 27.27	21 31.81	16 24.24	9 13.63	2 3.03
5	2.64	Difficulty of travel in rural school inspection.	18 27.27	26 39.39	10 15.15	4 6.06	7 10.60

Table 33 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
6	2.56	Overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Asst. Organisers of Schools, etc.	19 28.78	22 33.33	8 12.12	11 16.66	5 7.57
7	2.36	Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment (as do Her Majesty's Inspectors in U.K.)	17 25.75	16 24.24	15 22.72	10 15.15	8 12.12
8	2.26	Rigid procedure of inspection and reporting.	11 16.66	18 27.27	23 34.84	5 7.57	9 13.63
9	2.11	Lack of support and recognition by the public of the work of Inspectors of Schools.	12 18.18	13 19.69	20 30.30	12 18.18	9 13.63
10	2.00	Limited promotional opportunities - e.g. to serve in other Divisions of the Ministry, Teacher-Training Colleges, etc.	2 3.03	23 34.84	24 36.36	7 10.60	10 15.15
11	1.95	Too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing.	9 13.63	15 22.72	15 22.72	18 27.27	9 13.63
12	1.83	Inspectors vested with insufficient executive powers.	9 13.63	12 18.18	21 31.81	7 10.60	17 25.75
13	1.56	Insufficient grant from Ministry to carry out work effectively.	6 9.09	15 22.72	15 22.72	14 21.21	12 18.18
14	0.06	Miscellaneous duties - demands at short notice.	1 1.51	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	65 98.48

Table 34. Significance of Problems and Hindrances Preventing Inspectors from Achieving their Ideal in their Job as Perceived by National Type Secondary School (English medium) Teachers.

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
1	2.78	Too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively.	16 34.78%	16 34.78%	6 13.04%	4 8.69%	3 6.52%
1	2.78	Lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors.	14 30.43	14 30.43	9 19.56	2 4.34	7 15.21
3	2.74	Overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Asst. Organisers of Schools, etc.	15 32.60	15 32.60	8 17.39	5 10.86	3 6.52
4	2.65	Too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing.	13 28.26	17 36.95	8 17.39	3 6.52	4 8.69
5	2.63	Exact nature of functions of Inspectors not clearly defined.	14 30.43	17 36.95	6 13.04	2 4.34	7 15.21
5	2.63	Rigid procedure of inspection and reporting.	14 30.43	15 32.60	9 19.56	2 4.34	6 13.04
7	2.26	The incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers.	9 19.56	16 34.78	8 17.39	4 8.69	7 15.21
8	2.07	Inspectors vested with insufficient executive powers.	7 15.21	12 26.08	11 23.91	9 19.56	7 15.21
9	1.98	Difficulty of travel in rural school inspection.	7 15.21	8 17.39	12 26.08	15 32.60	4 8.69

Table 34 (cont'd)

Rank	Mean wt.	Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	Not applicable (I don't know)
10	1.85	Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment (as do Her Majesty's Inspectors in U.K.)	7 15.21	8 17.39	12 26.08	9 19.56	10 21.73
11	1.69	Limited promotional opportunities - e.g. to serve in other Divisions of the Ministry, Teacher-Training Colleges, etc.	6 13.04	8 17.39	11 23.91	8 17.39	13 28.26
11	1.69	Insufficient grant from Ministry to carry out work effectively.	6 13.04	13 28.26	4 8.69	7 15.21	16 34.78
13	1.67	Lack of support and recognition by the public of the work of Inspectors of Schools.	4 8.69	8 17.39	13 28.26	11 23.91	8 17.39

in significance. Inspectors' and this group's perceptions of the significance of the problem area - lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors - coincide; both respondent groups place this problem in third position. A significant feature of this table is that teachers give a high placing, (fifth), to "difficulty of travel in rural school inspection". This is not surprising as 60% of teachers in this group were from rural areas. Placing of problem area - "overlap in functions of Inspectors and State Supervisors, etc." coincide at number six for English medium

Primary School teachers and this group. Also teachers in this group did not think promotional opportunities are limited for Inspectors (placed eleventh).

National Type Secondary School (English medium) teachers share Inspectors' perception that there are "too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively"; 32 teachers (69%) said it is the most significant problem facing Inspectors. These teachers were also concerned at Inspector's lack of academic and in-service training facilities for self-advancement (placed second). A little over 67% of teachers believed the exact nature of functions of Inspectors were not clearly defined for him and, accordingly, this problem area was ranked fifth. Like their Malay medium Secondary School counterparts, these teachers did not perceive as significant limited opportunities for promotion for Inspectors (placed tenth).

The problem - too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively - was perceived by all 28 Inspectors to be very significant/significant while 149 teachers (61%) also viewed it as very significant or significant. Inspectors and teachers from Secondary Schools perceived "lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors" to be a more significant problem than did Primary School teachers. Also a higher percentage of teachers (59%) than Inspectors (53%) perceived the problem - improper definition of Inspector's functions - to be significant.

While Inspectors perceived problems relating to their status and conditions of work to be more significant, teachers' perceptions

of significance of problems relate more to the manner in which Inspectors carry out their functions. For example, 82% Inspectors viewed as significant their appointment being not autonomous, while another 53% felt there were limited promotional opportunities for them. The job satisfaction of Inspectors of Schools appear in Appendix F, the information being obtained from Section C of the questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools. However, both groups, Inspectors and teachers, viewed the low Inspector to teacher ratio to be significant enough to impede proper execution of Inspector's functions.

Question 5

Attitudes of Teachers Towards Inspection.

- a. Is there any increase in diffidence in asking for advice from Inspectors of Schools as teachers grow older?
- b. Are attitudes towards inspection the same or different among primary and secondary school teachers?
- c. What percentage of teachers regard the Inspectors' visits as being educationally valuable?
- d. What are teacher suggestions and remarks whereby the Inspectors' visits could be made more beneficial?

Section E of the questionnaire for teachers was drawn up to obtain teachers' attitudes towards inspection¹ and provide answers to the four questions listed above in Question five. The section was divided into two parts: Part I which required teachers to provide 'yes' or 'no' answers to six specific questions relating to educational inspection; teachers were also asked if they preferred formal or informal visits by Inspectors. In Part II, space was provided for teachers to make suggestions and remarks aimed at making school inspection more effective and beneficial.

Data was treated to determine frequencies of responses made by each teacher group to each of the four specific questions asked in Question five. These are discussed below, each in turn.

- a. Is there any increase in diffidence in asking for advice from Inspectors as teachers get older?

The first two questions of Section E of the questionnaire for teachers dealt with the freedom with which teachers ask the Inspector for advice. Frequencies are reported in Table 35 as percentages of the total number of respondents in each age group. An analysis of teacher responses, by age group, revealed that there is no increase of diffidence in asking for advice as the teacher gets older.

1. This section of the questionnaire is adapted from that used by the Australian Council for Educational Research in a research study done in 1938 on teacher attitudes to educational inspection. See Cunningham, K.S. and Morey, Elwyn A., Children need teachers, a study of the supply and recruitment of teachers. Melbourne. Australian Council for Educational Research, 1947 (ACER Series No. 62) pp. 146-151.

Table 35. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Teacher Responses, by Age Group, to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision.

Number and per cent of teachers, by age group, saying:														
Age Group														
	1 (18-25 Yrs.)		2 (26-30)		3 (31-35)		4 (36-40)		5 (41-45)		6 (46-50)		7 (51-54)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you ask the Inspector questions and advice on the subject of teaching methods?	12	7	58	18	58	19	32	8	13	4	3	3	5	2
	60.00	35.00	76.31	23.69	74.36	24.36	80.00	20.00	76.47	23.53	50.00	50.00	71.43	28.57
2. Do you ask the Inspector for advice on the subject of problem children?	10	9	49	27	49	29	29	11	10	7	4	2	5	2
	50.00	45.00	64.47	35.53	62.82	37.18	72.50	27.50	58.82	41.18	66.66	33.33	71.43	28.57
3. Do you consider the Inspector's visit of value to you a. in conveying new ideas?	17	2	56	20	64	14	33	7	14	3	4	2	7	0
	85.00	10.00	73.68	26.32	82.05	17.95	82.50	17.50	82.35	17.65	66.66	33.33	100.00	0.00
b. in estimating success of your work?	12	7	38	37	42	35	23	17	8	9	3	3	6	1
	60.00	35.00	50.00	48.68	53.84	44.87	57.50	42.50	42.35	57.65	50.00	50.00	85.71	14.29

To the question "do you ask the Inspector questions on the subject of teaching methods?" teachers in age group four (36-40 years) had the highest (80%) 'yes' score while teachers in (46-50 years) age group had the lowest percentage score of 'yes' (50%). Further, 11% more teachers in group seven (51-54) asked the Inspector for advice on teaching methods than did group one (18-25 years). Teachers in the youngest age group (18-25 years) returned a 50% 'yes' score to the question "do you ask the Inspector for advice on the subject of problem children?" while teachers in age group four again returned the highest percentage 'yes' score (72-50%). Another significant feature of the responses was that teachers in the oldest age group (51-54 years) had a higher percentage of 'yes' scores than teachers in all other groups, except group four (36-40 years).

When teacher responses to questions one and two of the questionnaire (Section E, part I) were considered together, it was found that there was no increase of diffidence in asking for advice as teachers get older. The highest percentage 'yes' scores was found for group four (76%) followed by group seven (71%), group two (70%), group three (69%), group five (68%), group six (58%) and group one (55%).

b. Are attitudes to inspection the same or different among

Primary and Secondary School teachers?

In order to obtain attitudes of Primary and Secondary School teachers towards inspection, two sets of questions were prepared and these are outlined in Section E, Part I of the questionnaire for teachers.

The first set of questions, Question 1 and 2, deal with the freedom with which teachers ask for advice on matters of teaching methods and problem children. The second set (Questions 3a, 3b, 3c and 3d) asked teachers whether they considered the Inspector's visit of any value in conveying new ideas, estimating success of work, inspiring to experiment and helping with difficulties. Responses of teachers in the English medium and Malay medium Primary and Secondary Schools are reported in Table 36.

An analysis of teacher responses to Question 1 and 2 showed that more teachers in the English medium Primary and Secondary Schools asked for advice than teachers in Malay medium Primary and Secondary Schools. When percentage 'yes' scores for the two questions were tabulated, it was found that teachers from English medium Primary Schools had the highest percentage, 81.45% followed by English medium Secondary School teachers, 65%, Primary School (Malay medium) teachers, 66.43%, and Secondary Malay medium teachers, 59.09%.

Next, responses from Primary and Secondary School teachers were considered separately to see if attitudes to inspection differed among them. These responses are tabulated in Table 37. The response scores of the two teacher groups showed 9.6% more Primary School (Malay and English medium) teachers asked for advice than Secondary School teachers from Malay and English medium schools.

Order of freedom with which all groups of teachers asked for advice was on matters of

Table 36. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Teacher Responses to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision.

Question		Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers		Primary School (English medium) Teachers		Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers		Secondary School (English medium) Teachers		Total Responses*	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you ask the Inspector 1 questions and advice on the subject of teaching methods?	Number	52	18	50	10	41	25	38	8	181	61
	Per cent	74.28	25.71	80.64	16.12	62.12	37.87	82.60	17.39	75.00	25.00
Do you ask the Inspector 2 for advice on the subject of problem children?	Number	41	29	51	10	37	29	27	19	156	87
	Per cent	58.57	41.42	82.25	16.12	56.06	43.93	58.69	41.30	64.00	36.00
Do you consider the 3 Inspector's visit of value to you a. in conveying new ideas?	Number	67	3	50	11	50	16	28	18	195	48
	Per cent	95.71	4.28	80.64	17.74	75.75	24.24	60.86	39.13	80.00	20.00
b. in estimating success of your work?	Number	40	29	37	23	36	30	19	27	132	109
	Per cent	58.14	41.42	59.67	37.09	54.54	45.45	41.30	58.69	54.00	46.00
c. as inspiring to experiment?	Number	48	22	40	20	41	25	20	26	149	93
	Per cent	68.57	31.42	64.51	32.25	62.12	37.87	43.47	56.52	61.00	39.00
d. in helping with difficulties?	Number	48	21	47	15	45	21	19	27	159	84
	Per cent	68.57	30.00	75.80	24.19	68.18	31.81	41.30	58.69	65.00	35.00

* There were a total of 10 no responses

(a) teaching methods (75%)

(b) problem children (64%)

c. What percentage of teachers regard the Inspectors' visits as being educationally valuable?

Responses of teachers to the remaining four questions of the six listed in Table 36 provided the information to answer the above question. The questions and replies were as follows:

1. Do you consider the Inspector's visit of value to you in conveying new ideas?

A majority of teachers (80%) agreed that it did, the percentage of affirmative replies varying from 60.86% for National Type Secondary School (English medium) teachers to 95.71% for Primary School (Malay medium) teachers. More Primary School teachers than Secondary School teachers considered the Inspector's visit valuable in conveying new ideas.

2. Do you consider the Inspector's visit of value to you in estimating success of your work?

Low percentage 'yes' scores were recorded by all teacher groups; 58.69% of Secondary School (English medium) teachers stated the Inspector's visit did not result in their being able to estimate success of their work. Overall, 54% of all teachers felt the Inspector's visit valuable in enabling them to estimate success of their work. This percentage score (54%) incidentally, is the lowest obtained for the four questions asked.

3. Do you consider the Inspector's visit as inspiring to experiment?

The affirmative replies from all teacher groups to this question showed consistency for the first three groups of teachers mentioned but 26 teachers (56.20%) in Secondary English medium schools asserted the Inspector's visit was not inspiring to experiment. The negative replies from this teacher group still resulted in 61% of teachers stating that the Inspector's visit was inspiring to experiment.

d. Do you consider the Inspector's visit of value to you in helping with difficulties?

Of the four teacher groups, Primary School (English medium) teachers found the visits of Inspectors most valuable in helping with difficulties. Yet again 58.69% of Secondary School (English medium) teachers felt the Inspectoral visits did not help solve their difficulties. However, 65% of all teachers found the Inspectoral visit did help in finding solutions to difficulties.

When responses of Primary and Secondary School teachers were viewed separately (Table 37), it was found that in reply to every question, a considerably smaller percentage of Secondary School teachers considered the Inspector's visit valuable, the percentage of 'yes' scores being 71.40% for Primary School teachers as against 57.59% for Secondary School teachers.

From the data in Table 36, the Inspectoral visit was found to be most valuable by 73% of National Primary School (Malay medium)

Table 37. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Replies from Primary and Secondary School Teachers to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision.

		Primary School (Malay and English medium) Teachers			Secondary School (Malay and English medium) Teachers		
		Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No	No Response
1	Do you ask the Inspector questions and advice on the subject of teaching methods?	Number 102 Per cent 77.27	28 21.21	2 1.52	79 70.54	33 29.46	0 0.00
2	Do you ask the Inspector for advice on the subject of problem children?	Number 92 Per cent 69.69	39 29.55	1 0.76	64 57.14	48 42.86	0 0.00
3	Do you consider the Inspector's visit of value to you a. in conveying new ideas?	Number 117 Per cent 88.64	14 10.60	1 0.76	78 69.64	34 30.36	0 0.00
	b. in estimating success of your work?	Number 77 Per cent 58.33	52 39.39	3 2.28	55 49.11	57 50.89	0 0.00
	c. as inspiring to experiment?	Number 88 Per cent 66.00	42 32.48	2 1.52	61 54.46	51 45.54	0 0.00
	d. in helping with difficulties?	Number 95 Per cent 71.97	36 27.27	1 0.76	64 57.14	48 42.86	0 0.00

teachers, followed by 70% of National Type Primary school (English medium) teachers, 65% of National Secondary school (Malay medium) teachers and 47% of National Type Secondary School (English medium) teachers.

A further analysis was made of teacher responses, by sex, to the four questions and these responses are presented in Table 38 as percentages of the total number of teachers in the sample, i.e. 244. In reply to every question asked, it was evident more male teachers than female teachers found the Inspectoral visit valuable, the percentage of affirmative replies from male teachers being 65.70% as against 60.58% for female teachers.

The order of value of visits as perceived by all teacher groups was as follows

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| 1. in conveying new ideas | (80%) |
| 2. in helping with difficulties | (65%) |
| 3. inspiring to experiment | (61%) |
| 4. in estimating success of work | (54%) |

65% of all categories of teachers found the Inspectors' visits valuable.

Further, teachers were requested to state whether they preferred formal or informal visits by Inspectors. Table 39 presents this information in respect to the four groups' perceptions of the type of visit preferred.

Informal visits by Inspectors are preferred by 87% of all teachers. The majority of teachers in each group desired informal visits

Table 38. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Analysis of Teacher Responses, by Sex, to Six Questions Relating to Educational Inspection and Supervision.

		Male Teachers		Female Teachers	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Do you ask the Inspector questions and advice on the subject of teaching methods?	Number	107 26	74 35	
		Per cent	43.85 10.66	30.33 14.34	
2	Do you ask the Inspector for advice on the subject of problem children?	Number	93 40	63 47	
		Per cent	38.11 16.39	25.82 19.26	
3	Do you consider the Inspector's visit of value to you	Number	109 23	86 25	
	a. in conveying new ideas?	Per cent	44.67 9.43	35.25 10.25	
	b. in estimating success of your work?	Number	75 56	57 53	
		Per cent	30.74 22.95	23.36 21.72	
	c. as inspiring to experiment?	Number	88 43	61 50	
		Per cent	36.07 17.62	25.00 20.49	
	d. in helping with difficulties?	Number	94 39	65 45	
		Per cent	38.52 15.98	26.64 18.44	

Table 39. Teacher Preferences for Formal/Informal Visits by Inspectors
of Schools, by Type of School and Sex.

Type of School	Total Number of Teachers	Number and percentage of teachers preferring formal visits by Inspectors of Schools			Number and percentage of teachers preferring informal visits by Inspectors of Schools		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1 National Primary School (Malay medium)	70	9 12.85%	6 8.57%	15 21.43%	26 37.14%	29 41.43%	55 78.57%
2 National Type Primary School (English medium)	62	7 11.29	0 0.00	7 11.29	30 48.39	25 40.32	55 88.71
3 National Secondary School (Malay medium)	66	4 6.06	1 1.52	5 7.58	37 56.06	24 36.36	61 92.42
4 National Type Secondary School (English medium)	46	2 4.35	3 6.52	5 10.87	20 43.48	21 45.65	41 89.13
TOTAL	244	22 9.01%	10 4.10%	32 13.11%	113 46.31%	99 40.58%	212 86.89%

from Inspectors, the percentage varying from 78.57% in the case of National Primary School (Malay-medium) teachers to 92.42% for teachers in Malay medium Secondary schools.

- e. What are teacher suggestions and remarks whereby the Inspectors' visits could be made more beneficial?

In view of the results obtained, it is interesting to consider the suggestions and remarks made by teachers in the space left at the end of the section. Teachers often expressed their personal views freely and at some length. Apparently, those teachers satisfied entirely with the existing state of affairs left this section blank.

Table 40 represents a summary of suggestions made by all groups of teachers. One outstanding feature characterized the replies, viz., 25% of all replies indicated that teachers desired a change of emphasis from the assessment function to that of suggestion and advice.

The second group of suggestions was concerned with the numerical strength of the Inspectorate and its effectiveness. About 20% of all replies indicated that Inspectors were unable to remain sufficiently long in a school to give the full value of their experience to teachers. This idea was expressed in a number of ways, e.g., 'more time to be spent by Inspectors in schools', 'smaller districts', 'more frequent visits' and 'more Inspectors'.

The inspirational value of a visit was stressed by some teachers; others indicated a desire for more encouragement and better treatment, more constructive criticism and regular informal discussions.

Table 40. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inspection; Summary of Teachers' Suggestions and Remarks.

Suggestions/Remarks		Number of times mentioned by:			
		Primary School (Malay medium) Teachers	Primary School (English medium) Teachers	Secondary School (Malay medium) Teachers	Secondary School (English medium) Teachers
1	Change of emphasis from the assessment function to that of suggestion and advise.	21	18	8	18
2	Inspectors to be more cordial and tactful.	5	8	12	10
3	Inspectors to give teachers new ideas in teaching methods and aids.	10	7	5	11
4	Inspectors to give (more) demonstration lessons.	11	8	7	4
5	More frequent visits by Inspectors.	10	2	9	9
6	Inspectors to give more constructive criticism.	4	5	3	8
7	Selection of Inspectors to be based on wider teaching experience.	5	8	2	1
8	More Inspectors to be appointed.	3	3	6	3
9	There should be greater awareness among Inspectors of problems at local, school level.	5	3	2	4
10	Inspectors to conduct more seminars and in-service courses for teachers.	4	4	2	3
11	Methods of Inspectors and teachers differ - Inspectors should accept suggestions from teachers.	6	1	1	4

Some teachers suggested revision of the means of selection of Inspectors, in particular paying more attention to experience and personality. A majority of replies from teachers in Malay medium Primary and Secondary schools indicated they wished to see more cordial ties established by Inspectors with teachers.

A total of 73 teachers (30%) left the section blank, indicating the fact that they were probably pleased with the present relationship with Inspectors.

Other interesting suggestions made by teachers included the following:

1. Inspectors to return to teaching periodically.
2. Less frequent visits.
3. Inspector to advise beforehand expected time of arrival.
4. Inspectors to observe more and advise less.
5. Keep teachers in districts acquainted with latest developments in education.
6. Training and refresher courses for Inspectors.
7. Evaluate and suggest improvement in school administration.
8. Follow-up visits on recommendations made.
9. After inspectorial visit, Inspector to hold discussions more with teachers and not school head.
10. Press heads to get more material and equipment for schools.
11. More Inspectors to be appointed as specialists.
12. Inspectors to possess higher degrees.

13. Inspectoral visits should not be to find faults.
14. Inspectors should establish better relations with teachers, community.
15. Work of Inspectors and State Supervisors, Assistant Organisers to be co-ordinated.
16. More visits to isolated schools.
17. Inspection to be done individually, not in a group.
18. Inspection to be done in a group, not individually.

An increase in the number of Inspectors would enable them to gain and maintain closer contact with teachers. It seems that much of the dissatisfaction expressed would then vanish.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The objective of this study was to obtain an insight into the present functions and powers of Inspectors of Schools as perceived by Inspectors themselves and teachers in selected Primary and Secondary Malay and English medium schools in Negri Sembilan. The investigation was primarily concerned with the setting in which the Inspector of Schools works - his functions and work load and the distribution of his time among various functions. The views of Inspectors and teachers on the effectiveness of his performance and on problems and hindrances relating to educational inspection were also determined. The Inspector's leadership role in education was examined in terms of relevant information found in the literature on educational inspection and supervision. An examination was made of sections 92-96 of the Education Ordinance 1957 which relate to the duties of Inspectors of Schools.¹

In this chapter, the conclusions stated arise out of the analysis of data and findings presented in this study in relation to the five questions that provided a focus for the study. In addition,

1. Appendix G gives a brief summary of the functions and powers of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools.

recommendations are respectfully submitted as possible contributions to providing more effective leadership services to teachers.

Conclusions

1. a. Inspectors of Schools do perceive their role as being primarily that of giving guidance to teachers. 96.42% of Inspectors stated they devoted 20% or more of their time/effort to providing guidance to teachers.
- b. Although 65% of all categories of teachers found the Inspectors' visits valuable, 52% of the teachers did not perceive the Inspector's role as primarily that of giving advice and guidance to teachers.
2. a. Inspectors of Schools perceived themselves to be involved in those leadership activities that aimed at improving the quality of teaching. Some of the activities which had major involvement of Inspector's time/effort were: (1) getting teachers to adopt new and better methods, (2) providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source, (3) advising and helping teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education, (4) giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers and (5) developing team work among members of school staffs.

b. Teachers' perceptions of Inspectors' involvement in leadership activities did not vary considerably from Inspectors' perceptions. A majority of teachers viewed Inspectors' major involvement to be in providing information and useful ideas in education, helping teachers individually, giving sympathetic guidance to beginning teachers and getting teachers to adopt new and better ideas.

3. a. Inspectors of Schools would like to see themselves involved more in four leadership activities - "developing team work among members of school staffs", "carrying out project work (e.g. school library development, etc.)", "giving sympathetic guidance to beginning teachers" and "establishing liason with teacher-training colleges".

b. Teachers in English medium Primary and Secondary schools perceive Inspectors to be involved in more leadership activities than do teachers in Malay medium Primary and Secondary schools. The former group expressed greater satisfaction at the extent of involvement by Inspectors in activities which they perceived as very important or important. The latter group desired to see Inspectors devote more time/effort in the leadership activities listed. Only in two activities - "getting teachers to adopt new and better methods" and "advising and helping teachers in their problems" - did these teachers perceive Inspectors to have major involvement.

4. a. Inspectors perceived problems relating to their status and conditions of work to be significant. The most significant of these was viewed to be "too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively". Inspectors were also concerned with the "lack of academic and in-service training facilities for self-advancement". Also viewed as significant was "the appointment is not autonomous". "Lack of coordination in the supervisory work of Inspectors with State Supervisors, Assistant Organisers, etc." was also viewed as significant by 53% of Inspectors.
- b. 61% of teachers also viewed the problem - "too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively" as significant. Teachers' perceptions of problems relate to the manner in which Inspectors carry out their functions. Teachers in English medium Primary and Secondary schools also felt that "lack of academic and in-service training facilities for Inspectors" constituted a significant problem. A slightly higher percentage of teachers (59%) than Inspectors (53%) viewed as significant the problem area - "improper definition of the nature of functions of Inspectors".
5. a. There is no increase in diffidence in asking for advice from Inspectors of Schools as teachers get older.
- b. 9.6% more Primary school (Malay and English medium) teachers asked for advice than teachers in Malay and English medium Secondary schools.
- c. (i) More Primary school teachers than Secondary school teachers

considered the Inspectors' visits valuable in conveying new ideas.

- (ii) 80% of all teachers agreed that the Inspectors' visits were valuable in conveying new ideas, the percentages of affirmative replies varying from 60.86% for National Type Secondary school (English medium) teachers to 95.71% for Primary school (Malay medium) teachers.
- (iii) 54% of all teachers found the Inspectoral visits valuable in estimating success of their work.
- (iv) While 61% of all the teachers stated that the Inspector's visit was inspiring to experiment, 56.20% of teachers in National Type Secondary School (English medium) asserted it was not.
- (v) 65% of all teachers found the Inspectors' visits did help in overcoming difficulties; 58.69% of English medium Secondary School teachers disagreed.
- (vi) 13.8% more Primary School teachers than Secondary School teachers considered the Inspectors' visits valuable.
- (vii) 65% of all categories of teachers found the Inspectors' visits valuable.
- (viii) Teachers' perceptions of the order of freedom with which teachers asked for advice is on matters of
 - (a) teaching methods (75%)
 - (b) problem children (64%)

- (ix) Teachers' perceptions of order of value outcomes of visits
 - (a) in conveying new ideas (80%)
 - (b) in helping with difficulties (65%)
 - (c) inspiring to experiment (61%)
 - (d) estimating success of work (54%)
 - (x) More male teachers than female teachers found the Inspectors' visits valuable, the percentages of affirmative replies for male teachers being 68.70% against 60.58% for female teachers.
 - (xi) 87% of all teachers preferred informal visits of Inspectors, the percentages varying from 78.57% for National Primary school (Malay medium) teachers to 92.42% for teachers in Malay medium Secondary schools.
- d. (i) 25% of all replies to the section "Suggestions and remarks to making the Inspectoral visit more beneficial" indicated teachers desired a change of emphasis from the assessment function to that of suggestion and advise.
- (ii) 20% of all replies indicated Inspectors were unable to remain sufficiently long in a school to give the full value of their experience to teachers.
- (iii) 30% of teachers did not make any suggestion or remark, indicating they were probably satisfied with the existing state of affairs

Few educators have at their command greater potentialities for influencing directly the type and quality of education students

are to receive than has the Inspector of Schools. His position of formal leadership provides him with the opportunity to motivate teachers and to improve standards and performance in teaching. The Inspector of Schools, in short, enjoys substantial opportunities to provide a high order of staff leadership.

The Inspector's efforts to conform to his role as an educational leader has constituted the focal point of this study. In the following pages are discussed the major findings of the study.

The advisory function of Inspectors of Schools has increased in importance. It emphasises the constructive side of supervision and there is no doubt that Inspectors of Schools in Malaysia welcome this opportunity to exercise constructive leadership. Teachers, too, for the most part appreciate that new relationships are possible with Inspectors with this change of emphasis. However, the study revealed 52% of teachers did not perceive the Inspector's role as being primarily that of giving advice and guidance to teachers. His position, apart altogether from his quality, makes the Inspector a leader. In his district, the Inspector is often looked on by the Education Department, by community and by teachers as the senior responsible officer of the Ministry of Education who should be able to speak with authority and to command respect for his views. No one else in his district can see the state of its educational institutions and practices as can the Inspector. More must be done to create among teachers a definite awareness of the Inspector's present leadership role.

From the findings of the study it would appear Inspectors have far too little time to do the advisory job they would like to. The present Inspector/school ratio is too great to allow Inspectors the time and the necessary flexibility of movement to devote to his professional leadership role. A possible solution would be to consider reducing the number of teachers in each Inspector's district to give him more time to providing teachers with the necessary advice and guidance. However liberal the intention of the central authority, i.e. the Ministry of Education, the work load may act in such a way as to limit the professional initiative of the Inspector. There are obviously many factors that determine an Inspector's work load - the number of Inspectors of Schools, the amount of travelling involved, the number of experienced teachers and the number of inexperienced teachers, probably being the most important. In most cases, it appears the Inspector's teacher-load is too heavy with the result that he has little time to bring about the desirable relationship with teachers.

A significant feature of the study was that Inspectors and teachers in English medium Primary and Secondary schools were concerned at the lack of academic and in-service training facilities for self advancement of Inspectors. Inspectors would be much better equipped if special attention were given to in-service preparation and regular and ample periods made available for updating of resources. Much more time must be given to the Inspectors' special preparation. Each Inspector needs time to develop an individual interest, to delve deeply

into some professional field. This cannot happen unless special provision is made for it. It is desirable, in determining an Inspector's reasonable work load, that a period of time should be deliberately set aside for the Inspector to undertake some study courses to improve himself. The Inspector himself should be a living example of a person continuously striving to reach higher levels of professional competence. Only then will his efforts be recognised as a sincere expression, not only of what he professes but of what he actually practices. The responsibility for maintaining and strengthening a truly professional spirit of inquiry and study in teachers rests, to large extent, on the Inspector's shoulders. One of the responsibilities of his leadership role is that he must apply himself vigorously the disciplines that he considers desirable for his teachers. This he will only be able to do if he has access to facilities for self-advancement. Considerable responsibility, therefore, rests on the Ministry to provide conditions and opportunities that will assist and encourage the Inspector.

Inspectors perceived as significant the problem - "lack of co-ordination in supervision the work of Inspectors with State Supervisors, Assistant Organisers of Schools, etc." There appears to be a need for closer and more informal liason between the Inspectors and advisory services provided by the State Education Department. Their ready availability to an Inspector is probably the best development of his advisory role.

Because the advisory role is probably of most crucial importance to the young teacher fresh from teachers' college, it is

essential that liason between the Federal Inspectorate and teachers' colleges should be widely developed. The majority of Inspectors and teachers perceived Inspectors to have no involvement in this responsibility area. It is essential that the Inspectorate and teachers' colleges be aware of each others' activities. Out of this liason can come ideas and the practices necessary to make as fruitful as possible the greater attention which must be given to the young teacher by the Inspector. Inspectors and head teachers are naturally concerned with the product of the teachers' colleges. This makes it vitally important that Inspectors should understand what the colleges are trying to accomplish within the limitations of the time available for formal training. If wastage is to be perverted, liason between college and the Inspectorate is imperative. The need to give sympathetic guidance and support to the young teacher provides the Inspector with one of his most important professional functions, a function which in its performance deserves much more thoughtful and thorough preparation than it now receives.

An interesting feature of the study was that while Inspectors perceived assessment to involve the most of their time/effort, after the guidance function, teachers as a group thought the Inspector devoted much less of his time/effort to this function. Of the nine leadership responsibility areas listed for the Inspector, teachers in Malay medium Primary and Secondary schools placed the assessment

function in fourth position while teachers in English medium Primary and Secondary schools thought the assessment function occupied third place in terms of the Inspector's time/effort. The effect on relations between Inspectors and teachers is probably such that, if assessment is too frequent, the advisory role of the Inspector will always be less well done than it could be.

Also significant was the view of teachers in Malay medium Primary and Secondary schools that the Inspector should devote more of his time/effort to providing rural teachers with material and equipment. The need for supervision would appear to be more pronounced in rural schools than in urban schools since ineffective teaching is probably more characteristic of the small rural school. Good education is known to be dependant much more on the pervading atmosphere and on harmonious relations with teachers and pupils than on formal instruction. But good teaching, by which is meant the creation of conditions most conducive to child growth, is undoubtedly assisted by such material aids as classrooms, equipment, textbooks and aids of a similar nature although it is by no means wholly dependent on them. The Inspector has a share in the responsibility to provide the material conditions most helpful to the learning situation. The Inspector has an important part to play in the provision of material conditions for he is one of the major sources upon which the Ministry depends for guidance and advice. Among the many ways help can be given to teachers, the dissemination of ideas about teaching aids and useful material is an important one.

The need for this in rural schools is particularly obvious.

Also noteworthy is the fact that further use can be made of head teachers as a group and as individuals for they have a contribution to make to each other as well as to their schools. Generally speaking, the Inspectors and head teachers may get on well together but because of the nature of their responsibilities, their relationship may tend to lack professional depth. The majority of Inspectors perceived themselves to be only slightly involved in delegating responsibilities to head teachers. Special training in the arts of administration and supervision is as important for head teachers as for Inspectors.

How do the findings of this study compare with findings of research studies on educational inspection and supervision carried out elsewhere?

Research studies carried out in America by Fielstra,¹ Campbell² and Ziff³ had sought to obtain a statement of beliefs about the supervisory role. The findings of these studies showed teacher expectations of the leadership role of supervisors to be that of providing direction, guidance and co-operation to teachers. Maximum goal achievement resulted when the supervisor's expectations for teacher behaviour are identical with the wants and needs of teachers. Inspection and

1. Fielstra, op. cit., pp. 16-18.

2. Campbell, op. cit.

3. Ziff, op. cit., pp. 500-501.

assessment were rejected as a supervisor's role. To some extent the findings of this study are similar to those discussed above in that the majority of teacher respondents were also of the opinion that the role of the Inspector should be that of an adviser. The administrative and assessment functions were viewed to be less important and so merit less of Inspector's time/effort.

Reference is also made to the findings and recommendations of the Select Committee (1968) of the House of Commons as outlined in the Report on Education and Science, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Briefly, these conclusions and recommendations were: the HMIs was a remarkable and useful body of men who need their functions re-defined. The Committee recommended cutting down their numbers, dropping completely the old-fashioned full inspections, giving more emphasis in their recruitment and training to an awareness of the social implications of education, providing for periodic return to work in the classroom and urging far greater co-operation with local inspectors. The Committee noted that in further education, their power to make or break colleges was enormous.

When comparison is made of the findings of the Select Committee and this research study, we note a similarity in some conclusions reached. Obviously, there is a need in Malaysia to increase the strength of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools as the present number is felt to be too small to be an efficient and effective force. The need is also felt here for a **system** of selection of Inspectors that

that will ensure Inspectors' awareness of the social implications of education. Teachers, for example, suggested that Inspectors return to classroom teaching periodically. As has been pointed out, there is also a need for the Inspectorate to establish better relations with State Education Department. However, it would appear that Inspectors in Malaysia have as yet not the wide powers, as have HMIs, to make or break colleges.

A research study carried out by the Australian Council for Educational Research in 1947 had sought to obtain teachers' attitudes towards inspection.¹ The results of the Australian study make interesting comparisons with the findings of this study in so far as teacher attitudes towards inspection are concerned. In the Australian study, it was found that

- (1) more Primary teachers asked for advice than Secondary teachers but on the whole only a little more than half of these teachers considered the Inspectors' visits of any value.
- (2) an analysis by age group revealed that there is an increase of diffidence in asking advice as the teacher gets older, particularly in the case of male teachers.
- (3) 20% of all replies from teachers indicated that the major weakness of the present inspectorial system was that Inspectors were unable to remain sufficiently long in a school to give full value of their experience to teachers.

1. Cunningham and Morey, op. cit., pp. 146-151.

- (4) About 20% of all replies indicated that teachers desired a change of emphasis from the assessment function to that of suggestion and advice.

In comparison, the major findings of this study may be summarised as follows:

- (1) 9.6% more Primary school teachers asked for advice from Inspectors than teachers in Secondary schools.
- (2) 13.8% more Primary school teachers than Secondary school teachers considered the Inspectors' visits valuable.
- (3) 87% of all teachers preferred informal visits of Inspectors of Schools.
- (4) 25% of all replies to the section "Suggestions and remarks to making the Inspectoral visit more beneficial" indicated teachers desired to see a change of emphasis from the assessment function to that of suggestion and advice.
- (5) 20% of all replies indicated Inspectors were unable to remain sufficiently long in a school to give the full value of their experience to teachers.
- (6) 30% of teachers did not make any suggestion or remark, indicating they were probably satisfied with the existing state of affairs.

Recommendations

The conclusions discussed in the preceeding section indicate that many factors make it difficult for Inspectors to perform their functions in an efficient and effective manner. The following recommendations might, therefore, be tentatively suggested.

1. The Ministry of Education should initiate a revision of the Education Ordinance 1957 for the purpose of improving Inspector/teacher relationships. In the Ordinance, the Inspectors' status as an adviser and executive officer is implied rather vaguely, if at all. Clarification is urgently needed of what the advisory and executive functions entail.
2. More Inspectors of Schools should be appointed. The present strength of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools is woefully inadequate.¹ Their numbers should be increased if their services are to be effective and efficient. The number (of Inspectors) should be made to fit work and not work to fit number.
3. The Ministry of Education should consider assisting Inspectors to obtain higher qualifications by making such provision as study leave and attendance at university or other relevant courses. In-service training is strongly recommended to ensure professional

1. A fact attested to by the Minister of Education. See Onn, Hussain, "Education in Malaysia", Talk given by the Honourable Minister of Education at Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, February, 1971. Information Ministry publication, p. 6.

growth and development. Inadequate preparation may have a serious consequence on Inspector competency.

4. Informal liason between the Inspectorate and teacher-training colleges should be strengthened so that the professional training begun at college may be continued in the classroom. There is still a good deal to be done in establishing that close liason between Inspectors and teachers' colleges out of which full understanding of each others' tasks, problems and potentialities can develop. Colleges need Inspectors to keep them in touch with the actual position and needs in schools.
5. As Inspectors expressed dissatisfaction with their present salary scale, consideration should be given to raising salaries substantially.
6. Inspectors of Schools should be encouraged by the Ministry and should attempt on their own initiative to give more leadership to School Boards and teachers. The Inspectors, through adequate pre-service and in-service preparation, should be able, then, to motivate and inspire the teachers to some extent in soliciting the professional assistance which they invariably need.

Further Research

This study has not been without its limitations. Advancement of knowledge in the field of supervision must go deeper than just evaluating various techniques and processes. It is suggested that further research be carried out to enhance our understanding of the concepts of supervision and leadership and that this research be directed along the following lines.

1. A nation-wide study of supervision for the purpose of determining the optimum work load of Inspectors of Schools and State advisory officers. The objective of the study would be to occasion an equable distribution of responsibilities among them and assignment of an optimum number of School Boards and staff personnel in each supervisory district.
2. An official definition of the duties and responsibilities of the supervising Inspector of Schools.
3. The preparation needs of Inspectors of Schools, West Malaysia.
4. The relationship of effective supervision to teaching practice and pupil achievement.
5. The status of the School Inspector; the objective of the study should be to determine factors which affect the selection of the Inspector, legal status of the incumbent of this position as well as the academic and professional background of the incumbent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ayer, Fred C., Fundamentals of Instructional Supervision. New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954 (Exploration series in education).
2. Baron, George and Taylor, William, ed., Educational Administration and the Social Sciences, The Athlone Press, University of London, 1969.
3. Blackie, John. Inspecting and the Inspectorate, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1970.
4. Boardman, Charles, Douglass, Hard and Bent, Rudyard. Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.
5. Burnham, Reba and King, Martha. Supervision in Action, Washington. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1961.
6. Dodd, W.A., Primary School Inspection in New Countries. Oxford University Press, London. 1970.
7. Edmonds, E.L., The School Inspector, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1962.
8. Franceth, Jane, Supervision as Leadership., Row, Peterson and Co., New York, 1961.
9. Gwyn, Miner J., Theory and Practice of Supervision, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1970.
10. Harris, Ben M., Supervisory Behaviour in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1963.
11. Leeper, Robert, ed., The Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change, ASCD, NEA, Washington 1965.
12. ——— The Supervisor: Agent for Change in Teaching. Washington, The ASCD, NEA, 1966.
13. London County Council. The London Education Service. London, Staple Press, 1961, 104 p.

14. Lucio, William H., and McNeil, John D., Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. MacGraw-Hill, 1962.
15. Lucio, William H., ed., The Supervisor: New Demands, New Dimensions. Washington. The ASCD, NEA, 1969.
16. "Malayan Inspectors at the London Institute of Education", Colonial Review, Vol. 10, September 1957: 67.
17. Mukherjee, G.H., The Principal's Staff Leadership Role - A Survey of Principal and Teacher Expectations in Selected Petaling Jaya and Kuala Lumpur Schools. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. University of Malaya, 1970.
18. Onn, Hussein, Education in Malaysia, Talk given at Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, February 18th, 1971.
19. Rath, James, ed., The Supervisor: Agent for Change in Teaching, Washington, the ASCD, NEA, 1966.
20. Recommendations: International Conferences on Public Education, 1934-1968, UNESCO, International Bureau of Education, Palais Wilson, Geneva, 1970.
21. Report of the Committee on Malay Education, Federation of Malaya, 1951. Government Printing Press, Kuala Lumpur.
22. Report of the Royal Commission on the Teaching Services, West Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Government Printer, 1968.
23. "The Inspectorate: Some Aspects of Administrative Development since 1832". Public Administration, Vol. XXXIII, 1955, pp. 44-57.
24. Wiles, Kimball, Supervision for Better Schools, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1950.
25. Wilson, Percy, Views and Prospects from Curzon Street, Basil Blackwell, London, 1962.
26. Wong, Hoy Kee, Francis and Ee, Tiang Hong. Education in Malaysia, Heinemann Educational Books, (Asia) Ltd., 1971.
27. Wong, Hoy Kee, Francis and Gwee, Yee Hean, Perspectives: The Development of Education in Malaysia and Singapore, Heinemann Educational Books, (Asia) Ltd., 1972.

SELECTED REFERENCES

1. Australian National Co-operating Body for Education. Compulsory Education in Australia. Paris, UNESCO, 1951. 189 p.
2. Ball, D.G., Cunningham, K.S., and Radford, W.C., Supervision and Inspection in Primary Schools. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1961.
3. Butts, Freeman J., Assumptions Underlying Australian Education. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research; New York, Teachers' College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1955, 80 p.
4. Central Advisory Committee on Education, Federation of Malaya, Report of the, Government Printers, Kuala Lumpur. 1968. Ch. 8.
5. Committee on Malay Education, Report of the, Government Printers, Kuala Lumpur, 1951. Ch. VIII, pp. 53-57.
6. Cunningham, K.S., and Moray, Elwyn A., Children Need Teachers, A Study of the Supply and Recruitment of Teachers. Melbourne. Australian Council for Educational Research, 1947. 185 p. (ACER Series No. 62), pp. 146-151.
7. Education Ordinance 1957. Pt. IV, Sections 92-96.
8. Final Report. Conference of Inspectors of Schools in the Far Eastern and Pacific Areas of the Commonwealth, 5-15 August, 1969. Singapore.
9. Gross, Neil and Herriott, Robert E., Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1965.
10. Gross, Neil, Mason, Ward S. and McEachern, Alexander W., Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958.
11. "Inspection as Leadership Through Guidance". Special Issue of The New Era in Home and School, Vol. 36, No.9, November, 1955, pp. 165-198. London. New Education Fellowship.

12. International Conference for Inspectors of Schools, Chichester, England, 1955. Various Papers. London, New Education Fellowship, 1955 Processed.
13. MacArthur, R.S., The Superintendency Leadership in Action. Toronto, The Canadian Education Association, 1955, 25 p. Processed.
14. Royal Commission on the Teaching Service, West Malaysia, Report of the, Government Printers, Kuala Lumpur, 1968. Ch. 8.
15. "School Inspection and Supervision". Special issue of Education Abstracts, Paris, UNESCO, May, 1956, Vol. VIII, No. 5.
16. Select Committee (1968), Report on Education and Science, Part One, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, H.M.S.O.
17. 'Supervision 1959'. Educational Leadership. Vol. XVI, No. 8, May, 1959.
18. "The Supervisor at Work", Educational Leadership, Vol. XIX, No. 2, Nov. 1961, pp. 82-118.
19. Warnasuriya, W. "School Inspection and In-service Training", The New Era in Home and School, Vol. XXXXII, No. 5, May 1961, pp. 84-87.

DOCUMENTS AND GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FEDERAL INSPECTORATE OF SCHOOLS.

1. Central Advisory Committee on Education, Report of the, Council Paper No. 44 of 1951, p. B378, Para. 17.
2. Special Committee on Education Policy, Report of the, Council Paper No. 70 of 1952, p. B788, Para. 44.
3. Education Ordinance, 1952, Federation of Malaya No. 63 of 1952. Part VII, Para 76, pp. 629-630.
4. Report of the Education Committee, 1956. Ch. 4, Para. 42-45.
5. Education Ordinance 1957. Part IV, Para. 92-96.
6. Report of Education Review Committee 1960.
7. Education Act 1961, Sections 96 and 97.

ARTICLES

1. Antell, Henry, "Teachers Appraise Supervisors", Journal of Educational Research, 38 (April 1945), pp. 606-611.
2. Armstrong, Louis E., "Strategy in Supervision", Educational Leadership, Vol. No. 4, pp. 245-248, Jan. 1947.
3. Bossone, R.M., "What Teachers Expect of their Administrators", California Journal of Secondary Education, 23 (February 1957), pp. 70-73.
4. Brammer, Lawrence M., "Counselling for Teachers - The Supervisor's Opportunity and Responsibility", Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. XXXIX, No. 5 (May, 1953), pp. 259-268.
5. Chang Min Phang, Paul, "The Role of the Inspectorate in the Development of Education in Rural Areas - A Malaysian Experience", Occasional Paper 7.
6. Cunningham, L.L., "Effecting Change Through Leadership", Educational Leadership, 21: pp. 75-79 (November 1963).
7. Denecke, Marie, "Supervision: Expectations of Beginning Teachers", Education, Vol. 78, No. 4 (December 1957).
8. Edmonds, E.L., "Inspection of Schools", Education To-day, R.S. Vol. 6, No. 4 (October, 1956). pp. 22-23.
9. _____ "Inspection or Advice?", Presidential Address, National Association of Inspectors and Educational Organisers, 1962.
10. _____ "Some Inspectoral Synonyms", Vocational Aspect, December, 1966.
11. Fielstra, Clarence, "Concepts and Purposes of Supervision held by Educational Leaders in California Public Schools", California Journal of Instructional Improvement, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 16-18 (October, 1958).
12. Frazier, Alexander, "The New Teacher-and a New Kind of Supervision?" Educational Leadership; 21: pp. 97-100 (November, 1963).
13. Greer, Edith S., "Human Relations in Supervision", Education, 82. pp. 203-206 (December, 1961).

14. Johnson, E.S., "Human Dimensions of Supervision", Educational Leadership, 18: pp. 222-227 (January, 1961).
15. Knight, F.B., "Possibilities of Objective Techniques in Supervision", Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 16, No. 1, June 1927, pp. 1-15.
16. Lawler, Marcella, "New Frontiers for Supervision", Educational Leadership, 19: p. 82 (November, 1961).
17. Lawrence, H.S.S., "The Role of the Inspector of Schools", Teaching: A Quarterly Technical Journal for Teachers, Vol. XXXIX, No. 3, March, 1967. pp. 91-95.
18. Lonsdale, B.J., "The 'Guese' of Supervision", Educational Leadership, 21: pp. 69-74 (November 1963).
19. Lucio, W.H., "Instructional Improvement: Considerations for Supervision", Educational Leadership, XX: pp. 211-217 (December, 1962).
20. National Society for the Study of Education. In-service Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators, The Fifty-Sixth Yearbook, Pt. I, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1957.
21. Swearingen, M.E., "Identifying Needs for In-service Growth", Educational Leadership, 17: pp. 332-335 (March, 1960).
22. U.S. Civil Service Commission. Leadership and Supervision, A Survey of Research Findings. Personal Management Series, No. 9, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1955.
23. Walkington, A.H., "Administration and Supervision in the Secondary School: A Survey of the Problems", The Australian Journal of Education, Melbourne, Vol. IX, 1965, pp. 47-54.

APPENDIX AQUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSPECTORS OF SCHOOLSA. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please complete the following responses by checking (✓) or complete the blanks as indicated.

1. Sex (i) Male _____ (ii) Female _____
2. Age (as at 1.1.73) _____ Years _____ Months
3. Race (i) Malay _____
 (ii) Chinese _____
 (iii) Indian _____
 (iv) Eurasian _____
 (v) other (please specify) _____
4. Indicate the highest academic qualifications you hold.

(i) School Certificate _____	(vi) M.Sc. _____
(ii) H.S.C. _____	(vii) M.Ed. _____
(iii) B.A. _____	(viii) R.C.D. _____
(iv) B.Sc. _____	(ix) other _____
(v) M.A. _____	(please specify) _____
5. Indicate the professional qualifications you hold.

(i) NCT _____
(ii) C.T. _____
(iii) S.T.T.I. _____
(iv) Dip. Ed. _____
(v) other (please specify) _____

6. Position held prior to appointment as Inspector of Schools.

7. Date of appointment to the Federal Inspectorate of Schools.

Page 2 of Questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools.

B.1. The following is a check list of activities that Inspectors may or may not be involved in when working with teachers. These activities are conveniently arranged under eight responsibility areas.

For each activity, please answer questions (1) and (2) by writing A,B,C or D in the blank that best indicates your response.

Question (1)	Question (2)
How important a part of the job of Inspector do you view this activity?	Indicate the degree of involvement in each activity listed.
A - very important	A - major involvement
B - important	B - moderate involvement
C - of little importance	C - slight involvement
D - not important	D - no involvement

I. Administration

(1) (2)

1. Interpretation and implementation of educational policies to teachers.

2. Development and supervision of sound school organisation.

I. Administration (cont'd) (1) (2)

3. Development of sound procedures for teachers to assess student progress. _____
4. Plan workshops, conferences, in-service training courses and seminars for teachers. _____

II. Assessment (1) (2)

1. Check observance of school regulations. _____
2. Assessment of teachers for confirmation in service. _____
3. Assessment of teachers for promotion in service. _____
4. Visit classrooms to obtain overview of achievement of pupils. _____

Page 3 of Questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools.

III. Advisory and Guidance Function (1) (2)

1. Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods. _____
2. Advice and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education. _____
3. Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source. _____
4. Developing team-work among members of school staffs. _____
5. Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.) _____
6. Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers. _____

III. <u>Advisory and Guidance Function</u> (cont'd)	(1)	(2)
7. Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	_____	_____
8. Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	_____	_____
9. Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	_____	_____
IV. <u>Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Conduct in-service education courses for teachers.	_____	_____
2. Investigation of complaints by members of the public.	_____	_____
3. Inspecting schools on the request of heads of schools and State Directors of Education.	_____	_____
4. Sitting on professional committees - curricula, etc.	_____	_____
5. Attend meetings of local, state and national professional organisations.	_____	_____
6. Plan annual conference of Inspectors of schools.	_____	_____

Page 4 of Questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools.

V. <u>Material and Equipment</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Procure curricula resources for teachers - A.V.A., library books, etc.	_____	_____
2. Analyse and evaluate instructional programmes for local use.	_____	_____

V. <u>Material and Equipment (cont'd)</u>	(1)	(2)
3. Develop instructional material and aids in teaching.	_____	_____
VI. <u>Research</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Preparation of educational journals, pamphlets and other publications issued by the Ministry.	_____	_____
2. Presentation of working papers at conferences, seminars, talks, etc.	_____	_____
VII. <u>Self-Growth</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Keeping abreast of development in the field of education particularly in the areas of educational inspection and supervision.	_____	_____
2. Regular meetings of Inspectors to exchange ideas and seek common solutions.	_____	_____
3. Enrolling for higher degree courses.	_____	_____
4. Attendances at conferences, sometimes international, seminars, etc. for exchange of ideas.	_____	_____
VIII. <u>Community Relations</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Development of good public relations between school and the community.	_____	_____
<u>Other Areas (Please elaborate, if any)</u>		
IX.		
X.		

Page 5 of Questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools.

- B.2. Of the first three functions listed above, rank them in order of importance.

Function	Ranking
1. Administration	_____
2. Assessment	_____
3. Advisory and Guidance	_____

- B.3. Consider 100% to be the total Time/Effort the Inspector can devote to all areas of responsibility

(a) What fraction of this 100% do you think you devote to each area at the present time?

(b) How would you like to devote the Time/Effort, if circumstances were ideal?

Fill in your responses below.

Area of responsibility	% of Time/Effort devoted now by me	% of Time/Effort I would like to devote
I. Administration	_____	_____
II. Assessment	_____	_____
III. Advisory and Guidance function	_____	_____
IV. Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education	_____	_____
V. Material and Equipment	_____	_____
VI. Research	_____	_____

B.3. (cont'd)

Area of responsibility	% of Time/Effort devoted now by me	% of Time/Effort I would like to devote
VII. Self-Growth	_____	_____
VIII. Community Relations	_____	_____
Other Areas (Please elaborate, if any)		
IX.		
X.		
Total for all areas	100%	100%

Page 6 of Questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools.

C. Job Satisfaction of Inspectors of Schools.

Please check (✓) the box on the right which best indicates your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the corresponding aspect of your present job.	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Response scored as	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
1. Are you satisfied with the present executive authority given you?	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Are you satisfied with the progress you are making towards the objectives which you set for yourself in your present job?	_____	_____	_____	_____

C. Job Satisfaction of Inspectors of Schools. (cont'd)

Please check (✓) the box on the right which best indicates your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the corresponding aspect of your present job.	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Response scored as	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
3. How satisfied are you with your present salary?	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. How satisfied are you with the amount of time you must devote to your job?	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. On the whole, are you satisfied that the school community you visit accept you as a professional expert to the degree to which you feel you are entitled by reason of your position, training and experience?	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. How satisfied are you with your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job?	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. How satisfied are you with the amount of interest shown by the community in its school system?	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. How satisfied are you with your present job when you compare it to similar Inspectoral positions elsewhere (for example, overseas)?	_____	_____	_____	_____

Page 7 of Questionnaire for Inspectors of Schools.

D. Problems and Issues in Inspection

Listed below are 13 problems and hindrances which might prevent Inspectors from having sufficient time or means to carry out their responsibilities as they would like to.

Rank these problems in order of significance as stated by checking (✓) against your response.

Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	significant	of little significance	not significant
1. Too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Lack of support and recognition by the public of the work of Inspectors.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Insufficient grant from Ministry to carry out work effectively.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Exact nature of functions of Inspectors not clearly defined.	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. The incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers.	_____	_____	_____	_____

D. Problems and Issues in Inspection. (cont'd)

Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	significant	of little significance	not significant
8. Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment (as do HMIS).	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Asst. Organisers of Schools, etc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Inspectors vested with insufficient executive powers.	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Rigid procedure of inspection and reporting.	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. Limited promotional opportunities - e.g. to serve in other Divisions of the Ministry, Teacher-Training Colleges, etc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. Difficulty of travel in rural school inspection.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other Problems (Please specify)				
14.				
15.				

Kepada Guru Guru yang berkenaan,

1. Pengajian ini adalah bertujuan untuk mendapatkan pandangan dan harapan guru guru terhadap peranaan yang sepatutnya dimainkan oleh Nadzir-Nadzir Sekolah Sekolah dan kemajuan yang diharapkan oleh guru guru kesan daripada lawatan Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah Sekolah.
2. Pengajian ini telah dipersetujui oleh Pengarah, Bahagian Peranchang dan Penyelidikan Pelajaran, Kementerian Pelajaran.
3. Pengarah Pelajaran, Negeri Sembilan telah memberi saya kebenaran membuat lawatan lawatan ka sekolah sekolah dan membenarkan guru guru memenohi Soalselidik ini.
4. Anda tidak di kehendaki menuliskan nama sama sekali.
5. Adalah di ingatkan janganlah menganggapkan bahawa Soalselidik ini bertujuan untuk menguji penerangan atau kenyataan. Tujuan hanya lah untuk mendapatkan pandangan professional anda mengenai sesuatu perkara penting yang berkaitan dengan pelajaran.
6. Adalah di harapkan semua bahagian yang terdapat di dalam Soalselidik ini di jawab.
7. Pemilihan akan guru guru dan Sekolah Sekolah di buat secara bebas.

SAYA UCAPKAN TERIMA KASIH DIATAS KERJASAMA TUAN TUAN.

Serjit Singh
Fakulti Pendidikan
Universiti Malaya
15.10.73.

APPENDIX B

SOALSELIDIK UNTUK GURU GURU
(Translation of Questionnaire for Teachers)

A. KETERANGAN LATAR BELAKANG

Tolong penohkan kekosongan yang berikut dengan menandakan (✓) atau memenohi kekosongan yang di sediakan.

1. Jantina (i) Lelaki _____ (ii) Perempuan _____
2. Umor sekarang (1) 18-25 _____ (5) 41-45 _____
 (2) 26-30 _____ (6) 46-50 _____
 (3) 31-35 _____ (7) 51-54 _____
 (4) 36-40 _____

3. Tandakan kelulusan akademik anda:

- (1) SRP _____
 (2) School Certificate _____
 (3) SPM _____
 (4) STP _____
 (5) Lain (Tolong huraikan) _____

4. Tandakan kelulusan iktisar anda:

- (1) DTC _____
 (2) RTC _____
 (3) MPSI, Tanjong Malim _____
 (4) Lain (Tolong huraikan) _____

5. Pengalaman mengajar sabagai guru.

- (1) Tahun pertama _____ (5) 16-20 tahun _____
 (2) 2-5 tahun _____ (6) 21-25 tahun _____
 (3) 6-10 tahun _____ (7) atas 25 tahun _____
 (4) 11-15 tahun _____

Page 2 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

B.1. Berikut ialah senarai kegiatan kegiatan di mana Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah mungkin terlibat atau tidak terlibat bila berhubung dengan guru guru. Kegiatan kegiatan ini di susun di bawah lapang bahagian tanggung jawab.

Bagi tiap tiap satu kegiatan tolong jawab soalan (1) dan (2) dengan menuliskan A, B, C atau D sebagai jawapan di dalam kekosongan yang di sediakan.

Sekiranya anda tidak tahu jawapan nya, atau tidak ada kaitan dengan anda, harap tuliskan E di dalam kekosongan petak (2).

Soalan (1)	Soalan (2)
Sajauh manakah anda fikirkan tugas tugas Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah ini penting?	Mengikut pendapat anda sejauh manakah Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah terlibat dalam tugas tugas nya?
A - sangat penting B - penting C - tidak beberapa penting D - tidak penting	A - terlibat dengan sepenuh nya B - terlibat dengan agak memuaskan C - tidak beberapa terlibat D - tidak terlibat E - saya tidak tahu (atau tidak kaitan dengan saya)

I. Pentadbiran

(1) (2)

1. Menerangkan dan mempraktikkan dasar pelajaran pada guru guru.

2. Memerhatikan perkembangan dan mengawas organasasi sekolah.

3. Memerhatikan perkembangan cara guru menilai kemajuan penuntut.

I. <u>Pentadbiran</u> (cont'd)	(1)	(2)
4. Merancang bengkel bengkel, persidangan persidangan, kursus kursus dalam kerja dan seminar seminar untuk guru guru.	_____	_____

Page 3 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

II. <u>Penilaian</u>	(1)	(2)
----------------------	-----	-----

- | | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| 1. Mengawasi memerhatikan sejauh manakah sekolah menjalankan undang undang nya. | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Menentukan samada guru guru layak atau tidak mendapat status tetap sabagai guru kerajaan. | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Menentukan samada sasaorang guru guru itu layak di naik pangkat atau tidak. | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Melawat bilek bilek darjah untuk mendapatkan pandangan mengenai kebolehan murid murid. | _____ | _____ |

III. <u>Tugas Sebagai Penasihat dan Pemandu</u>	(1)	(2)
---	-----	-----

- | | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| 1. Mendapatkan kerjasama guru guru mengajar mereka menderima cara baru yang lebih memuaskan. | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Menasihati dan menolong guru guru berkaitan dengan masaalah yang di bangkitkan oleh guru guru berhubung dengan pelajaran. | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Memberi penerangan dan buah fikiran yang berguna berkaitan dengan pelajaran dari mana mana punca. | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Menjalankan kerjasama di antara guru guru sekolah. | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Menjalankan projek projek (chontoh, kemajuan perpustakaan). | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Memberi panduan dan sokongan kepada guru guru baru. | _____ | _____ |

III. <u>Tugas Sebagai Penasihat dan Pemandu (cont'd)</u>	(1)	(2)
7. Melaporkan pada pihak yang berkuasa (Kementerian Pelajaran) tentang kehendak, harapan dan aspirasi guru guru.	_____	_____
8. Meletakkan tanggung jawab tanggung jawab atas guru besar guru besar.	_____	_____
9. Menghubungi pengetua pengetua maktab maktab perguruan mendapatkan maklumat mengenai darjah pengetahuan akademik, pengetahuan iktisar dan cara mengajar yang telah di pelajari oleh guru guru maktab maktab tersebut.	_____	_____

Page 4 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

IV. <u>Tugas tugas sebagai Pegawai Pelajaran di Kementerian Pelajaran.</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Menyiasat aduan aduan orang ramai.	_____	_____
2. Melawat sekolah sekolah atas permintaan guru guru besar. Sekolah sekolah dan Pengaroh Pelajaran, Negeri.	_____	_____
3. Menjadi ahli jawatan kuasa - contoh ahli jawatan kuasa kurikulum.	_____	_____
4. Menghadiri mesuarat mesuarat organisasi organisasi yang berkaitan dengan pelajaran di peringkat tempatan, negeri dan kebangsaan.	_____	_____
5. Perancangan mesuarat tahunan Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah.	_____	_____

V. <u>Alat Alat dan Kelengkapan</u>			(1)	(2)
1. Dapatkan bahan kurrikula untuk guru guru - alat panduan pandang dengar, buku buku perpustakaan.			_____	_____
2. Analisa dan nilai-kembali rancangan rancangan pengaran untuk kegunaan tempatan.			_____	_____
3. Mengadakan bahan bahan pengajaran untuk di gunakan sabagai bantuan.			_____	_____
VI. <u>Penyelidikan</u>			(1)	(2)
1. Menyediakan majalah pendidikan, risaalah dan penerbitan penerbitan lain yang di keluarkan oleh Kementerian.			_____	_____
2. Membincangkan kertas kerja di persidangan persidangan, seminar seminar, ceramah, etc.			_____	_____
VII. <u>Perkembangan untuk Sendiri</u>			(1)	(2)
1. Mesti mengikut perkembangan perkembangan yang di laku di pelajaran terutamanya di bahagian pengawasan dan perlawatan sekolah sekolah.			_____	_____
2. Mengadakan meshuarat di antara Nadzir Nadzir sekolah untuk bertukar fikiran dan mendapat penyelisarian yang sama.			_____	_____
3. Melanjutkan pelajaran yang lebeh tinggi.			_____	_____
4. Menghadiri persidangan, kadangkala di peringkat antarabangsa, seminar seminar dan lain lain lagi, untuk bertukaran fikiran.			_____	_____
Page 5 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)				
VIII. <u>Perhubungan dengan Awam</u>			(1)	(2)
1. Mendapat perhubungan yang baik di antara sekolah dan masharakat.			_____	_____

Bidang Lain (Tolong huraikan, jika ada)

IX.

X.

B.2. Daripada tiga tugas yang tertulis di bawah, atur mengikut darjah mustahak.

Tugas	Darjah mustahak
1. Pentadbiran	_____
2. Penilaian	_____
3. Tugas sebagai Penasihat dan Pemandu	_____

Page 6 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

- B.3. Anggap 100% sebagai jumlah masa/tenaga Nadzir Nadzir sekolah boleh di tumpukan kepada semua bahagian tanggung jawab.
- (a) Beberapa bahagian daripada 100% anda fikir Nadzir sekolah tumpuhkan masa/tenaga kepada tiap tiap bahagian tanggung jawab?
- (b) Bagaimana anda mahukan Nadzir Sekolah menumpuhkan masa/tenaga beliau, kira nya di dalam keadaan ideal?

Tolong mengisikan jawapan nya di dalam kekosongan di sediakan.

Bahagian tanggung jawab	% Masa/Tenaga maseh di tumpukan oleh Nadzir Sekolah sekarang.	% Masa/Tenaga saya mahukan Nadzir sekolah tempuhkan.
I. Pentadbiran	_____	_____
II. Penilaian	_____	_____
III. Tugas sebagai Penasihat dan Pemandu	_____	_____
IV. Tugas tugas sebagai Pegawai Pelajaran	_____	_____
V. Alat alat dan kelengkapan	_____	_____
VI. Penyelidikan	_____	_____
VII. Perkembangan	_____	_____
VIII. Perhubungan dengan Awam	_____	_____
<u>Bidang Lain (Tolong huraikan, jika ada)</u>		
IX.	_____	_____
X.	_____	_____
Jumlah semua bahagian	100%	100%

Page 7 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

C. Tolong jawab soalan soalan yang berikut. Tiap tiap kenyataan berkaitan dengan Nadzir Sekolah sekolah. Dalam menjawab sesuatu soalan tolong tuliskan di dalam kotak huruf A, B, C, D atau E yang sesuai yang boleh menerangkan kelakuan Nadzir Nadzir sekolah.

Sajauh manakah Nadzir Sekolah Sekolah
terlibat di dalam corak pelakuan
berikut?

- A - sentiasa
- B - kerap kali
- C - kadang kala
- D - jarang
- E - tidak pernah

Kenyataan

1. Memberi guru guru perasaan yang kerja kerja mereka itu adalah kegiatan kegiatan yang mustahak. ☐
2. Memberi guru guru perasaan yang mereka itu boleh memberi sumbangan yang penting dalam mempertingkatkan pencapaian murid murid dalam bilek darjah. ☐
3. Mempunyai cadangan yang membena untuk di berikan pada guru guru dalam soal menyelesaikan masaalah masaalah besar guru guru. ☐
4. Mempunyai kecenderongan dalam perkembangan perkerjaan saya, taraf dan keadaan berkerja. ☐
5. Melayan guru guru sebagai professional. ☐
6. Tidak menggalakkan guru guru yang ingin mencuba fikiran fikiran baru di bidang pelajaran. ☐
7. Menggunakan hasil hasil penyelidikan bila cuba melesaikan masaalah pelajaran. ☐
8. Menegor guru guru yang mempunyai fikiran dalam bidang pelajaran yang tidak salari dengan nya. ☐
9. Memberitahu guru pekara pekara yang sepatut mereka tahu kerana berkaitan dengan kerjaan mereka. ☐
10. Menolong guru guru memahami punca masaalah masaalah yang mereka hadapi. ☐

Page 8 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

D. Pekara pekara dan masaalah masaalah yang dihadapi Nadzir Nadzir sekolah bila menjalankan tugas.

Dibawah ialah sinarai sinarai masaalah dan rintangan rintangan yang mungkin mengikut Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah daripada menjalankan tugas tugas mereka dengan sepenoh nya.

Tolong atur masaalah masaalah ini mengikut yang penting dahulu sebagai yang ternyata dengan menandakan (✓) di bahagian yang sesuai.

Masaalah/Rintangan	Paling mustahak	Mustahak	Kurang mustahak	tidak mustahak	tidak ada kaitan
1. Terlalu banyak guru guru di dalam satu daerah untuk di awasi dengan berkesan.	—	—	—	—	—
2. Kurang sambutan dan pengiktirafan daripada awam atas tugas Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah.	—	—	—	—	—
3. Terlalu banyak masa di gunakan dalam membuat laporan dan kerja kerja tadbir.	—	—	—	—	—
4. Kurang kelulusan akademik dan kemudahan latehan dalam kerja bagi membolehkan Nadzir Nadzir ini melanjutkan pelajaran.	—	—	—	—	—
5. Kurang bantuan wang dari Kementerian bagi membolehkan mereka menjalankan tugas dengan berkesan.	—	—	—	—	—
6. Tugas Nadzir Nadzir tidak begitu terang.	—	—	—	—	—
7. Peranaan Nadzir Nadzir di bidang panduan dan penilaian tidak selari.	—	—	—	—	—

D. Perkara pekara dan masaalah yang dihadapi Nadzir Nadzir sekolah bila menjalankan tugas. (cont'd)

Masaalah/Rintangan	Paling mustahak	Mustahak	Kurang mustahak	tidak mustahak	tidak ada kaitan
8. Nadzir Nadzir sekolah tidak mempunyai kuasa untuk bertindak dengan bebas.	—	—	—	—	—
9. Terdapat tumpang-tindih di antara tugas tugas Nadzir Nadzir sekolah dengan pengelola pengelola sekolah peringkat Negeri. (Chontoh - Penyelia Sekolah Sekolah dan Penolong Pengelola Sekolah Sekolah).	—	—	—	—	—
10. Nadzir Nadzir sekolah tidak di beri kuasa eksekutif.	—	—	—	—	—
11. Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah di kenakan mengikut pendekatan yang telah di tentukan dalam menjalankan tugas dan membuat laporan.	—	—	—	—	—
12. Peluang untuk pangkat terhad chontoh berkerja di bahagian lain dalam Kementerian, di Maktab Maktab Perguruan.	—	—	—	—	—
13. Susah membuat lawatan di kawasan desa.	—	—	—	—	—
<u>Lain lain (sila terangkan)</u>					
14.					
15.					

Page 10 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

E. Pandangan Guru terhadap pengawasan Nadzir.

I. Harap tulis "ia" atau "tidak" di bahagian kosong yang telah di sediakan.

(1) Adakah anda bertanya sendiri kepada Nadzir

Sekolah Sekolah dan mendapatkan nasihat
mereka mengenai cara cara mengajar? _____

(2) Adakah anda bertanya untuk mendapatkan

nasihat Nadzir berkenaan dengan murid
murid yang mempunyai masaalah tertuntu? _____

(3) (i) Adakah anda memandang pengawasan Nadzir

Sekolah Sekolah ini berguna kepada anda

(a) dalam menyampaikan fikiran fikiran
baru? _____

(b) dalam menilai kejayaan anda dalam
menjalankan tugas? _____

(c) menjadi penderong dalam membuat
percubaan percubaan? _____

(d) menolong menyelesaikan masaalah
masaalah yang di hadapi? _____

(ii) Saya lebih suka Nadzir Nadzir Sekolah

membuat pengawasan secara formal/secara
tidak formal.

(Potong yang tidak berkenaan)

Page 10 of Questionnaire for Teachers. (Translation)

II. Cadangan dan Tegoran

Dalam bahagian kosong yang telah di sediakan bahawa, adalah di harapkan anda, dengan ikhlas, sanggup menuliskan cadangan cadangan dan tegoran tegoran yang di fikiran mustahak dan ada kaitan nya dalam persoalan hendak membuat pengawasan Nadzir Nadzir dapat di jalankan dengan lebih berkesaan dan menguntungkan.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Dear Teacher,

1. This study seeks to obtain the views of teachers on the expectations they hold for the role of INSPECTORS OF SCHOOLS and the improvements teachers would like to see in school Inspection.
2. This study has been approved by the Director, Educational Planning and Research Division, Ministry of Education.
3. The Director of Education, Negri Sembilan has given permission for me to visit schools and for teachers to complete the Questionnaire.
4. You are NOT required to write your name - strict anonymity will be maintained.
5. Please note that the Questionnaire is not a test of facts or information. It merely seeks your professional views on an important subject.
6. Please complete all sections of the Questionnaire.
7. The sample of schools and teachers has been randomly selected.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.

Serjit Singh
Faculty of Education
University of Malaya
15.10.73

APPENDIX CQUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERSA. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please complete the following responses by checking (✓) or complete the blanks as indicated.

1. Sex (i) Male _____ (ii) Female _____
2. Present age (1) 18-25 _____ (5) 41-45 _____
 (2) 26-30 _____ (6) 46-50 _____
 (3) 31-35 _____ (7) 51-54 _____
 (4) 36-40 _____
3. Race (1) Malay _____ (4) Eurasian _____
 (2) Chinese _____ (5) Others _____
 (3) Indian _____ (please specify) _____
4. Indicate the highest academic qualifications you hold.
 (1) L.C.E. _____
 (2) School Certificate _____
 (3) H.S.C. _____
 (4) B.A. _____
 (5) B.Sc. _____
 (6) R.C.D. _____
 (7) Others qualifications _____
 (please specify) _____
5. Indicate the professional qualifications you hold.
 (1) D.T.C. _____ (5) Dip. Ed. _____
 (2) R.T.C. _____ (6) Other professional
 (3) Normal Class _____ training (please specify) _____
 (4) College Trained _____ (7) No professional training
 (temporary teacher) _____

6. Years of Service as a trained teacher.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) 1st year _____ | (5) 16-20 years _____ |
| (2) 2-5 years _____ | (6) 21-25 years _____ |
| (3) 6-10 years _____ | (7) above 25 years _____ |
| (4) 11-15 years _____ | |

Page 2 of Questionnaire for Teachers.

B.1. The following is a check list of activities that Inspectors may or may not be involved in when working with teachers. These activities are conveniently arranged under eight responsibility areas.

For each activity, please answer questions (1) and (2) by writing A, B, C or D in the blank that best indicates your response.

If you do not know the answer or it does not apply to you, write E in the blank in column (2) against that activity.

Question (1)	Question (2)
How important a part of the job of Inspector do you view this activity?	Indicate the degree of involvement in each activity listed for the Inspector.
A - very important B - important C - of little importance D - not important	A - major involvement B - moderate involvement C - slight involvement D - no involvement E - not applicable (I don't know)

I. <u>Administration</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Interpretation and implementation of educational policies to teachers	_____	_____
2. Development and supervision of sound school organisation.	_____	_____
3. Development of sound procedures for teachers to assess student progress.	_____	_____
4. Plan workshops, conferences, in-service training courses and seminars for teachers.	_____	_____

Page 3 of Questionnaire for Teachers.

II. <u>Assessment</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Check observance of school regulations.	_____	_____
2. Assessment of teachers for confirmation in service.	_____	_____
3. Assessment of teachers for promotion in service.	_____	_____
4. Visit classrooms to obtain overview of achievement of pupils.	_____	_____

III. <u>Advisory and Guidance Function</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Getting teachers to adopt new and better methods.	_____	_____
2. Advise and help teachers individually in problems posed by teachers relating to education.	_____	_____
3. Providing information and useful ideas in education from whatever source.	_____	_____
4. Developing team work among members of school staffs.	_____	_____
5. Carrying out project work (e.g. School library development, etc.)	_____	_____

III. <u>Advisory and Guidance Function (cont'd)</u>	(1)	(2)
6. Giving sympathetic guidance and support to beginning teachers.	_____	_____
7. Interpret to competent authority (the Ministry of Education) the needs, expectations and aspirations of teachers.	_____	_____
8. Delegate responsibilities to head teachers.	_____	_____
9. Liase with teacher-training colleges with a view to ascertaining level of scholarship, professional knowledge, teaching methods the graduates take with them to schools.	_____	_____

Page 4 of Questionnaire for Teachers

IV. <u>Duties as an Executive (Education) Officer of the Ministry of Education</u>	(1)	(2)
1. Conduct in-service education courses for teachers.	_____	_____
2. Investigation of complaints by members of the public.	_____	_____
3. Inspecting schools on the request of heads of schools and State Directors of Education.	_____	_____
4. Sitting on professional committees - curricula, etc.	_____	_____
5. Attending meetings of local, state and national professional organisations.	_____	_____
6. Plan annual conference of Inspectors of Schools.	_____	_____

V. <u>Material and Equipment</u>		(1)	(2)
1. Procure curricula resources for teachers - A.V.A., library books, etc.	_____	_____	
2. Analyse and evaluate instructional programmes for local use.	_____	_____	
3. Develop instructional material and aids in teaching.	_____	_____	
VI. <u>Research</u>		(1)	(2)
1. Preparation of educational journals, pamphlets and other publications issued by the Ministry.	_____	_____	
2. Presentation of working papers at conferences, seminars, talks, etc.	_____	_____	
Page 5 of Questionnaire for Teachers.			
VII. <u>Self-growth</u>		(1)	(2)
1. Keeping abreast of developments in the field of education particularly in the areas of educational inspection and supervision.	_____	_____	
2. Regular meetings of Inspectors to exchange ideas and seek common solutions.	_____	_____	
3. Enrolling for higher degree courses.	_____	_____	
4. Attendances at conferences, sometimes international, seminars, etc. for exchange of ideas.	_____	_____	
VIII. <u>Community Relations</u>		(1)	(2)
1. Development of good public relations between school and the community.	_____	_____	

Other Areas (Please elaborate, if any)

IX.

X.

B.2. Of the first three functions listed below, rank them in order of importance.

Function	Ranking
1. Administration	_____
2. Assessment	_____
3. Advisory and Guidance	_____

Page 6 of Questionnaire for Teachers.

B.3. Consider 100% to be the total Time/Effort the Inspector can devote to all areas of responsibility.

(a) What fraction of this 100% do you think the Inspector devotes to each area of responsibility?

(b) How would you like the Inspector to devote his Time/Effort if circumstances were ideal?

Fill in your responses in the boxes provided.

Area of responsibility	% of Time/Effort devoted now by the Inspector	% of Time/Effort I would like the Inspector to devote
I. Administration	_____	_____
II. Assessment	_____	_____
III. Advisory and Guidance Function	_____	_____
IV. Duties as an E.O.	_____	_____
V. Material and Equipment	_____	_____
VI. Research	_____	_____
VII. Self-growth	_____	_____
VIII. Community Relations	_____	_____
OTHER AREAS (Please elaborate if any)		
IX.	_____	_____
X.	_____	_____
Total for all areas	100%	100%

Page 7 of Questionnaire for Teachers.

- C. Please answer the following question for each statement listed below as it applies to the Inspector of Schools. In answering each question, please write in each box the one letter that best describes the behaviour of the Inspector.

To what extent does the
Inspector of Schools engage in
the following kinds of behaviour?

A - Always
B - Frequently
C - Occasionally
D - Almost never
E - Never

Statements

1. Gives teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity. ☐
2. Gives teachers the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students. ☐
3. Has constructive suggestions to offer teachers in dealing with their major problems. ☐
4. Takes a strong interest in my professional development, status and conditions of service. ☐
5. Treats teachers as professionals. ☐
6. Discourages teachers who want to try out new educational ideas. ☐
7. Utilises research evidence when considering solutions to educational problems. ☐
8. Reprimands teachers whose educational ideas disagree with his own. ☐
9. Brings to the attention of teachers educational literature that is of value to them in their jobs. ☐
10. Helps teachers to understand the sources of important problems they are facing. ☐

Page 8 of Questionnaire for Teachers.

D. Problems and Issues in Inspection

Listed below are problems and hindrances which might prevent Inspectors from having sufficient time or means to carry out their responsibilities as they would like to.

Rank these problems in order of significance as stated by checking (✓) against your response.

Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	Not significant	NA. (not applicable; I don't know)
1. Too many teachers in the district to supervise effectively.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Lack of support and recognition by the public of the work of Inspectors.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Too much time taken up by administrative work and report writing.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Lack of academic and in-service training facilities in continuing education for Inspectors.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Insufficient grant from Ministry to carry out work effectively.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Exact nature of function of Inspectors not clearly defined.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. The incompatibility of the roles of Inspectors - that of providing guidance and evaluating work of teachers.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Inspectors do not enjoy autonomy of appointment (as do Her Majesty's Inspectors in U.K.)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Page 9 of Questionnaire for Teachers.

Problem/Hindrance	Very significant	Significant	Of little significance	No significant	NA. (not applicable; I don't know)
9. Overlap in functions of Inspectors of Schools and State Supervisors, Asst. Organisers of Schools, etc.	—	—	—	—	—
10. Inspectors vested with insufficient executive powers.	—	—	—	—	—
11. Rigid procedure of inspection and reporting.	—	—	—	—	—
12. Limited promotional opportunities - e.g. to serve in other Divisions of the Ministry, Teacher-Training Training College, etc.	—	—	—	—	—
13. Difficulty of travel in rural school inspection.	—	—	—	—	—
<u>OTHERS (Please specify)</u>					
14.	—	—	—	—	—
15.	—	—	—	—	—

Page 10 of Questionnaire for Teachers.

E. Teacher Attitudes Towards Inspection

I. Please write "yes" or "no" against each of the following questions.

(1) Do you ask the Inspector questions and advice
on the subject of teaching methods? _____

(2) Do you ask the Inspector for advice on the
subject of problem children? _____

(3) (i) Do you consider the Inspector's visit of
value to you _____

(a) in conveying new ideas? _____

(b) in estimating success of your work? _____

(c) as inspiring to experiment ? _____

(d) in helping with difficulties? _____

(ii) I would prefer more formal/informal visits
from Inspectors of Schools. _____

(Delete that which you do not favour).

II. Suggestions and Remarks

In the space provided below, please feel free to make
any suggestion or remark that you think is relevant and important
to making school inspection more effective and beneficial.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

APPENDIX DList of Schools in the Sample of Teachers1. National Primary Schools
(Malay medium)(a) Urban

- (1) Sekolah Kebangsaan Mantin, Mantin.
- (2) S.K. Temiang, Seremban.
- (3) S.K. Rahang, Seremban.
- (4) S.K. Ampangan, Seremban.
- (5) S.K. Dato Bandar Rasah, Seremban.
- (6) S.K. Rantau, Rantau.

(b) Rural

- (1) Sekolah Kebangsaan Kg. Gelam, Port Dickson.
- (2) S.K. Si Rusa, Port Dickson.
- (3) S.K. Chuah, W. Pos Chuah, Port Dickson.
- (4) S.K. Tampin, Tampin.
- (5) S.K. Gemencheh, P. Pos Batang, Melaka.
- (6) S.K. Rokan, P. Pos Batang, Melaka.
- (7) S.K. Pedas, Rembau.
- (8) S.K. Undang Rembau, Rembau.
- (9) S.K. Lubok China, W. Pos, Lubok China.
- (10) S.K. Ulu Bendol, Tanjong Ipoh.
- (11) S.K. Tanjong Ipoh, Tanjong Ipoh.
- (12) S.K. Sri Menanti, W. Pos, Seri Menanti.
- (13) S.K. Kuala Pilah, Kuala Pilah.
- (14) S.K. Kuala Klawang, Kuala Klawang.
- (15) S.K. Teriang, Kuala Klawang.
- (16) S.K. Dato' Undang Abdullah, Kuala Klawang.

2. National Type Primary Schools
(English medium)

(a) Urban

- (1) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) King George V, Ampangan, Seremban.
- (2) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) St. Paul's, Seremban.
- (3) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Anglo-Chinese, Seremban.
- (4) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Convent, Rahang, Seremban.
- (5) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Rantau, Jalan Linsum, Rantau.

(b) Rural

- (1) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Tunku Munawir, Kuala Pilah.
- (2) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Tunku Kursiah, Kuala Pilah.
- (3) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Datuk Undang Johol, Johol.
- (4) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Tunku Besar, Tampin.
- (5) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Tunku Abdul Rahman, Gemas.
- (6) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Port Dickson.
- (7) S.R.J.K. (Ing.) Undang Jelubu, Jelubu.

3. National Secondary Schools
(Malay medium)

(a) Urban

- (1) Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan Tunku Durah, Seremban.
- (2) S.M.K. Rantau, Rantau.
- (3) S.M.K. Mantin, Mantin.

(b) Rural

- (1) S.M.K. Za'aba, Kuala Pilah.
- (2) S.M.K. Port Dickson, Port Dickson.
- (3) S.M.K. Tunku Besar, Tampin.
- (4) S.M.K. Bandar Tinggi, Kuala Klawang.
- (5) S.M.K. Datuk Sedia Raja, Chembong, Rembau.

4. National Type Secondary Schools
(English medium)

(a) Urban

- (1) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) King George V, Seremban.
- (2) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) St. Paul's, Seremban.
- (3) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Convent, Jalan Birch, Seremban.
- (4) Kolej Tunku Khursiah, Seremban.
- (5) Sekolah Dato Abdul Razak, Seremban.

(b) Rural

- (1) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Tunku Mohammed, Kuala Pilah.
- (2) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Tunku Kursiah, Kuala Pilah.
- (3) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Datuk Abdul Samad, Tanjung Ipoh.
- (4) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Port Dickson.
- (5) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Tunku Besar, Tampin.
- (6) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Undang Jelubu, Kuala Klawang.
- (7) S.M.J.K. (Ing.) Undang Rembau, Rembau.

APPENDIX E

Distribution of Teachers by Age, Race and Sex in English and Malay-medium Schools.

Age group (in years)		MALAYS		CHINESE		INDIANS		OTHERS		TOTAL	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
18-25	Number	3	7	2	3	1	4	0	1	6	15
	Per cent	1.23	2.87	0.82	1.23	0.41	1.64	0.00	0.41	2.46	6.15
26-30	Number	28	28	6	7	0	5	1	1	35	41
	Per cent	11.48	11.48	2.46	2.87	0.00	2.05	0.41	0.41	14.35	16.80
31-35	Number	28	19	9	8	5	4	3	1	45	32
	Per cent	11.48	7.79	3.69	3.28	2.05	1.64	1.23	0.41	18.44	13.12
36-40	Number	15	8	5	0	4	5	0	3	24	16
	Per cent	6.15	3.28	2.05	0.00	1.64	2.05	0.00	1.23	9.84	6.56
41-45	Number	9	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	12	4
	Per cent	3.69	0.82	0.41	0.00	0.82	0.82	0.00	0.00	4.92	1.64
46-50	Number	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	1
	Per cent	1.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.41	0.00	0.00	2.05	0.41

APPENDIX E (cont'd)

Age group (in years)		MALAYS		CHINESE		INDIANS		OTHERS		TOTAL	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
51-54	Number	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	6	2
	Per cent	1.64	0.82	0.41	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.82
Total	Number	91	66	24	18	14	21	4	6	133	111
	Per cent	37.29	27.06	9.84	7.38	5.74	8.61	1.64	2.46	54.51	45.49

APPENDIX FJob Satisfaction of Inspectors of Schools

Please check (✓) the box on the right which best indicates your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the corresponding aspect of your present job.	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response
Response scored as	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
1. Are you satisfied with the present executive authority given you?	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
2. Are you satisfied with the progress you are making towards the objectives which you set for yourself in your present job?	<u>2</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
3. How satisfied are you with your present salary?	<u>3</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
4. How satisfied are you with the amount of time you must devote to your job?	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
5. On the whole, are you satisfied that the school community you visit accept you as a professional expert to the degree to which you feel you are entitled by reason of your position, training and experience?	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
6. How satisfied are you with your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job?	<u>7</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

APPENDIX F (cont'd)

Please check (✓) the box on the right which best indicates your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the corresponding aspect of your present job.	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response
Response scored as	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
7. How satisfied are you with the amount of interest shown by the community in its school system?	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
8. How satisfied are you with your present job when you compare it to similar Inspectoral positions elsewhere (for example, overseas)?	<u>3</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>

APPENDIX GDUTIES AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL INSPECTORATE

The duties and powers of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools were defined under sections 92-96 of the Education Ordinance, 1957.

Briefly they may be summarised as follows:

- (a) The Chief Inspector is charged with the responsibility, except in respect of religious studies for ensuring that an adequate standard of teaching is maintained and developed in schools.
- (b) The Chief Inspector and Inspectors may give professional advice to local education authorities and managers and governors of schools and any teacher on matters relating to teaching and teaching methods.
- (c) The Chief Inspector and Inspectors are empowered to inspect all registered schools and report their findings to the Minister of Education who, in his discretion, may authorise issue of the reports to those concerned with the administration of the schools including any teacher.
- (d) The Chief Inspector or Inspectors is not empowered to issue any order or direction to the managers or governors or the staff of any school.

