

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this final chapter is to discuss the main findings of the study, namely the types of leadership that predominated the secondary schools, what aspects of similarity and differences that school leadership behavior are the important contributors to school effectiveness, geographical location and the achievement of the pupils.

In order to study school effectiveness in raising students' achievement and academic performance, the two schools that had been selected for this special study, mainly because the students compositions, enrolment characteristics and their social-economic background show a high degree of similarity.

School effectiveness was defined in terms of overall percentage scores (or passes) in successive national public examinations. Consistency of results was required in order for a school to be classified as effective. Such consistency in results arising from chance would seem to be unlikely.

Furthermore, the schools were classified on the basis of their performance over a five-year period. Finally, the two schools chosen were shown to be significantly different with respect to their academic productivity and leadership behavior.

5.2 Summary of Findings

5.2.1 The Predominated Leadership Types

The type of leadership that predominates these two schools was the Personal Orientation Type of Leadership Behavior. The two Principals seemed scored higher in the Person Orientation Leadership behavior compared to the System Orientated Leadership Behavior.

The total means that related to Person Orientation is 63.38 compared to 52.12 of the System Orientation. This implied that both of the secondary school principals were predominated by Person Orientation Leadership Behavior. However the difference of 8.7 in the total mean of two leadership behavior, shows that both the school leaders displayed great concern about their school needs as well as person needs.

5.2.2 Similarity And Differences In Leadership Behavior

Results from the LBDG Form XII shows that principal from the urban school, which is the more productive and effective school, has significantly scored higher in the sub-scales such as “Tolerance of Uncertainty”, “Demand Reconciliation”, “Representation”, “Tolerance of Freedom”, “Role Assumption”, “Consideration”, “Predictive Accuracy” and “Integration”. It is interesting to note that the more productive school had significantly higher scores for all the six components of Person Orientated Leadership.

Principals from the more productive school also scored higher for the sub-scales “Tolerance of Freedom” and “Consideration”, whereas principal from the rural settlement, which is said to be less productive school, had high scores for “Tolerance of Freedom”, “Initiating Structure”, and “Persuasion”, where the mean scores for the sub-scales of “Initiating Structure” and “Representation” remained unchanged. Therefore, we can make a conclusion that, the principal from the more productive school was significantly more System Orientated rather than Person Orientated, while the less productive school slightly more on Person Orientated Leadership Behavior.

5.2.3 Aspects Of Leadership That Contribute to The Effectiveness

It was noted that, the three most important aspects that contribute to the effectiveness of principals as school leaders are the “Tolerance of Freedom”,

“Consideration” and “Initiating Structure”. “Tolerance of Freedom” would be allowing the staff members to have initiative decision and action, whereas “Consideration” would have regards to comfort, well-being, status and contributions of followers will always be considered important and “Initiating Structure”, which is

a sub-scale under “System Orientated Leadership Behavior” will be able to define his or her own leadership behavior. This also enables followers to know what are expected from them.

5.2.4 Leadership between Urban And Rural Leaders

When the 12 sub-scales were collapsed to two dimension of leadership behavior, it was obvious that, ranking the top was ‘initiating structure’ for both the urban and rural secondary school. The correlation coefficient of 0.86 strongly indicated that, there was a high relationship between the rank ordering of the behavioral dimension of urban and rural.

The urban school principal categorized as ‘high’ on System Orientation Leadership Behavior (23.8 %), compared to her rural counterpart (21.4%). On the other hand, the rural secondary school principal was rated 20.3 % on Person Orientated Leadership that compares to 22.6 % of urban counterpart.

According to the mean of sub-scales, both the urban and rural secondary school scored low percentages in both “Predictive Accuracy” and “Tolerance of Uncertainty”. This meant that both the leaders have to take measure and consideration to overcome the weaknesses, just to make sure the effectiveness of leadership and schools are more guaranteed.

5.2.5 Leadership Behavior and Academic Achievement of Pupils

Results shows that, the secondary school leaders with better academic achievement tended to score higher in all six components in the Person Orientated Leadership Behavior. Other than that, she also managed to obtain better score in sub-scales in the System Orientated Leadership category, such as “ Representing”, and “Role Assumption”.

With comparison, the urban secondary school leader performed better in both Person and System Orientated Leadership. In other word, the better academic achievement secondary school leader rated ‘high’ in both the Person Orientated Leadership (53.7 %) and System Orientated Leadership (43.8%).

The analysis shows enough evidence that leader who was ‘high’ in both types leadership achieved better academic performance. Therefore, there is a need to establish a close relationship between leadership behavior and the pupils’ academic performance. However, as mentioned earlier, this type of relationship needs some

“reservation” since there are other factors and variables, for examples: the social-economic background, environmental influence and the roles that play by the Parents and Teachers Association, will definitely affect the academic achievement of pupils. And yet, researcher needs to determine whether the leadership behavior can caused better academic achievement, or otherwise.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

With the obvious limitation, the generalize ability in this study will restricted the population from which the samples principals were selected. Anyhow, general implication about leadership of secondary school and its relationship to the academic performance may be suggested. For this purpose, study could be replicated in other areas to compare similarities and differences of leadership behavior with more teachers and schools related variables.

LBDQ Form XII along with the Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire (OCDQ) could be used to make an in-depth study of schools to relate the relationship between Leadership Behavior and school climate. Longitude studies where the LBDQ can be used to compare behavior changers of principals before and after training could be one way of evaluating training programs. Similar studies could also be carried out in other states to see if such patterns exist in other parts of the country.

5.4 Conclusion

According to Lim (1983) in a study found that, there was influence of geographical location to the production (when refer to academic achievement) in the schools. Logically, one could say that the overall academic performance in Common Nation Examinations in urban areas are better than those in the rural areas. In other words, leadership behavior in a urban school differs from a rural school.

Rural secondary schools' principal are generally more Person Orientated Leadership while the urban counterpart displays more towards System Orientated leadership. The effect of location on leadership behavior would be significant since a substantial numbers of rural school are small. The rural communities and the school's stakeholders are not so demanding as in the urban school (Lim, 1983) With comparison, the urban communities are more emphasis on the school production and performance. That is the reason why the country's most prestigious schools are often located in the urban areas. To maintain this kind of prestige, the urban schools' principals have to compete to each other to gain the support from the communities. Whereas the rural school principals are described as group able to better problem solver when facing all kinds of complexities and constrains, such as deal with dissatisfactory teaches serving in the rural areas where basic facilities are always could not meet their needs. The implication is that, this kind of informal nature of rural environment may account for more Person Orientated Leadership among rural secondary school principals.

As long as the effectiveness and success of schools are concerned, undoubtedly, the geographical location is one of the factor that has great influence to the leadership behavior, but other factors which can contribute to the effectiveness of school should not be neglected. The commitment of teachers and close cooperation between Education Departments, school and community also play an important role in developing and maintaining an effective school. The success of National Education Policy is a joint effort of all parties concerned.

The principal from the more productive secondary school tended to be more Person Orientated as well as System Oriented. This type of principal has better working relationship with their teachers especially in behavior attributes 'Tolerance of Freedom' and 'Consideration'. This enables teachers to scope for better initiative, thus contributes better academic performance in urban school.

Though heads from less productive school exhibits more in 'Production Emphasis' behavior, but the national examination results always did not reflect this type of leadership behavior. As a conclusion, statistical evidences in this study show that, there was a significant relationship between pupils' academic achievement and leadership behavior.