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ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes existing research on the characteristics, training, and roles of headmasters (or principals) in schools in developing countries. It also reports results of more than 30 interviews focused on the headmasters' perceptions about their own selection, training and support needs.

The authors found that few relevant studies exist at present and that most of those few contain some methodological limitations. Many suffer from low response rates, an inability to sort out personal and professional variables, and the lack of a common definition of educator "effectiveness." The headmaster-selection process is crippled by the lack of knowledge about headmaster characteristics and about how these characteristics relate to success in their positions. Also, although the reported studies evince interest in what a headmaster should do, few have addressed what headmasters in fact are called upon to do, how they would prefer to distribute their time on the job, and what type of training would be practical in assisting them with their duties.

The interviews made apparent that a headmaster position is considered desirable and is actively sought, in most cases as an element of upward mobility. Discrepancies exist between the expected and actual roles of headmasters, partly because their expected roles are mandated by higher officials, without regard to the real constraints—lack of funds, materials, personnel, and time—that prevent accomplishment of these roles in developing countries. Educations innovations are emerging at a rapid rate, but they are seldom local in origin and are seldom accompanied by the means of putting them into practice. Managing these innovations within existing contexts and applying them to local needs are significant concerns for educators.

Most of the headmasters interviewed had little formal training for their jobs, but all indicated that training is needed. The problem is determining what kind of training has practical consequences for improving headmaster performance. Beyond a very positive feeling toward on-the-job
learning, the authors found very little agreement on what should be included in headmaster training program curricula. They suggest that course might appropriately vary with the experiential development of the trainee; the needs and concerns of newly appointed headmasters differ from those of "old timers" in that the neophytes still need practical skills while the experienced group is more concerned with applying educational policies. Most of the headmasters indicated that finding time to participate in training courses would be a significant problem for them.

The paper identifies a number of areas that merit study as groundwork for developing effective headmaster-training programs. Objectives of these studies should include —

a. identifying personal and professional characteristics of those headmasters who are effectively increasing the schools' impact on learning in developing countries;

b. describing exactly what an effective (or ineffective) headmaster does and does not do in practice;

c. identifying the key competencies that are necessary for effective and efficient school operations;

d. matching these competencies to the experiential development of the trainees; and

e. developing a plan for evaluating the personal and professional impacts of headmaster training programs.
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INTRODUCTION

"A headmaster in my old school never misses an opportunity to lecture students but never takes the trouble to know them personally. What resulted is this: I have not yet encountered a student who remotely likes or respects the headmaster. Frustration is the cause for the graffiti and broken chairs and tables in the school. Ninety percent of the writings on the wall are often directed at the headmaster..."

Letter to the Editor from a Penang (Malaysia) parent. New Straits Times, January 7, 1988

Until relatively recently, a major concern in a worldwide education has dealt with quantity - the provision that all individuals within any nation be provided with opportunities for personal satisfaction and/or advancement through education. With the recent provision in most developing countries of universal free public education and with the concomitant establishment of national policies on education this concern has, in many ways, been replaced by concern for quality as well. And while many studies of educational endeavors have attempted to examine what factors are most influential in predicting or determining "quality," most have stopped short of examining the two most critical players - the teacher and the "headmaster" or "principal."

The quote at the top of this page in many ways reflects the usually ambivalent reactions that individuals have to principals or headmasters. With increased availability of education throughout the world, more and more individuals have had interactions - both positive and negative - with headmasters. But Interacting with a student is only one small part of the multi-faceted role that the headmaster assumes. He is indeed an advisor for students and teachers, but he is also a leader, a planner, a decision maker, a fiscal controller, as well as a buffer between the government and the community. In local educational circles it is the headmaster who serves as the target point for questions and concerns, praise and blame. Furthermore, headmaster-targeted questions come from superiors, coordinates, and subordinates and appear to be coming in
ever increasing numbers. Some headmasters effectively deal with the questions within their school contexts; others are less successful. Yet, at least in lesser developed countries, there is little known about the identification, training, or even the roles of these headmasters. The purpose of this paper is to provide some indication of what data are known. Of specific concern are those elements that have been found in educational research to be associated with effective leadership and to what extent these elements are amenable to training.

Methodologically, it first appears that the determination of these significant educational research studies calls for a straightforward analysis and synopsis of the extant literature that describes evaluation and research studies completed in the school contexts of developing countries. However, the writers quickly found a difficulty with this assumption - in comparison with similar studies in more industrialized nations, there are many fewer studies reported\(^1\) and, as detailed in the following section, there are some methodological problems with the studies that have been completed. As a result, the authors took it upon themselves to journey to three developing countries - Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia - to investigate the perceptions of headmasters concerning the selection, training and support needs of individuals who find themselves in these leadership roles. What follows includes both a review of the literature and also a summary of the opinions of more than 30 headmasters from three countries - countries whose leadership has collectively, and yet individually, recognized the importance of the headmaster and has generated both planning and implementation of headmaster training elements that will assure the development of a cadre of effective educational leaders over the next several decades.

\(^1\)An indication of this can be found in Dave's (1987) review of research studies on teacher effectiveness in India from 1943 to present. He lists a total of 109 studies. The number of studies of headmaster effectiveness or training program impact is considerably fewer in number.
While position papers and policy agendas must exist within various ministries of education, these documents were not available to the authors. Informal discussions with personnel attached to ministerial offices, however, indicated that few research efforts have been completed that focus directly on the needs, characteristics and processes of effective headmasters. Research that leads to policy decisions with respect to headmaster selection, evaluation and training thus appears to be lacking, although there is an emerging literature that describes regional or national headmaster training programs that have recently been developed/implemented or are in the planning stages.

These caveats aside, the document that follows attempts to provide a review of the studies that we have found. After these introductory remarks, the first section of the paper focuses on methodological difficulties that must be considered in reviewing the extant literature. The second section deals with research on headmaster effectiveness and includes a review of studies that have been reported in the literature and provides the results of our efforts. The third section deals with headmaster training programs - opinions, mostly, since there are few evaluation data that are available. The last section focuses on a summary and recommendations.

The writers would like to express their appreciation to a number of professionals who have assisted us in the development of this document. Dean Anar: Attachoo of Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok graciously provided the site for interviewing some key Thai headmasters. Dr. Artah Aziz of the Institute Bahasa in Kuala Lumpur provided both the site for interviewing and also invited some outstanding headmasters for interviewing. In Indonesia, the work of Gatot Suradji in Jakarta and Jusuf Djalisastra in Bandung must be singled out. Each of these individuals not only worked with local Ministerial officials to identify those to be interviewed, but also conducted the interviews and reported their opinions to us for summary. Staff members at the University of Houston, including Dr. Larry Hughes, Ms. Paula Cordiero and Mr. Peter Nanos are to be thanked for their efforts as well. Finally, Dr. Adriann Verspoor of
the World Bank is recognized in appreciation of his encouragement and creative - and very constructive - review of our efforts.
SECTION 1 - METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the chapters that follow the authors present a review of research efforts that have studied headmaster effectiveness within developing countries. Before reporting our findings, however, it is necessary to raise a few questions about the methodologies of the researchers whose studies we reviewed and also about our own fact-finding efforts.

An underlying question in any research effort always lies slightly below the full consciousness of the researcher, his subjects and the reader of the research report - why do the research, anyway? This statement is as valid in developing countries as it is in more industrialized areas. As is well known, educational research is a relatively young endeavor. Even in more industrialized countries, where research has taken on an almost mythic cult following, educational research up until the early 1960's appears to have had one basic purpose - to prove the mental mettle of the individual who wished to complete requirements for a doctorate. One is hard pressed to find a single study reported in the past century that has made a truly significant difference in educational practice. The reasons for such failures are numerous: small sample sizes, lack of control efforts, an insistence on the use of positivistic quantitative studies, etc.

Furthermore, most studies of educational efforts were limited to gathering data through questionnaires, not actual observations of educational efforts. Lastly, individuals attempting to complete dissertations are normally not concerned with policy decisions - their primary concern is the completion of degree requirements.

Fortunately, over the past twenty years, significant changes in research agendas have made it possible to plan, implement and analyze educational research so that there are also practical implications for such studies. Meta-analysis techniques have made it possible to combine the results of numerous studies. Financial inducements from governmental and private agencies have encouraged the study of larger samples of subjects, providing better control situations, implementing sociological and anthropological research designs, and making it possible for teams of researchers to
view educational successes and failures up close. Furthermore, these externally supported efforts required that the findings be scrutinized for policy implications.

Unfortunately, in the review of studies that follows, very few of these advances noted in the previous paragraph are found in the literature on headmaster effectiveness in developing countries. Most of the studies are reports of single-person dissertations and reflect many of the faults of all dissertation studies. They also have one additional difficulty that must be recognized - although most of the studies were completed within developing countries (and mostly by nationals) they were completed as requirements of doctoral programs of foreign universities, and accomplished usually under the tutelage of foreign advisors. The good news, however, is that there are at least rudimentary data available.

What are these data bits about? A number of areas are covered in the studies. Extremely popular have been studies that dealt with the societal functioning of a school under the leadership of a headmaster. These types of studies were quite popular in the United States some two decades ago. At that time, under the influence of educational sociologists, effectiveness was defined in terms of the societal functioning of a school. A number of researchers looked at the "climate" of a school - the cooperative and uncooperative efforts of principals, teachers and students in the educational endeavor. The instruments used in these studies are easily administered and permit the collection of a large amount of data. In the reviewed studies the reader will see a sizable number of reports about (a) organizational climate - the school environment as viewed by headmasters and teachers - and (b) the leadership style of the headmaster as perceived by teachers, headmasters and members of the community which is served by the school.

The instruments used to gather data concerning these variables are identical to the ones used to gather similar data in the United States over the past 20 years. Thus, the reader must recognize the possible difficulty in interpreting the results. A simple translation of words and sentences to another language does not solve the communication
problem, obviously. In only a few studies were new reliability and validity studies of these instruments completed before the instruments were administered.

A second problem is response rate. In some few studies, usually government-supported, there are significantly high rates of response. But in more than a few studies the reported response rates are at the 30-40% range, probably due to the unfamiliarity of questionnaire efforts or other cultural and environmental variables. Results of studies in industrialized countries are questioned if response rates dip below 60%. A third problem is related to the complexity of the interrelationships between personal and professional variables in school settings. This complexity is compounded even more by attempts to find single or minimal causes or at least univariate relationships between such things as leadership and administrative style, school climate, and a number of other community, teacher and student variables.

Only a few studies that were found used a similar operational definition of teacher effectiveness to that which has become popular in process-product studies within more developed countries - the change in student learning that results from school or classroom effects (see for example, Medley, 1982). Perhaps it is significant that such studies have become popular in more developed countries only in the past 20 years or so since the catchword for school budgeting cycles has become "accountability." Within more industrialized countries, parents and other taxpayers have required school personnel to demonstrate that they have focused seriously on the raison d'être of schools - "preparation of a learned citizenry." This does not mean that researchers and policy makers within developing countries have not recognized waste in school operations (see for example, Huq's classic 1975 study on the return of educational output). But what the reviewed studies do make clear is that there is a growing interest in studying different measures of success. Instead of research that looks only at more global criteria such as number of schools, texts, libraries or the dropout rate of schools, these studies focused on administrator background and efforts - and while the studies are mostly
correlational, we feel that they are a forward step toward the development of future cause-effect studies that just might permit more valid and reliable policy decisions.

In light of these concerns, the authors took it upon themselves to gather additional data with respect to headmaster concerns. A structured interview protocol was developed with assistance of faculty and staff members in the College of Education, University of Houston. The authors - with interpreters where necessary - completed a set of interviews in January, 1987 with selected headmasters in Bangkok, Thailand and Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Drs. Jusuf Djajisastra and Drs. Gatot Suradji, both Indonesia Ministry of Education and Culture officials, completed similar interviews in Bandung and Jakarta, respectively. Both of these individuals studied with the authors at the University of Houston in 1986.

It is well recognized that structured interviews gather only a small range of data - mostly opinions. However, we felt that the opinions of headmasters would be valuable additions to the data base with respect to headmaster training needs.

In selecting individuals for the interviews it was originally hoped that a range of headmaster characteristics would be evident - age, length of service, settings (rural, urban), and perceived effectiveness. However, in actuality, the writers were limited to those individuals who were made available for interview by local supervisors. As can be seen on Table 1a, b, c, d in Appendix 2, there were some differences in demographics; however, throughout the interviews it was evident that the interviewees were those considered to be the most effective in the regions. Original plans also called for the local supervisors to be interviewed - in fact, this only occurred in the Bandung and Jakarta interviews.

In the following chapters we report our findings. We attempt to summarize the research studies that we have found and, where possible, consider the implications of these studies in light of the findings of our interviews.
SECTION 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE HEADMASTERS

Headmaster training must be viewed within its contexts. An experienced, presumably respected, teacher is chosen to become a "lead" or "principal" teacher and is given responsibility for the operation of a single school setting. This process of selecting a teacher to assume the leadership of the school appears to be universal in schools of developing countries.

While the tasks of administration no doubt vary from site to site, nonetheless, it is the headmaster or principal who is held responsible for success or failure, operation or lack of operation of a school. Obviously, what the principal does on the job depends on numerous variables, a key one being the requirements of the job as specified by those who employ him/her. How well these requirements - whatever they are - are met is some measure of headmaster effectiveness. What is known about the characteristics of headmasters in developing countries, and how are these characteristics related to the accomplishment of job requirements?

CHARACTERISTICS OF PRINCIPALS

In his comparison of leader behavior of school principals in Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan, Sara (1981) identified four approaches that have been commonly used to study leadership:

1. Traits Approach - the use of personal attributes to select administrators; the assumption with this approach appears to be that leaders lead, regardless of the situation.

2. Situation Approach - the view that leadership is a function of a particular situation; leaders can be ineffective in one situation and extremely effective in others. Of concern in these studies are contextual factors found within the environment in which the leader finds himself.

3. Sociological Approach - this view holds that there is a multifaceted set of determinants for leadership effectiveness - among these are the characteristics
of the leader, the contexts and size of the group, and the social organization that exists.

4. Behavioral Approach - Researchers like Halpin (1959) are the forerunners of the view that leader behavior can be seen as task-oriented, considerate of his followers' feelings and needs, or a combination of both. Of concern here is the *actual behavior* of leaders.

The latter two approaches are those which assume that at least some part of leadership effectiveness can be increased through training efforts.

Obviously, headmasters or principals must be appointed and the usual means for doing this is through the use of the Traits Approach - the selection of a headmaster based on some personal attributes. A key assumption in the Traits Approach is that it is possible to predict in advance which of two applicants will perform the most effectively and efficiently in the position. In many ways, this set of predictive variables is closely related to those teacher variables such as social class, sex, intelligence, personality traits, and the like that have been used in processing applicants for teaching positions. These variables were dubbed with the term PRESAGE variables by the American researcher Harold Mitzel some thirty years ago (cf. Mitzel, 1957). But just as studies of teacher effectiveness in more developed countries have not generally been successful in determining significant relationships between teacher PRESAGE characteristics and student achievement, few studies have found significant relationships between headmaster PRESAGE characteristics and school effectiveness.

However, in recent studies of school effectiveness (cf. Stevens & Marsh, 1987), there have been serious inquiries into the range of strategies that American elementary principals have and use in solving problems that occur in the school. "Visionary" principals appear to be forward-looking and have been described as individuals who see day-to-day problems as a means of increasing school productivity rather than as simply hindrances that impede progress or achievement. Most reports indicate that this
characteristic is not taught - it is within the personality of the visionary himself. While in the United States there have been developed a series of tests to measure a number of these presage traits, no such studies focusing on personality or other personal variables have been reported in developing countries.

In general, the demographic characteristics of those individuals chosen to be headmasters in developing countries have not been major areas of research concern if the extant literature is indicative. The one single important characteristic appears to be that principals emerge from the teaching population. Some studies indicate that headmasters in schools in lesser developing countries possess academic qualifications ranging from at least nine years of schooling plus teaching credentials to a university degree plus a teaching diploma or advanced degree (see UNESCO, 1981).

Boonme (1977) reported that over 70% of secondary headmasters in Bangkok were male, while most teachers (over 60%) in these same schools were female. Boonme also indicated that most administrators (70%) had bachelor's degrees, the remaining having completed certification through some other school avenue. Al-Tammar (1985) found that Kuwaiti principals generally had social science backgrounds and that most lacked graduate degrees.

The elementary headmasters that were interviewed in Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia reflect a wide variance of demographic characteristics. As noted in Appendix 2 only a few of our interviewed headmasters were appointed to their first positions after they were 30 years old. If these data are representative, maturity is one valued demographic characteristic.

When asked what makes an effective headmaster, our interviewees responded with the following: knowledge, leadership, skillful, hardworking, fairness and the good use of judgment. Comments from the Head of headmasters in Bandung, Indonesia were interesting. The following characteristics were reported as being important for headmasters to succeed: the headmaster should be a good listener, a disciplined person
and highly organized. A critical characteristic for Indonesian headmasters was being a "Pancasilist" - an individual who strongly supported the five underlying guideposts of the country; in other words, to be a nationalist and a supporter of national goals.

The major difficulty with these traits, however, remains the valid determination of whether a person has them or not. Few studies focused on this measurement issue.

SELECTION OF HEADMASTERS

It would be expected that the position of headmaster or principal would be actively sought by teachers in developing countries. This seeking was evidenced in one Thai study in which it was reported that the headmaster’s role is viewed with great prestige (Imoat, 1986). However, in another study (Stanley-Marcano, 1984, Trinidad-Tobago) subjects viewed the principalship as an unattractive job possibility. Our findings reflected the findings of Imoat - at all four interview sites, participants expressed great enthusiasm and honor concerning their role as headmaster. However, both in our sample and in the meager literature that can be found dealing with selection procedures, these procedures appear to be diffuse. Only one study was found that raised serious questions about the selection criteria and processes of headmasters and this study was completed a decade ago. Mutunga (1977) found that the background and training of school heads in Kenya had no bearing on who became a secondary school headmaster and he questioned whether or not the then existing policies favored certain ethnic or social groups.

Headmaster selection is a critical question in most developing countries because the post assignment is often a long-term one. There is not a great deal of turnover in the jobs - what turnover there is, is reflected in headmasters who leave at relatively low mandatory retirement ages (55 years, for example, in Malaysia; 60 years in Indonesia).
TABLE 1
TIME SPENT ON ADMINISTRATION

SITE: BANDUNG, INDONESIA
N = 7 (3 MALE, 4 FEMALE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT TIME</th>
<th>PREFERRED TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. School Maintenance and Operation</td>
<td>5-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff Development</td>
<td>7-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching</td>
<td>2-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Meetings with Parents</td>
<td>3-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meetings with Students</td>
<td>3-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Meetings with Teachers</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meetings with Other Community Members (A)</td>
<td>3-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School Finance/Teachers</td>
<td>3-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teachers Teaching Preparation (Advising, Revising, Inspection)</td>
<td>10-22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Includes PTA equivalents as well as other representatives of the community.

"Present Time" refers to the reporting of what headmasters actually do with their time at present.

"Preferred Time" refers to how the headmasters would prefer to spend their time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Present Time</th>
<th>Prefered Time</th>
<th>Change %</th>
<th>No. Increase</th>
<th>No. Decrease</th>
<th>No. Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>School Maintenance and Operation</td>
<td>5-25% 12%</td>
<td>5-25% 12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>5-50% 16%</td>
<td>5-30% 13%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Curriculum Program Development</td>
<td>5-50% 22%</td>
<td>5-55% 23%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5-30% 14%</td>
<td>0-20% 11%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Meetings with Parents</td>
<td>5-30% 12%</td>
<td>5-13% 8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Meetings with Students</td>
<td>0-20% 8%</td>
<td>5-15% 8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Meetings with Teachers</td>
<td>5-25% 11%</td>
<td>5-15% 10%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Meetings with Other Community Members (A)</td>
<td>0-10% 4%</td>
<td>0-10% 6%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>School Finance/ Budget</td>
<td>4-8% 7%</td>
<td>3-15% 4%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Teachers Teaching Preparation (Advising, Revising, Inspection)</td>
<td>2-10% 6%</td>
<td>1-10% 6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Includes PTA equivalents as well as other representatives of the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Present Range</th>
<th>Present Mean</th>
<th>Preferred Range</th>
<th>Preferred Mean</th>
<th>Change %</th>
<th>No. Increase</th>
<th>No. Decrease</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>School Maintenance and Operation</td>
<td>5-25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10-34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>5-20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5-25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Curriculum Program Development</td>
<td>5-30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5-35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>3-30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Meetings with Parents</td>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Meetings with Students</td>
<td>4-10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Meetings with Teachers</td>
<td>8-10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8-10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Meetings with Other Community Members (A)</td>
<td>3-10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3-10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>School Finance/Budget</td>
<td>5-16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5-15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Includes PTA equivalents as well as other representatives of the community
In our interview, we also found that all headmasters were former teachers (some still teach part time in their schools). The following characteristics were projected as reasons for the selection of headmasters from the available teaching pool:

- effective teaching performance
- not being intimidated by students, colleagues or parents (Indonesia)
- ability to work well with others (Thailand)
- problem-solving skills
- positive attitude toward work
- knowledge
- skillful, hardworking
- good use of judgment

This focus on what a person does rather than the characteristics that he brings with him reflects an interesting claim made by Woodard in her Thai study. Woodard notes that "The Thai characterize tasks, not people" (p. 25). Perhaps this is why the behaviors of a person are critical in the selection procedure and why some of the test-trait selection procedures found in America are not used to a great extent in headmaster selection processes in Thailand.

However, it was further stated by our sample headmaster that teachers are often nominated for headmaster positions by their headmasters - sometimes, the teacher assumes a role as assistant headmaster, even without the title. Teachers, who are employed as governmental civil servants (in all three countries), know that their service records must be kept clean if they are to be selected for any advanced positions. The final decision for selection lies in either Municipal, State or Regional Offices of Education. The use of Personnel Job Evaluation Reports (Indonesia) for this final processing is not unusual.

From what we can see, a teacher is selected to be a headmaster and THEN trained; there appear to be few cases where the individual selected does not make it to the
headmaster position. No studies were found which reported that principals were selected from a cadre of applicants or appointees who first experienced some form of administrative training and THEN were "promoted" to the headmaster position. The one aberration to this last statement would be in those cases where a teacher serves as a deputy headmaster in a school, usually coupling the roles of teacher and administrative assistant. In these cases, "promotion" often follows when the individual demonstrates to his superordinates that he/she has the experience necessary to assume the role of headmaster. While this appears to be a significant step, it should be noted that there are no guidelines for determining who the deputy will be.

In short, there appears to be little evidence of systematic policies for the selection of principals that seriously consider an agreed-upon set of personal traits or training.

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

Very few studies focused on exactly what the headmaster does in his/her educational setting within developing countries. Pinkoompee's (1978) study identified the following administrative tasks that Thai administrators engage in:

- staff personnel services
- curriculum and instruction development
- school business and management
- school law
- pupil personnel services
- school community relationships
- school plant planning
- facilities and human relations

This list could have just as easily come from any beginning text on educational administration used in any university in the U.K., Canada, Australia or the United States. But what is missing is a description of what these phrases mean in the day-to-day
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>GATHERED DATA</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akpakpan (1979)</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Principals &quot;vague&quot; on such things as staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Tammar (1983)</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Principals want more freedom in role determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaedung (1977)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Principals see centralized system as limiting their actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkoompee (1978)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Global roles (personnel; community relationships, planning...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert (1979)</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Questionnaires to principals and teachers</td>
<td>Discrepancy between principal and teacher perceptions of actual performance of principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaedung (1977)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Principals see centralized system as limiting their actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodard (1985)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Sentence-completion Questionnaire</td>
<td>Lack of agreement concerning role of principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structured interviews with school and community members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
operations of a school. There is virtually nothing available in Pinkoompee’s study or any other that described the “average” day, week or year in the life of a headmaster in a school within a developing country. Only one partially ethnographic study of the work of the principal was found in our literature search. Woodard (1985) worked with elementary principals in South Thailand and concluded that most of her sample principals had very little influence over decisions that affected the quality of efforts in the schools. Based on her structured interviews she furthermore found that most of her sample principals were quite unclear about their roles in improving the teaching-learning process in their schools. She also noted that principals were especially reluctant to deal directly with pupil misconduct, attention and resistance (p. 95), perhaps because of the societal importance of the avoidance of conflict.

Based on the reported studies there appears to be more interest in determining what a headmaster or principal SHOULD do. In these determinations, the instruments used were usually those developed for the same purpose in the more developed countries. Already-developed questionnaires from such organizations as the National Association of Secondary School Principals and other similar agencies in the United States or Canada abound in the studies we have reviewed.

An example of this type of study is found in Roberts’ (1979) Liberian study. The investigator used Guba and Getzels’ Social System Theory and its related questionnaire to find that there were significant discrepancies between what principals thought they were doing in schools and what they were actually doing.

Woodard’s study (1985) is another which raises the question of whether or not at least novice headmasters know exactly what is expected of them. She found only a moderate consensus among her sample principals, teachers and community members over the central elements of the principal’s role.

Other studies reflect dissatisfactions about what principals do NOT do or are not allowed to do. Headmaster respondents in more than a few studies (see, for example, Al-
Tammar, 1983) expressed the need for more leeway in selecting teachers and allocating funds. Kaewdung (1977) argued that the Thai system is highly centralized and all matters concerning educational policies, planning, curriculum, and evaluation are entirely controlled by the central government. Thus, there are significant limitations to the administrative role of educators, headmasters and teachers. On the other hand, a more recent and well documented study by Tongpradista (1983) reflected considerably more optimism within Thailand. Secondary principals there indicated that they did have the responsibilities for hiring new teachers, planning budgets, selecting academic texts and resolving learning problems of individual students.

Interestingly missing in the unusually optimistic report of Tongpradista is any notation of the responsibility of staff development. While principals in more developed countries are assuming more and more responsibility for at least planning staff development efforts within their schools, such efforts are not as yet in the job descriptions of principals responding in the studies we have reviewed. As noted by Akpakpan in his 1979 Nigerian study, "the school principal currently has only vague responsibilities in staff development." The lack of reported data indicates that this situation has not changed much in the last decade.

Job descriptions existed at all our interview sites but the interviews made it clear that these descriptions are more global than specific. Generally, the following four functions were identified at all sites.

Supervision - of teacher/learning processes and physical facilities; this area of personnel management was generally seen as the most difficult role of a headmaster.

Manager - distributing tasks fairly among the staff members; arranging lesson timetables/schedules.

Evaluator - of teacher capabilities as well as pupils' achievement.

Motivator - of teachers to teach and pupils to achieve.
These functions are not surprising and reflect the functions of administrators in a number of educational and other sites, worldwide.

However, to gather more detailed information about what exactly the headmaster did, respondents were asked to complete another section of the Interview Protocol titled "Time Spent on Administration." In this form, the respondents noted the approximate percentages of time they presently spend in administrative responsibilities and also to reflect the amount of time they would prefer to spend on these duties during an average week. In each case, respondents were encouraged to add items if they were spending time on other efforts. Additions were made in both the Bandung (Indonesia), and Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia) sites. Unfortunately, data from the Jakarta interviews are not available. Table 1 (a,b,c) summarizes the results.

It is extremely difficult to generalize from these tables. The ranges of different responsibilities is surprising; only in Bandung is there anything resembling a commonality among the respondents. Yet, even here there is a range of 3-30% of time spent on school finance and budgeting.

Most interesting are those items that the headmaster would change if he could. In Indonesia, 6 headmasters would increase the amount of time spent on staff development; an additional 4 headmasters would increase the amount of time they meet with teachers. What makes little sense, however, is why 5 headmasters would then like to decrease the amount of time involved in dealing with the teacher's preparation. Perhaps it is because of the inspection duty that was mentioned - often negatively - throughout the interviews. Interesting also is the suggestion by four headmasters that spending less time with both students and parents would be appreciated.

In Malaysia time for curriculum program development and meetings with students would be increased for about half the respondents; the other half would decrease this time. It is interesting, however, that the range in staff development time is as high
as it is (5-50%; 5-30% preference). These upper ranges are well above those reported in both Indonesia and Thailand.

In Thailand, time for staff development and curriculum program development would be increased (for three respondents) while teaching (four respondents) and school finance/budgeting (three respondents) would be decreased if it were possible to do so.

Only in the Bandung interviews were the same preferences suggested by the person to whom the headmaster reported. This is found in Table 1a as "HM%." The Head appears to want more maintenance and operation (27%) and curriculum program development (13%) than he sees at present. The one surprising report from the Head is that he sees only 7% of the headmaster's time being spent on staff development.

Of course, it is recognized by the writers that self-report inventories are not exact measures of what really happens. Nonetheless, the data might be useful in the design of future observation efforts.

PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS

A major dilemma in describing the effectiveness of principals is that there are so many different definitions of what constitutes effectiveness. As noted earlier, most studies of teacher and/or school effectiveness in more industrialized countries have used a narrow range of criteria - usually dealing with some element of pupil intellectual growth. Effective teachers are thus defined in terms of their impact on learners. A difficulty in using this criteria for determining headmaster or principal effectiveness is that the number of intervening variables between the headmaster and the pupil are multiple, complex and often uncontrollable.

Yet, throughout the world it is evident that some schools, over time, have better prepared youngsters to assume regional or national leadership positions, have graduated a high percentage of artisans and artists, or have prepared a greater number of key scientists or other professionals. For our purposes, in this section we must simply
state that the diffuse nature of "quality" is something that we have to accept almost on a faith basis from respondents and researchers, although in some selected studies it is evident that the dependent variable of quality is that of pupil growth - these studies will be identified.

An example study that used other-than-pupil-growth as a criterion is that of the Indian scholar, Dave (1987). He makes it clear that the low morale of teachers in less effective schools in his country can be tied directly to the lack of administrative leadership on the part of the headmaster. This is, obviously, no less true in more developed countries. But at least in the United States, effective schools are characterized by assertive and achievement-oriented leaders. The effective school - one that has consistently high pupil achievement - normally reflects an orderly, peaceful and purposeful climate; there are high expectations for staff and students, and there is - more often than not - effective leadership evident in the plan, design and implementation of instructional programs - programs that keep students academically engaged in those tasks that engender learning. Dave, however, in his study does not make it clear that what he means by "less effective schools."

School effectiveness was defined along a sociological basis by a number of American researchers starting in the early 1960s. Gorton and McIntyre in their national study of secondary principalship in the United States (1978) summarized several decades of research on the sociology of the school by noting that effective principals have "an ability to work with different kinds of people having various needs, interests and expectations." Such summaries reflect earlier theorists such as Halpin (1959) who depicted a number of leadership styles that represent combinations of "task orientation" (high emphasis on tasks to laissez-faire leaders) and "people orientation" (highly concerned about the needs and wishes of subordinates or not concerned about such concerns). Similar findings were theorized by individuals like Blake and Mouton (1964).
What emerged from these theories are a number of instruments which assess interpersonal relationship preferences and actualities of the principal and staff members of hierarchical organizations such as schools. Especially popular in educational research were instruments like the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed initially by Halpin and Croft (1963) that permits the identification of such factors as the leader's.

"thrust" - behaviors that move the organization in a positive direction
"openness" - behaviors that are reflected by shared leadership of a number of people in the organization
"authority needs" - a reflection of the perceived needs of headmasters to "be in charge"

and other factors. Other instruments like Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale permit the identification of the leader's openness to alternative suggestions and willingness to share leadership. Still other instruments permit a measure of the authority needs of headmasters as well as a determination of job satisfaction of both headmasters and teachers.

Studies of headmaster's roles and efforts use one of these three areas as measures of effectiveness. A sampling of reported research follows and is summarized on Table 3, which provides summary statements about the studies.

**EXPERIENCE.** Ehiametalor (1985) found that his Nigerian principals with 12-19 years of experience performed at higher levels than others in his sample. However, both Loxley (1984, Botswana) and Ali (1984, Kuwait) found no relationship between number of years of administrative experience and perceived leadership skills (Ali) and student achievement (Loxley). Morales and Pinellsiles (1977) determined that there was a low, but significant, relationship between the length of the principal's postsecondary education and student achievement in primary and secondary urban schools in Bolivia. Sembiring and Livingstone (1981) found some relationship between
TABLE 3
STUDIES INVOLVING PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS
EXPERIENCE/EDUCATION/OTHER VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ehiametaler (1985)</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Teacher opinion</td>
<td>12-19 year experienced headmasters more effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales/(1977) Pinellesiles</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>More postsecondary education = slightly higher scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sembiring/(1981) Livingston</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Higher achievement related to both headmaster salary and length of teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (1984)</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Teacher Opinion of Leadership Skills</td>
<td>No relationship with years of experience, age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxley (1984)</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>No relationship with years of headmaster experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongpradista (1983)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Years of experience not related (Higher/Lower Rated Schools) to achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave (1987)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Low morale of teachers tied to lack of administrative skills of headmasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdulwahed (1984)</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Teachers are more critical of headmaster effectiveness than are headmasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingatangui (1979)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maduagwu (1986)</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Principal Questionnaire</td>
<td>Urban Heads more satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nwadike (1982)</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapaneeyangkul (1983)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td>Role expectations of Heads different when reported by supervisor or teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEX DIFFERENCES/SIMILARITIES**

- **Abdulwahed (1984) Kuwait**
  - Teacher Opinions
  - Female principals more concerned with tasks
  - Male principals more concerned with students

  - Teacher Opinion
  - No significant differences of Leadership Skills in male/female headmasters

  - Teacher Opinions
  - Leadership styles between male and female Heads

- **Ogguokiri (1983) Nigeria**
  - Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)
  - Head's "thrust" greater in more mature Heads

**SOCIAL CLIMATE OF SCHOOLS**

- **Ahmad (1981) Malaysia**
  - Heads exhibiting high human relations
  - Orientations were in schools that are more "open"

  - Principals and teachers in their opinions about Heads' "demand reconciliation"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhotong</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Heads more supportive of staff and emphasizing school goals judged more competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatangul</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Heads with rigid rules did not motivate teachers or students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanasobohn</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Secondary Heads high on interpersonal relationships; low task-oriented human relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imoat</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Secondary Heads hold lower democratic values than primary Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1986)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaewdang</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Heads’ interpersonal concerns better predictors of student business achievement than concerns for business management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahdi</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Teacher Opinions</td>
<td>Principals less tolerant when problems have vague solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbuokiri</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership style of Head related to school organizational climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaniyi</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Climate related to pupil achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Ahmad</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinprasong</td>
<td>泰国</td>
<td></td>
<td>More mature teachers rate Heads’ “initiating” behaviors high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indonesian pupil achievement and the salaries of headmasters and length of teaching experience. In his review of these latter studies, Fuller (1987) correctly noted that administrator salary might be reflecting other context variables. In Indonesia, for example, numerous headmasters hold two jobs in order to make additional salaries. Higher paid headmasters might be able to concentrate their efforts on those steps necessary to generate more effective school environments.

But there are other findings that reflect almost the opposite. Ali (1984) found no significant relationships between Kuwaiti secondary school principals' age or sex and their perceived leadership skills.

**Studies of Job Satisfaction and Colleague Opinion.** As would be expected from questionnaire data in general, few studies identify negative perceptions of administrator effectiveness from his viewpoint (only one such claim is made, in a study by Dhanasobhon, 1982 in Thailand). Reflecting the findings of most studies, are Abdulwahed's (1984) Kuwait study, Chinatangul's (1979) Thailand study and Nwadike's (1982) Nigerian study. All three researchers found that their sample teachers were more critical of principals' effectiveness than were principals themselves. Interestingly, in Abdulwahed's study, female principals were found to be more concerned with organizational tasks while male principals were more concerned with people. Singh (1984) determined that teacher job satisfaction in schools in Nepal was highly related to the headmaster's task and expressiveness but inversely related to the headmaster's authority needs.

Ali (1984) found differences in the perceptions of principals and teachers of the principals' "demand reconciliation" (the call on the part of the principal for others to complete their responsibilities while at the same time insuring a cooperative attitude). Similar differences were found by Mahdi (1984) in her sample of staff members in elementary schools in urban Baghdad, Iraq. Mahdi also found that teachers reported that their principals were less tolerant with them when problems arose for which there
were not clear-cut solutions. Sinprasong (1983) found that more mature private secondary school teachers in urban Thailand rate their principals’ leadership behaviors as high on initiating; the same was not true of younger teachers. In yet another Thai study, Dhanasobohn (1982) found that secondary school principals in Bangkok reflected high interpersonal relationship and low task-oriented human relations behaviors. In a similar study, Imoat (1986) found that Thai secondary principals held lower democratic values than similar individuals at lower levels. In yet another Thailand study, Chinatangul (1979) found that administrators of schools that had more rigid rule applications were lacking in behaviors that motivated teachers and students to strive for success.

Sara’s (1981) study involved over 1200 Nigerian, Pakistani, Saudi and Sudanese teachers in analyzing perceptions of leadership behaviors of 99 headmasters. In each of the countries it was found that

a. The principal’s actual behaviors fell short of the teachers’ ideal expectations.

b. Teachers and principals had similar ideal expectations of the leadership behaviors of the principals.

c. Teachers and principals differed significantly in their descriptions of the actual behaviors of the principal.

d. Principals reflected a high relationship between their ideal behaviors and what they did in their leadership roles.

Roberts (1979) however, provided a clever explanation for such findings. She noted that other things like the lack of funds, materials, training and time are the real cause of the discrepancies between the expected and actual roles of her sample secondary school principals and teachers in Liberia.

In a well-designed Nigerian study, Olaniyi (1985) attempted to examine not only the perceptions of teachers, students, and principals of school climate but also views the relationship between the role of the principal and secondary student achievement. He
found that there was a reasonably high degree of reliability between the various perceptions of school climate. Interestingly, when student demographic variables were controlled, he found that school climate was highly related to student scores on a nationally standardized test. Ahmad's (1981) findings were similar in her study of elementary schools in Malaysia. Al-Shakhis (1984) found that demographic variables (specifically sex, income and childhood background) as well as organizational variables had a significant effect on the leadership styles, attitudes and perceived needs among Saudi Arabian principals. Ogbookiri (1983) found similar results when he looked at secondary principals in Nigeria.

The Ogbookiri study is especially fruitful in a number of areas. Looking at the organizational climate of secondary schools, he found that the leadership style of the principal was significantly related to school organizational climate; significant is that the principal's "thrust"\(^2\) was determined to be the best leadership characteristic. Ogbookiri further determined that those administrators with more experience had the greatest "thrust."

Nwadike's (1982) study is interesting in that he found that Nigerian secondary school teachers saw their principals as "better administrators than leaders." This was also reflected in parental ratings of principals.

The study completed in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia by Ahmad (1981) is quite revealing. She found a bimodal distribution between elementary school principals - they were found to be either both human relations-oriented and task-oriented or reflected neither of these characteristics. She also found that high human relations-oriented schools were more open.\(^3\) Yet, she was unable to find a relationship between

\(^2\) Thrust is defined by Halpin and Croft (1966) as the behaviors of principals that are characterized by evident efforts to 'move the organization.' This is considered a positive trait.

\(^3\) "Open" schools refer to those in which the actions of principals and teachers emerge easily and without constraint and in which leadership emerges easily and appropriately from both the principal and the teachers (see Halpin & Croft, 1966).
principal leadership style and student achievement. Fascinatingly, however, Ahmad did find that the leadership style of her principal sample was related to principals' perceptions of bureaucratic controls that affected the schools.

Kaewdang's (1977) study of 120 schools from a stratified sample of Thai elementary schools is also instructive. Kaewdang found that there were significant relationships between the principal's modeling behaviors, encouragement of community/teacher sharing in the development of school policies, and student achievement in language and mathematics. It is fascinating to note that there was also found to be a very low relationship between the principal's concern with the tasks of finance and business management and school effectiveness. Bhotong (1983) looked at differences between leadership variables of those principals assigned to Recognized Schools (schools that, because of their previous record of excellence were "recognized" nationwide) in Thailand. It was determined that administrators in these schools were more supportive of staff members, had a higher goal emphasis and work facilitation and were judged to be more competent by their teachers than principals assigned to other schools. Whether the assignment was a result of the administrator already having these skills was not addressed in the study but it was evident that those principals rated the highest were more goal committed and consultative in their interactions with subordinates.

Tongpradista (1983) found no relationship at all between such things as age, years of experience, school size or number of assistants and the self-perceptions of administrative abilities and effectiveness of secondary school principals in urban Bangkok, Thailand. In a similar study, Tapaneeyangkul (1983) found that the role expectations of headmaster are different when reported by supervisors and secondary school teachers in Thailand. Interestingly, these expectations were perceived differently by teachers who varied in their levels of academic training, age and years of teaching experience.
Other context variables such as wealth, educational background and geographic location of schools were viewed in some studies of headmaster effectiveness. Rural schools were especially targeted. Verspoor and Leno (1986) cited the work of Heyneman (1980) and World Bank reports to note that the quality of teaching and learning remains low in rural areas throughout the world. While we found no studies of headmaster impact on school effects, there were some studies that looked at other relationships.

According to some reports, capable headmasters are not required to be in rural areas, and if they come to urban centers from these areas they seldom see any incentive to return (see, for example Collings and Lyons (1980), p. 46). Maduagwu (1986) found that there were no differences in job satisfaction of Nigerian principals based on salary or degree holdings. What makes a difference, it appears, is the location of the school where one serves as headmaster. Those principals of schools located in more remote areas appear to be less satisfied with their jobs than those located near the cities. Satisfaction, in this case, appears to be related to the opportunities for quality learning.

In an interview process, attempts to identify poorer-rated headmasters for the interviews met dead ends. However, in discussions with headmasters the question was raised about what constitutes a "poorer-rated school or headmaster." The answers that were received were almost the total opposite of the reasons that the headmasters thought they had been chosen for interviewing. There were some other answers, however:

Lack of confidence of parents in school leadership and performance
Lack of "tranquility" in school
Failure of school to meet local needs
Fiscal irresponsibility
Headmaster does not follow edict of superiors and does not insure cooperative efforts among teachers in school
Headmaster does not spend enough time on the job
These comments probably would be heard from critics of poor schools in any country but there is one comment that is especially interesting: the failure of the school to meet local needs. In all three countries compulsory schooling is a recent event. In addition, national curriculum requirements have appeared only recently, and within Indonesia, these requirements have changed significantly each of the past three decades. Interviewed headmasters all agreed that even in rural districts parents supported their increased educational thrust. However, in some schools, effective headmasters are better able to balance local needs and national curriculum requirements. Satorn (1971) made an interesting point concerning the relationship of headmasters and rural parents. His publication is a bit dated but he noted that over 85% of the Thai people are farmers and practice a subculture often little understood by urban-oriented administrators. There are no studies, however, that document this. In fact, the family backgrounds of most of our interviewed rural headmasters indicate that they came from similar backgrounds as their clientele.

One is reminded here of Michael Katz’ IRONY OF EARLY SCHOOL REFORM - a little recognized, but highly important study of American educational change. Katz projects the idea that the greater confidence that the public (in this case, local parents) have in the school as an agent of societal “improvement” the more support they will give to the school. One needs only to view the lack of public confidence that has emerged in the United States over the past 20 years to see some interesting parallels.

In our interviews we found that both the Heads and the headmasters pointed directly to the results of instruction that occur in their school. Students in their schools were reported to have scored well on national tests (all three countries); in addition, a high percentage of graduates were admitted to next level academic schools (Indonesia). In a number of interviews the headmasters indicated that they had been praised for efficiency and dedication by their superiors. In over half of our interviews, headmasters singled out their teachers for credit (they were seen as diligent; they
provide extra lessons to students voluntarily; they were dedicated...). The Malaysian headmasters were specific in noting the division of work (and presumably leadership) in their schools among their staffs and themselves.
SECTION 3 - HEADMASTER TRAINING ELEMENTS

No studies were found which denied that headmasters should have advanced training. Mohammed (1981) makes it clear that most secondary principals in Malaysia recognize the importance of self-development, both academically and professionally. His sample principals furthermore reflected a keen consciousness of their deficits in administration skills as well as the desire to remedy their weaknesses. Interestingly, Asasucharit (1983) found that younger, less experienced, and less educated principals in larger secondary schools in Thailand saw a greater need for in-service training than their counterparts.

Rodwell and Hurst in their 1985 Barbados symposium report indicate that there are five main forms of administrator training in developing countries:

1. Ad-hoc on-off courses or conferences organized by local, regional or Ministerial authorities
2. University courses
3. On-the-job training
4. Training abroad
5. Specialized Ministry-sponsored institutes

Listing the types of training does little, however. A problem is not with the identification of types but with the impact of the programs on the trainees. No studies report dissatisfaction with the goals of training programs - if there is perceived dissatisfaction it is with what is seen as the hit-or-miss nature of the efforts.

Rodwell and Hurst raise a number of points concerning the relative advantages and disadvantages of each form of training but the issue typically comes down to one of the perceived dichotomy between practice and theory. While on-the-job training can be a valuable and practical learning experience it is rarely provided in a systematic way (cf. Rodman & Hurst, p. 7). Often the selected teacher is simply thrust into a principalship. In larger schools, the selected individual serves as an apprentice under a
headmaster until such time as the assistant assumes the top job, either in that school or another. It is for this and other reasons that Gajir (1978) reported that the most efficient and valid means for designing in-service programs for administrators was to design personalized training elements - focusing on the individual concerns of administrators - that would result from frequent Ministerial evaluations of individual administrators.

The development of national institutes for the training of educational administrators has been one solution offered in a number of countries (including India, Thailand, Philippines, Kenya, Papua New Guinea and Malaysia). Malaysia, in fact, has developed a permanent institution - the Malaysia Education Staff Training Institute (MESTI) - as part of the Ministry of Education that has assumed the responsibility of the training of educational administrators and supervisors.

Yet there are three problems with such thrusts. The first is that even in countries like Malaysia where national institutes have been in existence for several years the numbers of new headmasters needed for the burgeoning number of schools is too large to be handled effectively. As a result, many headmasters continue to learn their skills primarily through on-the-job training programs. The second problem relates to the curriculum and instructional efforts of the training programs. There is general disagreement about what the curriculum should reflect and who should provide the training: Ministry staff members, higher education faculty, or more experienced colleagues. This latter point will be dealt with in our summary section.

Kinggundu et al. (1983) pointed to a set of studies which indicate that there is a favorable attitude within developing countries toward the use of administrative training strategies in more developed countries. Among the studies cited are:

- Moursi's (1975) study seemed to show that traditional cultures in developing countries do not impede the application of new training methods and these environmental factors, in fact, encourage the use of newer methods.
- Badran and Hinings' (1981) study concluded that developing countries have the advantages of being late starters; in fact, they are more open to scientific management techniques than are older firms in the West.

This opinion, however, is countered by the pessimism of Thiagarajan and Prahalad (1969) who some two decades ago pointed to a number of problems involving the implementation of behavioral science-oriented management training programs for administrators in developing countries.

Lastly, Rodman and Hurst correctly indicate that such national or regional efforts are also burdened by the lack of coherent national policies for the training of administrators, although some countries like Thailand and Malaysia have led the way in the development of such policies.

STUDIES ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF HEADMASTER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Just how successful are training programs for headmasters? There are few such studies that have dealt with this question although both Tongpradista (1983) and Tipayarat (1985) noted that the Thai ministry's training program for administrators was highly valued by secondary principals.

Two other studies stand out, however. Hariri's Saudi Arabian study (1982) investigated whether principals who had gone through specialized headmaster training programs were perceived differentially as being more competent and whether the schools they administered had more favorable "climates" (here using Halpin's organizational climate ideas). He found instead that those administrators from 150+ buildings who went through training programs were rated no higher than non-trained administrators by their respective teachers. Similarly, no differences were found in the climates of their respective schools. Similar results were found by Rodprasert (1976). In his study two samples of administrators were selected from a pool of headmasters who were judged to be more and less effective by their teachers. No significant differences were found between the administrative performance of
secondary-school principals who were trained or not trained in educational administration techniques.

Of course, in these studies it is quite feasible that the training programs were not the cause of the difficulties, but, nonetheless, these findings are important to recall.

STUDIES THAT PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR HEADMASTER TRAINING ELEMENTS

While numerous evaluation studies concerning headmaster training elements are lacking, there are many suggestions concerning ways to offer or improve headmaster training programs. Time as well as course objective and delivery systems are usually cited. There also appears to be overriding concern that there should be national policies and plans for the training of pre-service and in-service training of principals.

The distinction between short-term needs of prospective or present headmasters (such things as financial reporting, keeping statistical data on students...) and their long-term needs (developing coherent community and school programs, involving others in setting policies...) is neatly identified by Mohammed (1981) in his study of Malaysian secondary schools.

Many training programs appear to focus primarily on the concerns of daily administration which take precedent over techniques for focusing on long-term policy planning efforts. This may be a workable training element for those beginning administrative careers but is probably not the most satisfactory training element for all experienced individuals. For example, Allege (1982) found that it was only the experienced Nigerian administrator who was able to perceive the seriousness of educational problems in his nation.

A number of other training suggestions emerged from various reported studies. Most frequently cited were agreements on the needs in the areas of administrative skills, leadership curriculum and instructional background, personnel management, parent and community involvement, as well as facility and financial management (see, for example, Shrestha, 1982, Nepal & Asasucharit, 1983, Thailand). Woodard (1983) suggested in
her ethnographic study that additional training is needed by administrators in human relations, methods for improving school organizational climate and techniques for assisting teachers with the teaching/learning process; however, these suggestions were also accompanied by great pessimism about the effectiveness of Southern Thai elementary headmasters. However, Gaban's (1982) study in Malaysia does provide some optimism for planning effective headmaster training programs. He found over 95% agreement between secondary principals, inspectors and central office personnel with respect to what competencies should be included in any training program for principals. Similar agreement was reported by Tipayarat (1985) between 280 elementary school principals in rural Thailand. On the other hand, Gajir (1978) reported little consensus from Nigerian principals concerning what should be included in in-service programs.

Jongjit (1983) reported a needs assessment study of public secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand. His headmaster respondents reported the following in-service program needs for administrators:

- providing the programs early in the school year
- using role playing as a form of instruction
- using expert trainers in specialized areas
- providing continuous programs of short courses of 1-10 days in length
- insuring that the group size was between 16-30.

Jongjit's findings can be contrasted with those areas of highest rating of in-service needs reported in Pinkoompee's (1978) needs assessment study of almost 30% of administrators in Thailand:

- "organizing the school system"
- "developing effective short and long-range plans"
- "designing and evaluating curriculum"
- "encouraging innovation and change in curriculum and instructional programs"
- "encouraging staff planning and facilities and human relations"

In several studies (one of which is that of Stanley-Marcano, 1984, Trinidad-Togabo), length of training was considered. Training periods ranging up to two school terms of full or part time study - away from the school site - are suggested.

Mohammed (1981) suggested that secondary school principals' associations be provided with a fund to provide in-service training for its members. The benefits of such support systems for "in-service" principals are cited in a number of studies. Al-Tammar (1983, Kuwait) cites local principal group meetings as being of key assistance, although his sample also indicated that they wanted even more meetings and especially wanted to meet more often with national professional groups and the Ministry staff.

Ogbuokiri's (1983) fascinating study of Nigerian secondary schools ended with the recommendation that where conditions permit, experienced principals should be placed over two or more secondary schools that can be clustered together, thus providing the opportunity for an inexperienced principal to have a year or two of experience under an experienced principal. Ogbuokiri's compatriot, Nwabuoku (1982), even went so far as to design a self-paced program for state-licensed principals in Nigeria based on the effective school research literature that he studied at the University of Pittsburgh. No results, however, are reported of his design either in operation or effectiveness.

**INTERVIEW RESULTS THAT FOCUS ON TRAINING CONCERNS**

In our interviews we asked a number of questions that deal specifically with training - both perceived needs and also the identification of where our sample headmasters learned their skills. One question that was asked dealt with the present organization of the school in which each headmaster was located.

In terms of school organization, the most commonly heard term was "hierarchically." There are over 20,000 schools in rural Thailand. Schools with over 480 students can have an assistant principal. In many rural primary schools, the
principal is a part-time teacher (Kaewdung, 1977). In all interviews the headmasters made it clear that other ancillary personnel evident in most western schools (secretaries, clerks...) are missing in primary schools in these three countries, although our sample schools appeared to have a significant number of "laborers." As a result, effective schools run on shared leadership: there are assigned roles for all teachers - everything from facility management, guidance, student affairs, curriculum (Bandung, Indonesia interviews), parent relationships (Thailand), "guardians" of various grade level classes, security, library (Indonesia), treasury and sports (Malaysia).

The responsibility for running the school, however, remains with the headmaster. In some cases (Bandung, Indonesia), as many as four individual schools are located at a single physical site; at the same site, four headmasters work together with their leadership subordinates. In other physical sites, different headmasters are assigned to morning and afternoon schools - necessitated because of lack of classroom space. The need for cooperative leadership efforts among headmasters is thus pointedly clear.

Malaysia has a special set of circumstances that can strain leadership. The growing importance of the Persatuan Ibu Bapa Guru (PIBG - Association of mothers, fathers, and teachers) at each school creates situations where the administrator must assure happiness in all sectors. The influence of the Governing Boards of schools (a remnant of the British influence in Malaysia) appears to be shifting to the PIBG. In those schools represented by our interviewed headmasters, it appears that a high degree of human relations skills is a must - according to our sample, if such skills are evident, the PIBG's influence improved the school even more. If the skills were not in evidence, problems ensued.

Headmasters were also asked what was the most difficult thing about being a school Head. The question produced a wide variety of responses. Among these were:
Personnel management - guiding and developing teacher skills and attitudes toward national and school policies; guiding teachers to continue their professional development; disciplining teachers when needed; uniting the campus to single goals; guiding school attendants to do the job properly; dealing with teachers who have minimal background in the subjects they are teaching; personnel assessment, especially with teachers who are less well trained.

As one Thai administrator put it - "convincing people who work in the school to work the way I want."

Financial matters - managing school finances given the small amounts that are set aside for each school; getting replacement furniture and other instructional aids with little or no money budgeted for such purchases; other general budget matters.

As one Malay headmaster noted: "There are limited funds and high expectations."

Policy changes - how to implement new governmental decrees with staff members who are not fully trained; understanding both the content of the new decrees and the implications for the school personnel and students; providing guidance to staff members to implement new ministerial decrees.

Time and scheduling management - arranging of hours for class time that meet the requirements of the syllabi while at the same time dealing with unavoidable outside disturbances in the community.

Campus difficulties - especially with Indonesian headmasters, there were reports of difficulties dealing with non-school attending children (noise of younger children, tardiness), local vendors and the smell of rubbish that is thrown near the campus by the local population.

Then there were the universal problems with (1) lengthy and not-very-useful supervisor's meetings and (2) paperwork.

Obviously the determination of training program elements must consider both things expected of all Heads as required by local, regional or national policies - for
which there are usually straight-forward mandates or, if modifications of usual steps are needed, for which permission from superiors must be obtained. However, in all leadership positions there are also those decisions for which there is considerable flexibility. Our interviewed Heads were asked to identify those decisions that they can make without consulting their superiors. Again, diverse answers were received.

Most interesting were responses of the Heads of Headmasters in Indonesia. Each headmaster pointed to the fact that since personnel decision making (hiring) was at the District level and that curriculum decisions were based mostly on a national mode, the major responsibilities for headmasters were primarily reserved for local campus management.

But within this local setting there were still many decisions that still must be made. Meeting of local needs within a national curriculum thrust certainly takes skill. Furthermore, the "personality" and the chemistry of the school appears to be directly reflective of the headmaster's leadership. This reflects the findings of a number of school climate studies reported in the previous section.

This discovery was also made in our Thai interviews. National curriculum changes have been many over the past two decades in Thailand, and it is the principal who assumes responsibility to assure that the curriculum is correctly implemented - all within district or national standards. This is not a simple process.

Even something as common in local schools as student expulsion is complex. In Malaysia, local parent committees must be convinced that expulsion of a student is indeed justified and best for all concerned.

Evident from all interviews was that local decisions that were made and were in any way at odds with Ministry or District requirements or expectations called for additional paperwork.

Responses to our intervention question about the most favored and/or major type of tasks supervisors ask them to perform were difficult to rank. Not unexpectedly,
written and oral reports are required at all sites and are requested on a variety of topics. What seems to be a key in interpreting the obtained data reflects on the implementation of recent governmental decisions. In Malaysia several new curriculum strands were presented to schools at almost the same time: reports on the teaching of new health texts and guides, lunch requirements and other curriculum changes designed to focus on student cooperation were major concerns that supervisors required of their headmasters. In Indonesia the catchphrase is Cara Belajar Siswa Active (student-active learning) that reflects the concerns that supervisors lay on headmasters in the Bandung area. Student-active learning is to be the mode of instruction but little training appears to be provided to the headmaster as to how the learning should be implemented or operated in his/her school.

Other supervisory concerns identified were to (1) to maximize the use of time during the school day and (2) to establish Teacher Work Groups (Bandung). In interviews in Jakarta it was found that headmasters heard a great deal about building cleanliness, student tardiness and general discipline.

In most cases, regular times were set for the reporting of demographic data (attendance, for example), and effectiveness data (student academic achievement). A major concern heard at all three sites was that these regular reports alone were enough to keep the headmaster busy. The "extra" requests - most of which deal with the need for additional data, mandatory training, or demands that local problems be dealt with, caused an even greater burden. In Malaysia, for example, recent mandates call for a monthly report on each teacher's performance that is based on classroom observations and/or interviews.

The Heads of headmasters in Indonesia indicated that their most frequent requests followed those stated by the headmasters. School enrollment and budget data were important but these Heads were uniform in their belief that the headmaster had to be that one person who could take responsibility for newly promoted governmental policies
(Indonesia's 5K's - security, cleanliness, correctness, beauty and familiarity with student active learning).

Information is given to headmasters in a variety of ways: by personal visits, by telephone, and by regularly scheduled meetings. The ever famous MEMO was also cited.

And finally, since the salary for a headmaster is not significantly greater than that of a teacher, there must be something that makes the position attractive. Like the areas of difficulty, a wide range of answers were provided here.

Significant is that at all interview sites the success of learners was identified as a highlight. Both high examination results and the development of learners' capabilities and the brightness of student lifelong prospects were identified as indicators here. Many headmasters placed the responsibility for these successes in the hands of their teachers.

The fact that teachers are doing what is expected of them was also singled out. The teachers' roles in the organization of school events (normal and extra-curricula) were brought up, as were teachers' roles in disciplining rowdy students. The camaraderie of the school was found to be rewarding in numerous interviews. There is something apparently pleasing to these headmasters in working with other people in education sites. This is key element in the statement of several interviews which indicated that teachers are willing to work cooperatively as a team (as one Bandung interviewee noted, "living in peace and familiarity"). One headmaster noted that his personal and professional pleasure came from seeing his teachers promoted to higher ranks.

Having a good relationship with community members was considered important to interviewees at all three sites. That parents expressed satisfaction with the school was very important, as was the well-received organization of recreation and musical events within the community.

Getting as much done as possible on a limited budget was also reported as satisfactory to a small group of interviewees. The procurement of key instructional materials (encyclopedias, texts, chairs...) with little or no budget is a challenge and
the fact that the acquisition was achieved with no governmental funding was seen as a highlight.

Many administrators expressed satisfaction in getting high ratings and respect from either the administration, teachers or local community members. Interestingly, nowhere in the interviews was there an indication that the respect of the children was important - success, yes; respect, no.

Our interview summary in the training area begins with a most revealing quote from one of our interviewed Malaysian headmasters: "It used to be all trial and error." This facet of on-the-job learning was reflected in all interview sites. However, in all three countries formal attempts are underway to provide at least minimal training for new headmasters. Some headmasters had no formal training before assuming responsibility for the school. Thai headmasters, however, are now required to attend three months of training in their Institute for the Development of Educational Administration. Similar formal training elements also exist in Malaysia and Indonesia. Many, however, indicated that the length of training (maximum program length is 3 months in Malaysia) was not long enough for new headmasters.

Unfortunately, those headmasters whom we interviewed were not fortunate enough to have experienced such training. They reported they learned a great deal as assistant headmasters, from professional journals (each county has a professional organization with a newsletter/journal), from books on supervision, from colleagues, from briefings and memos from district managers and from supervisors during routine visits. Malaysian headmasters were especially positive toward their colleagues whom they called upon when they need assistance with difficulties.

A major problem that is reflected here, however, is that learning to solve problems is different from learning to prevent problems. The majority of the headmasters interviewed indicated that "on-the-job," "experiential" learning was most valuable but they realized that such learning is reactive, not proactive. While the
headmasters had no first hand experiences with the newly-developed pre-service administrative training programs in the different countries, they were unanimous in their positive responses IF such programs could assist in heading off the problems for new headmasters.

Mention was made at all sites about Ministry or District bulletins which are apparently universally read; some individuals indicated that they were involved in academic programs leading to advanced degrees but the time required for such training (even after selection by their governments) was prohibitive and caused difficulties on the job - even in situations where they were away from campus for study, they were still seen as having responsibilities, in absentia. More than half of the individuals interviewed indicated that they did not have time to take advantage of any training offerings due to time pressures associated with the job of being a headmaster.

Indonesian headmasters raised some interesting points about the effectiveness of their training programs. As was mentioned before there is a great impetus (especially in areas of West Java) toward the use of student active learning in the classroom. Training elements have provided headmasters with some information about how a school should operate using such formats. However, the headmasters indicated that a number of contextual variables (lack of teacher training, equipment, parental support...) mitigated against the use of such efforts. It is interesting that the one school that the interviewers visited in Bandung that was actively engaged in student-active learning was headed by the wife of a governmental official who studied student active learning in the United States - she is also the former head of in-service training for portions of Indonesia and was both knowledgeable of the method and quite capable of providing the necessary in-service training for her school personnel.

The responses of headmasters in the various sites were quite similar when queried about areas of additional training they desired. They were uniformly willing to be involved in further study either in their home areas, somewhere else in their
nations, or abroad, in order to improve their administrative skills. They identified the following areas as being personal needs:

THAILAND - (1) Curriculum development; the development of greater understanding of curriculum in order to work better with their teachers.
(2) Finance - all interviewees felt they had very poor understandings of most phases of school finance.
(3) Human relations techniques that would permit the administrators to get along with staffs and community members.

MALAYSIA - (1) School management - running the local campus and meeting the needs of both local and national agencies.
(2) Finance - especially budgeting.
(3) Curriculum and Program Development - greater understanding of both the content and processes of curriculum development and implementation.
(4) Personnel management - especially staff development activities and procedures.

INDONESIA - (1) Staff development and supervision.
(2) Curriculum and program development - this was mentioned in both Jakarta and Bandung and appeared to reflect a high concern for newly proclaimed curriculum reforms and a concomitant focus on student-active learning in the classroom.
(3) Budget and financial concerns.

Obviously the concerns are similar in all three sites.

The two Heads of headmasters who were interviewed in Indonesia indicated that they saw their headmasters as needing additional training in:

(1) Staff development.
(2) Curriculum and Program development.
(3) Supervision.
The Jakarta Head also indicated that he would like to have his headmasters become more proficient in the maintenance and operation of school facilities.

A number of strategies relative to training format were suggested:

1) Periodic 2-3 day sessions that deal with specific topics; the sessions would be either optional or required.

This comment came from at least half of the headmasters in both Thailand and Malaysia who indicated that the present courses were too short (usually 4 hours or so in Malaysia); the time period was identified as including intensive coverage of a small number of topics, rather than a diffuse coverage of a large number of topics.

2) Visits to exemplary schools for brief periods of time.

This comment came from two headmasters in Indonesia who indicated that it was difficult to work with teachers in the area of something like student-active learning when he/she felt uneasy about understanding the concept.

3) University study either within the country or abroad.

4) 3/4 months training programs away from school sites periodically (perhaps every few years or so).

It was interesting to hear from headmasters in Malaysia that the teaching of seminars or courses should be in the hands of instructors who had recently been headmasters and thus better understood the difficulties that headmasters experience on a daily basis. This was iterated by one headmaster in Indonesia: the short courses should be taught by instructors who are "capable and proficient, having great respect from teachers and parents."

And finally, responses to less formal approaches (seeking advice, from whom, etc.) were diverse and usually were related to the problem for which the advice was needed. Staffing and academic concerns are typically taken to supervisors at the District level. Parents were seen as important sources of advice on student problems (this was especially noted in Indonesia and Malaysia - the latter with the BIPG as a standing source
of advice). Staff meetings were cited as important. However, only in Thailand were informal meetings between headmasters of "primary school clusters" identified. In these cases, 7-10 headmasters meet on a monthly or bi-monthly basis to share problems and suggestions; this clustering appears to exist with the strong support of provincial supervisors in a great number of Thai provinces. Those headmasters interviewed in Malaysia indicated that they also met several times a year with other headmasters but such meetings appeared to be more "ad hoc" than those attended by the Thai headmasters.

A special advising element emerged from interviews with the Malaysian headmasters. An informal committee of headmasters has created a "Headmasters Reading Program Committee" whose responsibility is to read professional administrative journals from around the world, identify articles most crucial to the needs and concerns of Malay administrators, translate these articles into Bahasa Malay and provide them to members.
SECTION 4 - SUMMARY STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The complexities of the data presented in the first three chapters makes it a challenge to provide a simple summary. In attempting this, several key points are made in the form of recommendations - recommendations that probably go beyond the data but, nonetheless, deal with the necessity and complexity of education within developing countries.

A. THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL/HEADMASTER

Regardless of the quote that initiated this paper, headmaster reports and our interviews with headmasters, teachers and other education-related individuals, the role of the headmaster is generally one which is actively sought. Many of the studies cited in Section 2, however, indicate that there are no agreed-upon methods of selection. Our interviewees from three countries appear to have come from families where a headmaster's position would be seen as an "upwardly mobile" step - this is not uncommon in more industrialized countries as well. No really significant relationships between other presage variables and headmaster selection procedures were reported either in the literature or in our interviews.

Nor is there any significant way to predict success for a headmaster. Ideally, all headmasters attempt to succeed in their positions; but a number of reports of clients (especially teachers) suggest that there is presently a lack of satisfaction with principal performances. However, if Roberts' (1979) Liberian findings can be generalized to other developing countries, the discrepancies between the expected and actual roles of secondary school principals can be placed within context variables - lack of funds, lack of materials, lack of time - rather than blamed on the headmaster, regardless of how he/she was selected. Furthermore, as Fuller (1987) correctly notes: "A good deal of evidence now suggests that material factors in schools - such as more textbooks or writing materials - exercise more influence on achievement in the Third World than in industrialized societies" (p. 287).
These context variables will not be significantly changed, regardless of headmaster selection procedures or training elements - yet they point to serious concerns. In each of the countries in which we interviewed headmasters, the headmaster is a lower link in a chain-like organization that extends upward from the school through district supervisors all the way to the central government's ministerial staff. The direction of "innovation" is a top-to-bottom flow; and innovations are appearing at an incredibly rapid rate in comparison to the changes in necessary context variables. In other words, "student-active learning" can be mandated from above in Indonesia, but with little additional materials, funds and help for teacher training and community preparation - not to mention administration in-service assistance - the contexts appear to be bastions from which innovations can be fought quite well. Local innovations are extremely rare, especially if they are not within the nationally mandated scheme. And, there is extremely little known about how headmasters in lesser developed countries influence school programs. One thing is evident, however. As Gallegos (1982) notes, "From a management perspective, new alternatives to teaching and learning seem to be accepted only if they reinforce existing administrative structures or if they totally bypass established administrative relationships" (p. 20). How to manage innovations, wherever they come from, remains a significant concern everywhere.

Our headmasters appeared to be burdened with administrative details, like paperwork, which were more of a reactive nature - attendance, reports on policy implementation, teaching and the like. It was the rare administrator who was involved in staff development. The relationships with the staff members appeared to be congenial - cf. the reports from most headmasters that they were able to give some of the multitude of responsibilities to their teachers in an attempt to keep up with all the responsibilities. The lack of secretarial and clerical staff in most schools only adds to this scenario of a day-to-day survival of mundaneness.
In light of this it is almost Pollyannish to read the reports of school effectiveness research in industrialized societies. The ideal headmaster there is a leader - of instruction, of policy making, of staff development - a visionary and a change agent. But even if these results are correct4 would such findings be transferable to the schools of lesser developed countries? Fuller (1987) makes a key point here: "A hierarchical style of school management would be viewed as desirable in some national contexts; a more participatory and professional school structure would be more normative in other cultural settings."

These multiple problems of selection criteria, lack of materials for effectively dealing with the curriculum, the need for headmasters to deal with traditionally highly structured organizations of which there is only a small link in the chain of duty, and the need to manage everything from national mandates to local needs are certainly weighty and point to the need for carefully planned, coordinated and implemented training programs. In most places in the world being a headmaster is certainly more complex than it was twenty years ago. In situations which call for a narrow range of decisions, training needs are minimal and are reflected in the number of times that our interviewees indicated that they learned "on the job." Apprenticeship training programs have certainly been effective in some trades throughout the centuries. But being a headmaster is more than a trade. Research studies in more industrialized societies are showing the principal's need to be knowledgeable to technical and human relations skills that call for both the selection of the most qualified candidates and the provision of training that insures that these qualified individuals become effective headmasters.

4 Recently in the United States there has been considerable discussion concerning these results. A teacher "empowerment" movement (following such organization management books as Scott Meyers' Every Employee a Manager) sees effective schools being more the responsibility of effective teachers and thus the future role of the principal is somewhat diminished from that projected in other "principal-oriented" reports. Some individuals, like Robert Howsam, even project the principal in a management role that might better be served if he/she were trained in business schools and organizational management programs rather than educational leadership programs.
As pointed out in the research efforts, and certainly reflected in those headmasters whom we interviewed, some headmasters have had successes. They work in supportive community settings, have happy and productive teachers, see children learn, and have a great rapport and outstanding respect from their clients and their superordinates. Most have had little formal training - yet all indicate that training is needed.

The training programs that now exist or are being developed in those countries where we conducted our interviews reflect agreement with this position as well. One of our interviewees noted: "It all used to be trial-and-error." This is changing but there is evidently more data needed. Studies are needed in a variety of areas. Among these are:

a. The identification of personal and professional characteristics of those headmasters who succeed. It is not clear which of Sara's (1981) approaches for studying leadership (traits, situation, sociological, behavioral) are the most valid in looking at selecting leaders or matching them with school/community environments, but there is a need for studying personal variables of those headmasters who have demonstrated effectiveness in schools of lesser industrialized countries. As was seen in Section 2 there have been few studies that have viewed effectiveness by viewing school impact on learners. These are certainly mandated.

b. Missing are those extremely valuable pieces of information that describe what exactly an effective (or ineffective) headmaster does and does not do in his role. These data bits will only be available through case studies that employ ethnographic techniques. Woodard's (1985) study is the only one that was found that used any form of anthropology-like observation techniques, and this constituted only a small part of her efforts. The obvious difficulties of such studies - time, small samples, the possibility of changing the school just by the researcher being there - are well recognized but there simply is a large void of data about the running of effective schools in developing countries. The data are needed badly.
B. NATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS - CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

In a number of countries there are obvious thrusts to develop training programs that permit teachers to assume the role of headmasters with at least minimal training. While we were unsuccessful in procuring significant documentation concerning the plans and implementation steps for these programs, much was learned from our Headmaster interviews. Interviewed headmasters indicated that the new training programs are seen as genuinely positive developments. However, a number of key questions are raised in both the extant literature and from our interview data. The first - and most important - question is how can headmaster training programs avoid getting results that show "no significant differences" between trained and untrained headmasters (see, for example, Hariri, 1982, & Rodprasert, 1976).

A critical step in avoiding such findings is determining exactly what should be included in headmaster training programs. Several studies noted in Section 3 of this report focused on mostly unsuccessful attempts to gain agreement about what should be included in headmaster training program curricula. There is, in fact, very little agreement about what should be included. The key to this problem is further compounded by the fact that there is a positive feeling toward on-the-job learning. Headmasters who have survived look back on this experience "by fire" as invaluable. However, individuals who are about to experience the fire may indeed prefer some easier way to learn.

A major problem is that curriculum planners for headmaster training programs are often not concerned with the same elements of headmastering as those undergoing training; and if there is a great mismatch between the curriculum and the headmaster, the training is seen as irrelevant and a waste of the participant's time. The waste of money for irrelevant training programs must be considered from a national educational scheme. Allege's (1982) study is only one that reflects this concern. Only his experienced Nigerian administrators were able to perceive the seriousness of NATIONAL
educational problems. The more mundane, day-to-day operational concerns seem to be reflected in the opinions of neophyte headmasters. This latter finding is certainly reflected in Mohammed's (1981) Malaysian study which found that there was a distinction between short-term needs (reporting, keeping statistical data...) and long-term needs (developing coherent plans, involving others in policy making...) among his Malaysian secondary school headmasters.

In many ways these results are a direct reflection of the significant findings of Frances Fuller, Gene Hall and their colleagues at the R&D Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas which, until 1987 was funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Fuller used the work of John Gabriel and others to develop a paradigm of predictable patterns of "concerns" - those elements that cause teachers and administrators the greatest consternation and seem to take up most of the available physical and emotional energies of professionals. Gabriel (1957) had earlier found that experienced teachers were concerned with the slow progress of learners, whereas beginning teachers were more concerned about discipline and receiving praise from inspectors. Fuller built upon this and found that helping professionals - teachers and headmasters - appear to go from the state of "self" concerns to "task" concerns and only then to reach the highest level of "impact" concerns.

If Fuller's model were applied to headmaster training programs, the sequence might look something like this:

Phase I - Concern about self

Level I - Concerns about self as a headmaster

Concerns here are such as "Why am I here?" and "Can I be a successful headmaster?"

Phase II - Concerns about task

Level 2 - How adequate am I?
How do I put together a budget? What is my role if a student is very disruptive?
What reporting does the Minister’s Office expect? When will I be visited? What do I do if there is a problem in the community?

Level 3 - How do my teachers and community members feel about me? about this school? What are the needs of my teachers and parents? Are they being met? Do these individuals see me as being in charge?

Phase III - Concerns about impact

Level 4 - Are teachers working to insure what the curriculum requires?
What teaching behaviors need to be modified? How can I work with teachers to increase their skills? Are there things in the community or building that can be changed to assist teachers in their jobs?

Level 5 - Are teachers working to insure that students are learning what they need?
Are teachers aware of the unique needs of their learners? Are they working to insure that student and community needs are being met that are not included in the curriculum?

Level 6 - How can I increase my effectiveness as a headmaster?
How can I learn more about other instructional ideas to share with my teachers? Can I collaborate with other headmasters to insure that both of our schools are effective? How can I get more feedback from my parents, teachers, regional heads so that I can increase my skills?

Fuller’s model has a great deal to say concerning training. It is interesting that in our interviews we heard administrators in three countries at each of the levels of concern. We heard comments about salary (mostly self concerns) about reporting needs taking time away from staff development efforts (task concerns), and the need for more collaborative efforts of headmasters in a region as well as student success (reflecting impact concerns). It is interesting to note in Fuller’s model that impact (or what has been defined as teacher effectiveness) does not become of paramount concern until well
into a career. Fuller's and other studies noted that it took years for a teacher to reach this highest level. One wonders whether the same is not true of headmasters.

A key issue, however, revolves around the curricula of headmaster training programs. If Fuller's ideas hold, it appears that headmaster training programs should take into consideration the concerns of the administrators at the time they are experiencing them. This would reflect Gajir's (1978) clamor for "personalized" headmaster training programs. On-the-job apprenticeships (carefully arranged to escape the "hit-or-miss nature" of such training as identified by Rodman and Hurst) might be quite effective for at least portions of early self and task-concerned headmasters. But at the same time, a theory base must be included and might be implemented in more conventional instructional settings. The theory would reflect both early and later headmaster concerns.

The issues of research on headmasters from the viewpoint of the concerns model are many. Among these are:

a. Identifying what key competencies for headmasters are necessary for effective and efficient school operations, now and in the future. An example of the need for this step is seen in the emerging role of the headmaster in staff development. If Fuller's model holds, staff development toward the goal of increasing teacher effectiveness would be seen only in those headmasters concerned with Task or Impact levels of concern. Virtually no studies that have been reported have attempted to identify these levels of concern, but it is suggested by our interviews that the small amount of time spent on staff concerns indicates that our headmasters had other things that were occupying their time (and that they wished to occupy their time).

---

5 We were unable to identify any studies that looked at headmaster concerns in our search. It should be noted, however, that World Bank staff members Verspoor and Leno (1986) used Hall's Concerns-Based Adoption model and Beeby's (1967) model of school stages to postulate stages of quality improvement in schools within developing countries. However, they appeared to ignore Hall's Stages of Concern dimension and focused directly on his Stages of Innovation Usage dimension.
b. Ordering these competencies in terms of those expected to be demonstrated by the initiate, headmasters who have minimal experience, and those of the professional, experienced headmaster. In this way, the satisfaction of trainees should remain (or become) high. It is also crucial that those needs identified by both governmental policy and educational research findings be met in the training efforts. Consider, for example, the number of studies cited in this document that deal with human relations skills as demonstrated by effective headmasters. These skills are some of the hardest training objectives that exist, so few training programs have actually focused on them (this inference is drawn from our interviews). It is well recognized that the easiest training objectives are those that are at the lowest level of concerns - dealing with reporting, having the correct information available... The most difficult training objectives focus on the highest level of concerns, but before training can be developed it is necessary to correctly order the competencies.

c. Identifying how well these programs work. Informal interviews with both headmasters and other key professionals within the three countries we visited did not leave us the impression that there was a national plan for evaluating the satisfaction and impact of those headmaster training programs that were being developed. Such studies are needed.

C. STUDIES IN THEIR CONTEXTS

In the second section of this report the authors examined a number of studies that have focused on headmaster selection, success, training and the like. Frankly, we were pleasantly surprised at the number of studies that we could find. We also expressed some dissatisfaction with the quality of some of the efforts. But, in retrospect, perhaps this dissatisfaction is a measure of misplaced expectations. Perhaps these studies present a true set of catalysts for future efforts.

The reader must keep in mind that most of these studies were completed with little or no financial support and completed only when local or national leaders
permitted the graduate student to gather data. The small samples and somewhat low response rate from headmasters and teachers are probably reflective of the lack of seriousness that such requests for response received. Some of the design flaws are just a matter of not being able to control certain variables or to get additional sample headmasters to cooperate in the study.

And there are some real holes in the data. We know virtually nothing of what a headmaster does on a daily basis. We have few - if any - measures of satisfaction from community members, teachers, students, supervisors. We do not know what competencies are critical in assuring success. We have no idea of why an individual teacher is selected to be a headmaster. And we don't know who would best benefit from training programs designed to either produce new headmasters or increase the skills of those in the profession.

But there is interest in finding answers to these questions. Furthermore, there appears to be a critical mass of researchers who are capable of finding these answers. The researchers are presently in leadership positions within developing countries or are presently being trained in research in universities throughout the world. This latter group is always in need of identifying interesting and important topics for study. Fortunately for us, many doctoral students from lesser developed countries studying in the United States completed their required research in their homelands instead of studying some educational problem in the city in which their university is located. This is to be applauded. What appears to be missing is a clearing house that would permit the channeling of this energy to its greatest effect.

RECOMMENDATION

Professional educators and funding agencies should consider developing a clearing house for headmaster research. Such a clearing house would be responsible for cataloguing available information about headmastering within developing countries, developing a research agenda - including known, surmised, and unknown areas of
research - and publicizing those areas of needed research data, thus encouraging
educational researchers to complete their research and assist in filling in the missing
portions of the research matrix.
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APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

USED IN HEADMASTER INTERVIEWS

THAILAND, MALAYSIA, INDONESIA

WINTER, 1988
HEADMASTERS
HEADMASTERS

1. Why do you think your school was selected for me to visit? (ask this question only if it is one of the recommended schools)

2. Describe the process by which Headmasters are selected.
   a. How were you selected?

3. How is your school organized? (hierarchically)

4. When you need advice, who do you ask?

5. Describe the functions of your job. (Ask for any available job descriptions)
   A. Here's how I spend my time on an average weekly basis: (assign percentages to these functions)
      1. School maintenance and operation
      2. Staff development
      3. Curriculum/program development
      4. Teaching
5. Meetings with parents
6. Meetings with students
7. Meetings with teachers
8. Meetings with other community members (name specifically)
9. School finance/budgeting

B. Here's how I would like to spend my time on an average weekly basis:
   1. School maintenance and operation
   2. Staff development
   3. Curriculum/program development
   4. Teaching
   5. Meeting with parents
   6. Meeting with students
   7. Meeting with teachers
   8. Meeting with other community members (name specifically)
   9. School finance and budgeting

6. What are the most frequent and/or major type of things your supervisor asks you to do. (List examples of specific items and what is required.)

   a. How do you get this information from your supervisor?
7. What kind of educational decisions can you make without dealing with your supervisor? (Examples: textbook decisions, teacher hiring and firing, curriculum revision, student admissions/expulsions, etc.)

8. How did you learn what you know about:
   a. school finance/budgeting
   b. staff development
   c. maintenance and operation of school facilities
   d. curriculum/program development
   e. supervision

9. In which of these areas would you like additional training?

10. In what other areas would you like additional training?

11. In what format would you like to receive additional training?

12. What is the most difficult thing you find in being a headmaster?

13. What do you enjoy the most in being a headmaster?
14. Are there opportunities for you to keep current in the field of education?

a. If there are, which of these opportunities do you take advantage of?

15. Describe the characteristics of an effective headmaster in your country.

16. What are the things you do that are most likely to improve your school?

17. You have been identified as an effective headmaster; what makes you an effective head?
THE HEAD OF HEADS (SUPERVISORS)
THE HEAD OF HEADS (SUPERVISOR)

1. How are your schools organized? (hierarchically) (Number and types of administrators per school)

2. Why are you recommending these schools?

3. Describe the process by which headmasters are selected.
   a. How long have you known these heads? In what capacity?

4. Describe the functions of your headmaster. (ask for any available job descriptions)
   a. Describe how your headmasters spend their time on an average weekly basis. (assign percentages to these functions)
      1. School maintenance and operation
      2. Staff development
      3. Curriculum/program development
      4. Teaching
      5. Meetings with parents
      6. Meetings with students
      7. Meetings with teachers
      8. Meetings with other community members (name specifically)
      9. School finance/budgeting
b. Here's how I would like my headmasters to spend their time on an average weekly basis.
1. School maintenance and operation
2. Staff development
3. Curriculum/program development
4. Teaching
5. Meetings with parents
6. Meetings with students
7. Meetings with teachers
8. Meetings with other community members (name specifically)
9. School finance/budgeting

5. What are the most frequent and major types of things that you ask your headmasters to do? (List examples of specific items and what is required.)

a. How do you give this information to your headmasters?

6. What kinds of educational decisions do you allow your headmasters to make? (Examples: textbook decisions, teacher hiring and firing, curriculum revision, student admissions/expulsions, etc.)

7. How did your headmasters learn what they know about:
   a. School finance/budgeting
   b. Staff development
   c. Maintenance and operation of school facilities
   d. Curriculum/program development
   e. Supervision
8. In which of these areas would you like to see them have additional training?

9. In what other areas would you like to see them receive additional training?

10. Are there opportunities for them to keep current in the field of education?

   a. If there are, which of these opportunities do they take advantage of?

11. Describe the characteristics of an effective headmaster in your country.
    (List specific skills and behaviors)

12. What do you look for when selecting a headmaster?
TIME SPENT IN ADMINISTRATION

A. Describe how your headmasters spend their time on an average weekly basis.
   (assign percentages to these functions)
   1. School maintenance and operation
   2. Staff development
   3. Curriculum program development
   4. Teaching
   5. Meetings with parents
   6. Meetings with students
   7. Meetings with teachers
   8. Meetings with other community members (name specifically)
   9. School finance/budgeting

B. Here's how I would like my headmasters to spend their time on an average weekly basis.
   1. School maintenance and operation
   2. Staff development
   3. Curriculum program development
   4. Teaching
   5. Meetings with parents
   6. Meetings with students
   7. Meetings with teachers
   8. Meetings with other community members (name specifically)
   9. School finance/budgeting
APPENDIX 2

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

OF INTERVIEWED HEADMASTERS

IN THAILAND, MALAYSIA AND INDONESIA
THAILAND
### DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF HEADMASTERS INTERVIEWED IN THAILAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELIGION</strong></td>
<td>BUDDH.</td>
<td>CATH.</td>
<td>BUDDH.</td>
<td>BUDDH.</td>
<td>BUDDH.</td>
<td>CATH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE BECAME HEADMASTER</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEARS EXPERIENCE AS HEADMASTER</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER HEADMASTER ROLES IN OTHER SCHOOLS?</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1 RURAL SETTING</td>
<td>2 RURAL SETTINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY BACKGROUND</strong></td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>MERCHANT</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>WORKER</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>TEACHER/GARDENER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION/TRAINING</strong></td>
<td>TCHR COL 4 YRS</td>
<td>TCHR COL 3 YRS UNIV.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 2 YRS COLOFED</td>
<td>TCHR COL 4 YRS UNIV.</td>
<td>COL OF ED 2 YRS UNIV.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 2 YRS OCURSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 1/2 YRS B.ED. HLTH</td>
<td>2 YRS GRAD SCH CERT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(NOTE: ALL OF THESE INTERVIEWEES WERE PRESENTLY ENGAGED IN MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAMS IN ADMINISTRATION)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANY OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING?</strong></td>
<td>5 DAYS</td>
<td>B.ED. ADMIN.</td>
<td>1 MONTH</td>
<td>5 DAYS</td>
<td>5 DAYS+ WORKSHOP</td>
<td>2 DAYS ON LUNCH PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER OF TEACHERS</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATIO S-T</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-TEACHING STAFF</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO YOU HAVE AN ASSISTANT?</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MALAYSIA
### Demographic Characteristics of Headmasters Interviewed in Malaysian Rural Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>CHRIST.</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Became Headmaster</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Experience as Headmaster</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Headmaster Roles in Other Schools?</strong></td>
<td>3 TIMES RURAL &amp; URBAN</td>
<td>2 TIMES RURAL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Background</strong></td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>TRUCK DRIVER</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>FOREST RANGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education/Training</strong></td>
<td>TCHR COL 3 YRS</td>
<td>TCHR COL 2 YRS +2 YRS PRIV. SCH.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 2 YRS</td>
<td>COL OF ED 2 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Other Administrative Training?</strong></td>
<td>IN-SERVICE PROGRAM (1977)</td>
<td>TCH. COLL SUPERV. COURSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students</strong></td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Teachers</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio S-T</strong></td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do You Have An Assistant?</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES(4)</td>
<td>YES(3)</td>
<td>YES(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic Characteristics of Headmasters Interviewed in Malaysian Urban Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>BUDDH.</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Became Headmaster</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46+</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Experience as Headmaster</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Headmaster Roles in Other Schools?</strong></td>
<td>1 Time</td>
<td>3 Times</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 Times</td>
<td>3 Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Background</strong></td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Gov't Serv.</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education/Training</strong></td>
<td>TCHR COL</td>
<td>TCHR COL</td>
<td>TCHR COL</td>
<td>TCHR COL</td>
<td>TCHR COL</td>
<td>TCHR COL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Other Training?</strong></td>
<td>Headmaster Basic Courses</td>
<td>MIN. ADM. Courses</td>
<td>Headmaster Basic Course 3 Weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students</strong></td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Teachers</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio S-T</strong></td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38-43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you have an Assistant?</strong></td>
<td>YES(4)</td>
<td>YES(1)</td>
<td>YES(1)</td>
<td>YES(3)</td>
<td>YES(3)</td>
<td>YES(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDONESIA
## Demographic Characteristics of Headmasters

**Interviewed in Bandung, Indonesia**

*(Individuals are headmasters of either urban or suburban schools)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Became Headmaster</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Experience as Headmaster</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Headmaster Roles in Other Schools?</strong></td>
<td>1 TIME URBAN</td>
<td>1 TIME SUBURBAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1 TIME URBAN</td>
<td>1 TIME URBAN</td>
<td>1 TIME URBAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Background</strong></td>
<td>PRIMARY SCH. HEAD.</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>GOVT OFF.</td>
<td>PAWN BRKR.</td>
<td>MERCHANT</td>
<td>POST OFF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education/Training</strong></td>
<td>TCHR COL 3 YRS.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 3 YRS.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 2 YRS.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 4 YRS.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 4 YRS.</td>
<td>TCHR COL 4 YRS.</td>
<td>TCHR 4 YRS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Other Training?</strong></td>
<td>HEADMSTR TRAIN. CRS.</td>
<td>HEADMSTR TRAIN. CRS.</td>
<td>HEADMSTR TRAIN. CRS.</td>
<td>HEADMSTR TRAIN. CRS.</td>
<td>HEADMSTR TRAIN. CRS.</td>
<td>HEADMSTR TRAIN. CRS.</td>
<td>ADV. CURR COURSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students</strong></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Teachers</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do You Have An Assistant?</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>