CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the conceptual model for studying effective schools where orderly school climate, effective leadership, high teacher expectation and emphasis on instructional skills.

This chapter consists of three main sections. This first section reviews literature, which determines some school determinants of achievement. The second section will conceptualize school leadership behavior. The third section reviews literature related to school effectiveness.

A number of empirical studies have shown that, there are always wide differences in academic achievement between the urban and rural areas. Obviously, the inability of school to improve the rural pupils has contributed to a decline both in public confidence in education and educators (Low, 1994). However, more recent studies demonstrated that some schools in rural areas are achieving tremendous academic performance in some rural settlements, this studies suggest strongly that schools in a considerable extent, can reduce the dependence of student achievement on family background.

In describing leadership behavior, the emphasis is not so much on what leaders are like but what leaders do in the course of leading a group of organization. Leadership is a key concept in understanding and improving organizations such as schools (Thomas, 1988).

When educators, school patrons or policy makers gather, school quality and effectiveness frequently drive the conversation terms such as "accountability", "academic achievement", "performance standards", "test scores", "teaching performance", "student dropout rates", "job satisfaction", and "productive learning culture" infuse these conversations. The majority of effectiveness studies have focused exclusively on student's cognitive outcomes in areas such as reading, mathematics or public examination results. Only a relatively few (mainly British) studies have paid attention to social or affective outcomes (Reynolds, 1976; Rutter, 1979; Mortimore, 1988; Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993). Due to this focus, the idea of the school effectiveness tells us more about the correlates of school effectiveness.

Over the years in Malaysia, parents had come to expect high performance from their children in terms of academic achievement in National Examinations. In the fifties and sixties, parents were generally content to leave the business of education to the school and their teachers. There was less anxiety then on the part of parents beyond securing a school place for their children who reached school going age. However in the eighties, effective schooling became an increasing sensitive and emotional issue among parents. Parents are concerned about whether schools are effective schools. To supplement what is taught in schools, parents begin to employ

tutors to give their children additional home tuition or at tuition centers. This is an unsatisfactory feature of the schooling system in Malaysia. As it reflects a wide spread of dissatisfaction with a lack of confidence in the ability of the school to produce the type of schooling results that parents desired. Therefore it is very important for the respective bodies to review the school system and to study its problem so that it is possible to reach "effective school" status.

2.2 Leadership Behavior

Warren Bennis (1989) gives three basic reasons why educational leadership is important. First they are responsible for the effectiveness of organizations. The success of all organizations rests on the perceived quality of leaders. Second, change and upheaval makes it essential for all institutions to have anchors and guiding purposes. Leaders fill the need. Third, there are pervasive national concerns about our schools. Education leaders have a key role in alleviating the public's concerns.

2.3 Leadership Theories and Style

According to Hoy and Miskel (2001), research concerning leadership theories could be summarized into two major theoretical approaches to leadership:-

2.3.1 The Traits Theories

Aristotle thought that individuals are born with characteristics that would make them leaders. The conception that the key factors in determining leadership are inherited produced the so-called Trait Theory of leadership. This theory attempts to identify distinctive physical or psychological characteristics of individuals that relate or explain behaviors of leaders. The theory makes assumptions that all human beings can be divided into "leaders" and "followers" where "leaders" possess certain qualities and traits which are non-existent among the followers' (Meyres ,1985).

2.3.2 The Behavioral Theories

Early conceptualization of leadership typically relied on two distinct categories of leader behavior – one concern with people, interpersonal relations, and group maintenance, and the other with production, task completion, and goal achievement (Cartwright and Zander,1953). In the Iowa Studies done by Lewin, Lippit and White (1952), styles of leadership could be classified into different types according to the leaders style of handling several decision making situations during the experiments which are:

(a) Authoritarian Leadership.

These types of leaders are very directive and allowed no participation in decision making. They even make decisions without consulting the group members. They structured the complete work 0situation for their subordinates. They also took

full authority and assumed full responsibility from initiation to task completion. This style resulted in generating more hostility and aggression.

(b) Democratic Leadership

A democratic leader involves his or her subordinates in decision making delegates authority, encourages participation in deciding work methods and goals. Subordinates were informed about condition affecting their jobs and encouraged to express their ideas and makes suggestions.

(c) Laissez – Faire Leadership

This leadership type appears to be ineffective one since the amount of goal defining done by subordinates in a hierarchical structure is limited in most formal organizations, and administrative superiors are required to evaluate the standard of work of their subordinates. Laissez-faire type leadership gives complete freedom for the group individual to decide what to do, without any involvement by the leader. The leader was only willing to supply information when asked and commented very infrequently on any member's activity.

(d) Contingency Leadership

Contingency approaches were the most influential models of leadership in 1980s. At their best, contingency leadership includes four sets of concepts that have to be considered – traits of leaders, characteristic of the situation, behavior of

the leader. and effectiveness of leaders (Hoy and Miskel, 2001). Contingency leadership also seeks to specify the conditions or situational variables that moderate the relationship among leader traits, behavior and performance criteria (Bryman, 1996).

Contemporary researchers and school administrators are likely to believe that the practice of leadership is too complex to be represented by a single set of traits or behaviors. Instead the idea that effective leadership behavior is "contingent" on the situation is more prevalent today.

Fiedler (1968) said that, a task oriented leader performs best in situations as both extremes, those in which he has no influence and power over the other group members." Relationship oriented leaders tend to perform best in mixed situations where they have only moderate influence over the group (Fiedler, 1967).

The relationship between a leader and his followers could be influenced by situational factors. The effectiveness of a group performance depends on whether there is match between the leadership style and the (favorable or unfavorable) characteristics of the situation as the degree to which the situation enables the leader to exert influence over his group. From Fielder's research we can conclude that a principal who had successfully lead one school would not automatically be successful in another school. The style of leadership employed by principal could have suited the situation of another school. The principal should review his or her leadership style to the appropriateness of the situation.

(e) The New Leadership.

Charismatic and transformational leadership theories were evoking high levels of interest among scholars and practitioners in the early 1990s (Carey, 1992). As new approaches, this genre of theory differs from traditional approaches in at least three ways:

- Leaders are managers of meaning who exhibit inspirational, visionary, and symbolic or less rationalistic aspects of behavior (House, Spangler and Woyke 1991; Brymanm 1996).

- Leaders emphasize the importance of the follower's emotional responses to their leader's inspiring vision.

- Charismatic and transformational theories tend to focus leaders at the upper levels of organizational rather than on the earlier emphasis on leaders at lower level who have face-to-face relationships with followers (Hunt, 1999).

(f) Charismatic Leadership

Since charismatic leaders are so successful in influencing follower commitment, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the way in which these leaders exercise personal power (Yulk,1979). Charismatic leaders are likely to use role modeling wherein they set an example in their own behavior for followers to

imitate. This process involves changes in the perception, attitudes, values, and emotional responses of followers as well as the imitation of the leader's behavior. The origins of charisma are usually attributed to Max Weber (1947). He believed that during at time of crisis, charisma emerges as a leader with an extraordinary spirit who comes forth with a radical vision. Charisma is a term that does not distinguish between good and evil or moral and immoral leadership (House and Howell, 1992).

At least five sets of behaviors are hypothesizes to activate leader influence-offering an appealing future vision, intensifying personal identification of followers, changing follower perceptions of work so that values are linked to task objectives, and heightening the self efficacy of individuals and the collective (Yukl, 1998; Conger, 1999). In recent study the findings provide only partial support for the theory and suggest a need for greater sensitivity to situational features (Shamir, Zakay, Brenin and Popper, 1998).

(g) Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership goes well exchanging inducements for desired performance (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Transformational leaders build commitment to the organization's objectives and empower followers to achieve these objectives (Yulk, 1988). By expressing their personal standards, transformational leaders are able both unite followers and change their goals and

beliefs in ways that produce higher levels of performance than previous thought possible.

Similarly, Bass (1998) observed that, transformational leadership stimulates others to view their work from new perspectives, generates an awareness of the mission or vision of the organization, develop colleagues and followers to higher lever of abilities and potential, and motivate them to look beyond their own interests towards those that will benefit the group.

2.4 Foreign Studies of Leadership Behavior.

To students of educational administration, probably the most well-known leader research inquires are the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) studies started at Ohio State University in 1940s.Originally developed by John K. Hemphill and Alvin Coons (1950).It measures two basic dimensions of leader behavior – initiating structure and consideration. Researchers have found that there is a relationship between leader behavior and school effectiveness. Brighthouse (1961), through a case study, confirms that "it is impossible to have a good and successful school without a successful leader". The leader Behavior Description Questionnaire has been used extensively, giving empirical support to the questionnaire as a reliable support for measuring leadership.

The LBDQ Form XII classifies leadership into two major groups. They are:

(a) Consideration or person orientated Leadership.

(b) Initiating structure or system orientated Leadership.

Similarly, research on school effectiveness concluded that strong administrative leadership was among those factors within the school that makes a different in student learning (Outson and Smith, 1979). Educational policy makers have been similarly inclined to believe that principal leadership is critical to the achievement of students. (Murphy ,1990).

A study by Brice (1993) on principal in Saskatchewan rural schools showed that difference in Principal perception of their leadership behavior and the perception of other staff members. The date also revealed that almost 50% of the difference between effective and non-effective schools could be explained by the difference in leadership behavior.

The importance of leadership has been strongly emphasized in the literature of school effectiveness and educational reforms Spinks (1992) and Leithwood (1994). Leadership is a critical factor for organizational performance and effectiveness, Yukl (1994).

Nominshan (1990) conducted a study to examine the extend to which the broad dimensions of Leadership Behavior – Initiating structure and consideration are evident among principals in elementary and secondary schools as perceived by

teachers. The findings indicated that there were differences between leadership of elementary and secondary school principals. The study also further revealed that principals exhibiting more task orientation resulted in more teacher dissatisfaction. This was because principals tend to emphasize datelines, seeing to it the teachers worked to capacity and asked teachers follow rules and regulations or "go by the book".

2.5 Local Studies On Leadership Behavior.

An awareness of importance of personality factors should result in an increased ability to predict leadership behavior in educational institutions (Herbert, 1981). Studies on leadership behavior among school principals is fast becoming on area of importance in research due to awareness of an effective school and the role played by its leader (Mukherjee G.H, 1970). In a study entitled "the Principle Staff Leadership Role", concluded that the school administrator could get the co-operation of his staff by satisfying their needs. This contributed to the full co-operation of the staff in achieving the objectives of the school.

Nazzari (1970) however, found no correlational relationship between selected personality characteristic of elementary school principals and the administration performance factors of sharing in decision-making, egalitarian relationship. social support, and managerial support as measured comprising the significant items derived from national principalship study.

Harcharand Singh Thandi (1972) in a study entitled "Some Aspects of Teachers, Perceptions of Principal's Administrative Behavior in Selected School" shows that teacher's satisfaction was seen in high schools where the principals exhibited democratic leadership and positive normative compliance.

Rahimah (1981) in her study on leadership behavior among 32 primary schools found most of the headmasters were task oriented rather than person oriented. In another study conducted by Suaidah (1984), revealed that most of the headmasters in primary and secondary schools involved in the study ranked high in the Task and Person Orientation. This was further reiterated by Salaman (1986), who said the headmasters gave equal importance to Task and Person Orientation.

Al Ramaiah (1998), stated that schools in Malaysia do lack principals with effective leadership styles. According to him, principals now are doing more managerial responsibilities rather than the role as an instructional leader. He agrees with the findings of Shukor (1995), where he reports, that Principals now are spending more time in doing things apart from their professional duties.

Rajathilagan (1994), in a study "Leadership Behavior and School Effectiveness" conducted in 32 primary schools stated that teachers felt that 'good" leaders should strike a positive balance in both concern for people and production. The study further revealed the Leadership Behavior of Headmasters has significant relationship of teacher's organizational commitment.

2.6 Leadership Effectiveness

To both practicing administrators and scholars, effectiveness is a complicated, multifaceted, and subtle topic. Three types of leadership effectiveness outcomes are: a) Personal – other perceptions of reputation and self-assessments, b) Individual member satisfaction, and c) Organizational goal attainment (Hoy and Miskel, 2001).

2.6.1 School Effectiveness

At the University of Delaware, Richard L. Venezky and Linda Winfield (1980), isolated "achievement-oriented leadership" as one of the primary factors in school effectiveness. A comprehensive study by two economists, Anita A. Summers and Barbara L. Wolfe of Federal Reserve Bank concluded that principals who were high academic achievement themselves produced better academic achievement.

Issues of organizational effectiveness and quality constitute key concepts in open system theory (Hoy and Miskel, 2001). Two theoretical bases for making judgements and for taking actions necessary to work towards school effectiveness are "The Goal Model" and "The System Resource Model". Within a goal model, schools are effective if the outcomes of their activities meet or exceed their organizational goals. Within system-resource model schools are effective when they secure an advantageous bargaining position and acquire a disproportionate share of scarce and valued resources.

2.6.2 Definitions of Effectiveness.

Effectiveness is not one thing; hence, a one-dimensional definition is not adequate. Without a theoretical guide, it is meaningless to claim that one is more effective than another. Although Reid, Hopkins and Holly (1987) concluded that "While all reviews assume that effective schools can be differentiated from ineffective ones there is in consensus yet on just what constitute an effective schools.

There is now a much grater degree of agreement among school researchers concerning appropriate methodology for such studies, about the need to focus explicitly on students outcomes and in particular, on the concept of the "Value added' by the school (MC Pherson,1992). For example Mortimore (1991) has defined an effective school as one in which students progress further than might be expected from consideration of its intake.

Definitions of school effectiveness are thus dependent upon a variety of factors as Sammons (1994) has argued. These include:

(a) Sample of school examined (many studies have focused on inner city schools and this context may affect the general applicability of results.

(b) Choice of outcome measures (Studies which focus on only one or two outcomes, may give only a partial picture of effectiveness, both in terms of effects and correlates of effectiveness),a broad range reflecting the aims of schooling being desirable study examined several cognitive measures and a range of social outcomes (Martimore, 1988).

(c) Adequate control for difference between schools in intakes to ensure that "like is compared with like" (ideally information about individuals pupils, including baseline measures of prior attainment, personal, social-economic and family characteristics are required.

(d) Methodology (value added approaches focusing on progress over time and adopting appropriate statistical techniques such as multilevel modeling obtain efficient estimates of school effects and their attached confidence limits are needed.

(e) Time scale (longitudinal approaches following one or more age cohorts over a period time rather than cross sectional "snapshots" are necessary for the study schools effects on their students) to allow issues of stability and consistency in schools effects from year to year to be addressed.

2.6.3 Evidence of Effectiveness

The central focus of school effectiveness research concerns the idea that "schools matter, that schools do have major effects upon children's development and that, to put it simply, schools do make a difference" (Reynolds and Creemers, 1990). Although Preece (1989) looked at research pitfalls of school effectiveness studies and made a number of critics of selected studies, Tabberer (1994) concludes that "Despite Preece's critics, there is little argument now that schools can do have an effect".

Most school effectiveness studies have focused on academic achievement in terms of basic skills in reading and mathematics or examination results (Goodlad, 1984). However a few have also provided evidence of important differences in school / affective outcomes such as attendance, attitudes and behavior (Reynolds, 1976, Rutter et al 1979, Mortimore et al, 1988 a).

2.6.4 Measuring Effectiveness

Methodological advances, particularly the development of multilevel techniques (Goldstein, 1987) have led to improvements in the estimation of schools

effects (Scheerens, 1992, Creemers 1994). These have enabled researchers to take better account of differences between schools in the characteristics of their pupil intakes and facilitated exploration of issues such as consistency and stability in schools' effects upon different kind of outcomes and over time.

Issues such as stability and consistency in effects over time and across multiple outcomes, departmental differences and differential effectiveness of individual schools (Nutall et al, 1989, Sammons et al, 1993 b). Thus, Tabberer (1994) discussing the possibilities of differential effectiveness notes that "It is important for, if it exists to a notable extent, then single feature measures of school effectiveness such as considered for league tables are brought further into question".

2.6.5 Outcome of schools effectiveness.

Three important performance outcome indicators of schools are:

(a) academic achievement

(b) job satisfaction

(c) perceived organizational effectiveness

2.6.7 Academic Achievement

Many parents and other citizens define organizational effectiveness narrowly, they equate school effectiveness with academic achievement. Input – Output, or

production-function research became popular in the mid of 60's. For schools, the input groups usually are classified as family resources, school resources, community characteristics, student resources and peer group resources, whereas the outputs are scores on achievement tests. (Lau 1978).

Scholars have deduced what they believe are the few critical school factors for enhancing scores on standardized tests. As popularized by Ronald Edmonds (1979), most educators became familiar with his five factor- effective-schools formula.

(a) Strong leadership by the principal, especially in instructional matters.

(b) High expectations by teachers for students achievement.

(c) An emphasis on basic skills

(d) An orderly environment

(e) Frequent and systematic evaluations of students.

Mortimore (1993) defined effective schools as ones in which student's progress further than what might be expected from their characteristics at entry.

2.6.8 Job Satisfaction

Why job satisfaction continues to attract so much interest? Paul E. Spector (1997) gives three reasons – utilitarian, humanitarian, and organizational

effectiveness. Job satisfaction is an indicator of good treatment and it also reflects how well the school organization is functioning. Differences among schools in job satisfaction levels of teachers can be diagnostic of potential trouble shots. Job satisfaction is the extent to which people like their jobs (Spector, 1997).

The situational model job satisfaction relates combination of task, organization and personal variables to indicators of job satisfaction (Glisson and Durick, 1988; Quarstien, Mc Afee and Glassman, 1992; Agho, Muller, and Price 1993). This contingency perspective generally divides the variables into three groups.

(a) Characteristics of the work organization

(b) Characteristics of job tasks

(c) Characteristics of employees

Interest in job satisfaction has been high among the scholars in educational administration. Useful models and widely applicable findings for job satisfaction are available to guide research and to inform administrative practice.

2.6.9 Perceived Organization Effectiveness.

To formulate a model of perceived organizational effectiveness, Paul E Mott (1972) combined several important performance outcomes, quantity of the product,

quality of the product, efficiency, adaptability and flexibility. Connie S. Logan, Chad D. Ellet and Joseph Licata (1993) found that structural coupling, robustness, academic achievement and student attendance were related to perceived organizational effectiveness as measured by IPOE. Finally, Cynthia L. Uline, Daniel M.Miller and Megan Tschanen-Moran (1998) found that expressive activities, such as teacher's trust in colleagues and principals and healthy school climate, and instrumental activities such as achievement in reading, math and writing are related to perceived organizational effectiveness of schools.

Barbara A. Spencer (1994) characterizes TQM (Total Quality Management) as a comprehensive set of management ideas, which emphasize or promote quality in organizations. Prominent leaders of TQM movement include W.Edwards Deming (1986), Joseph M. Juran (1989) and Ruth Wageman (1995) believe that these proponents agree that the primary goal of organizations is survival.

2.7 Conclusion

It could be seen from the above review that principals are clearly important in determining the effectiveness of school. There is no evidence of effective schools with weak leadership has emerged in reviews of effectiveness research. Studies also shown that the distinguishing features of assertive, achievement-oriented leadership lie not only in the day-to-day tasks of principals but rather in the principal's overall performance and the direction to which he or she is committed. Leadership is not simply about the quality of individual leaders although this is of course important, it

is also about the roles that leaders play, their styles of management, their relationship to the vision, values and goals of the school and their approach to change.

Looking at the research literature as a whole, it would appear that different styles of leadership can be associated with effective schools, and a very wide range of aspects of the role of leaders in schools have been highlighted.

Research too has shown that schools are more effective when staff build consensus on the aims and values of the school, and where they put this into practice through consistent and collaborative ways of working and decision making.

Studies to determine the basic dimensions of leadership behavior generally identify to distinct categories – concern for task, concerns for individuals and interpersonal relations.