Principal Leadership for Private Schools Improvement: The Singapore Perspective

Prof. Dr. Victor YU[•]

Abstract

This paper aims to examine leadership qualities among private school principals in Singapore. Findings from the study indicate that effective principals are able to establish trust, create structures that promote principal-teachers communication and maintain a high level of moral values. Specifically, it presents the findings from the case of ten private schools in Singapore. Included an overview of the study and a discussion of emergent themes and questions related to the roles of the principals and the relations between school and the community. The results from our study indicate that financial goal rank top above all other goals set by the private school principals. The emphasis on maximizing financial gain is a cause of concern as many school principals have lost their intellectual integrity as well as their academic values in their pursuit of financial gains.

Keywords: principal; school leadership; school reform, organizational change

INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to examine the leadership qualities among private school principals in Singapore. It looks at the growth of the Private School industry in Singapore. Data were obtained from field studies as well as published reports of the Government ministries. Specifically, it presents the findings from the case of ten private schools in Singapore. Included is an overview of the study and a discussion of emergent themes and questions related to the roles of the principals and the relations between school and the community. The results corroborate our hypothesis that the private school industry has emerged not only as a complementary sector to the traditional school sector, but also as a profit-making industry. The "profit-making" objectives are causes of concern as many school principals have lost their intellectual integrity as well as their academic values in their pursuit of financial gains.

In the first section of this article, the researcher summarizes the objectives of the study and the research questions. A background of the private school industry is included. Next, a review of the literature on principal leadership related to professional development and school improvement is discussed. The following section analyses the findings of the study and considers the implications of the analysis for

[•] Professor of Management - Dutch Delta University, Netherlands

principal leadership and areas for future research.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This paper examines the trends of growth of the private school industry in Singapore and aims to throw some light on the leadership of private school principals. It also looks at factors that have remained the driving force in the development of the private school industry. The main objectives of this study are:

1)   to study the structure and trends in the growth of the private schools in Singapore,

2)   to ascertain the leadership qualities of private schools principals, and

3)   to understand the expectations of educational leadership in the private school environment.

4)   to determine what factors contributed to the effectiveness of the schools

5)   what quality the principal possesses to lead the school effectively.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.   What is the state of leadership among private school principals?

2.   What is the principals' perception of their leadership roles?

3.   What are the constraints and difficulties that the principal face when he takes up these leadership roles?

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY

Though this study was conducted in Singapore, its relevance and significance is far from being merely regional. The implications are likely to go beyond geographical, cultural and social boundaries.

There are a number of potential contributions that this study makes, both theoretical and practical. In theory related issues, the key areas where this study makes a contribution:

1)   Principal Leadership: There are certain attributes that are considered important–personal and professional. The importance of this study is related to professional development of principals of private schools. If principals are able to identify the vital links connecting student learning, staff motivation with principal leadership, they will be better prepared to be leaders. In school improvement and development process, the leadership roles of principals are highly important. Without the changes of the their perceptions of their leadership roles, change will be minimal and difficult. Principals' understanding and perceptions of their own roles in facing new demands in school restructuring are essential for these will affect the outcomes of reforms as their interpretations may shape their role-taking

behavior.

2)   Policy Makers – This study is also helpful in providing policy makers with certain suggestions to improve the private education sector. The introduction of a certification scheme for private school principals could be considered. Among the criteria to be considered are qualifications and experience of the principals. Thus, the principal have to become not only a Chief Administrator but also a professional leader. In addition to focusing on profit-generation motives, the principal must create a school culture which promotes teaching and learning. The research findings show that most principals place profit-making as their number One priority, on top of everything else. Policy makers, however, should be careful not to introduce over-restrictive regulations which may suppress the operations of the private schools. Private schools should be seen as a viable alternative to students who may not be able or do not wish to enroll in the public schools for some reasons.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Enrolment at Singapore's private schools have been growing rapidly to 409,479 in 2006. Of these figure, 151,430 or 37% are full-time students. There were a total of 1203 private educational institutions in Singapore of which 642 are commercial schools. The private sector plays a complementary role of running continuing / supplementary education classes in commercial and business studies, computing, language and fine arts courses. Private schools offer courses at the certificate, diploma, bachelor and postgraduate levels. Through collaborations with international universities, private schools offer students the opportunity to attain international certification. In Singapore, only the government universities have the license to issue degrees. Unlike countries such as Australia or Canada, Singapore's private schools do not receive any government funding.

Because there is no government funding, private schools in Singapore do not have to comply to values such as equality of opportunity, the right of all children to a high-quality education, rejection of discrimination and respect for ethnic differences. However, there are much consensus among owners of private schools that they have a moral obligation to contribute to the development of students as well as respect for tolerance of difference especially in a multi-cultural multi-religious nation such as Singapore.

There are mixed feelings as to whether private schools are just enterprises with profit-making as their main motives. Like any private enterprise, private schools strive hard to attract customers and offer them the best possible value.

The roles of private schools in Singapore:

It is widely acknowledge that education is an important source of economic and social development in Singapore.

Private schools in Singapore face many disadvantages: lack of funding, low image with local students, and profoundly strict regulatory environment. Yet, despite these obstacles, private schools have managed

to survive and thrive, finding a niche for themselves and contributing to the development of Singapore as a global schoolhouse.

The main challenge facing private schools is the bias against private schools. Parents are more likely to send their children to public schools as they have more confidence in the teachers and curriculum of the public schools.

As private schools do not receive funding from the government, the question arise as to what extent should the government oversee and regulate the administration of private schools.

What role is the government playing or intend to play in promoting the private school sector?

Within the education sector, there is some disagreement about the use of the term "private" to describe government-funded institutions. Are institutions such as the Singapore Management University, the Nanyang Academy of Fine Arts or the LaSalle College of the Arts truly private? The degree of public funding should be a important criteria to distinguish between government-funded private institutions and truly private schools which receive no governmental funding at all. Both LaSalle College of the Arts and the Nanyang Academy of Fine Arts received financial support from the Singapore Ministry of Education in the form of polytechnic-level funding for the respective Diploma programme. They are also exempted from the CaseTrust for Education scheme, which the "real" private institutions have to comply with.

In this paper, we will limit of definition of private schools as those incorporated schools, many of which are companies limited by guarantee with all the assets owned by individuals, companies or religious institutions. The private schools in Singapore cater to both local and international students as well as working adults.

The main advantage of private school in Singapore is that most private schools feature smaller classroom sizes that allow students to receive a lot more attention from teachers. Because there are more personal attention given to students, the dropout rates are generally lower.

The diversity landscape in private school environment provides an invaluable experience to students. Students normally come from different countries bringing along with them the diverse cultures of their respective countries. Students are, therefore, exposed to people from different socio-economic classes, which can broaden their educational experience.

Other possible advantages of private schools include:

1.   Innovation and flexibility - As private schools do not receive state funding, they have more flexibility to develop programs and practices best suited for their students.

2.   Private schools view students and parents as clients. Therefore, they must be more proactive to meet their needs and concerns

3.   Private schools offer the opportunity for integration of age groupings. Learning is not age specific and younger students have the opportunity to tap on the experiences of the older students.

4.   Private schools sees education as a lifelong process. Because they have a more relaxed guideline on the age of the students, working adults find private schools more accommodative to their learning needs.

Crucial change factors that will guide effective private schools practices:

1)   The principle of self-determination and relative autonomy. School principals need to have increase control over their school strategies and financial health

2)   The principle of incorporating practical applications with theory.

3)   The principle of promoting schooling as a priority. The issue here is that improvement in socio-economic being is promoted by improvement in education.

In Singapore, there are no private post-secondary institutions as the government do not allow private institutions to issue their own degree. Therefore, the growth of private, for-profit post-secondary institutions is largely absent. This places Singapore at a disadvantage position behind countries such as United States, Australia or United Kingdom where we see private universities have firmly established themselves as being on the move globally. For example, the University of Phoenix has expanded its operations into Brazil, India, the Netherlands and Mexico.

In recent years, we have seen many governments encourage the growth of private institutions to meet the demands of postsecondary education while minimizing the public investment. This is evident in Egypt, Chile, India, China, and Malaysia. While the Singapore government has been encouraging foreign universities to set up operations in the country, it has not changed its policies of allowing local private institutions to offer their own postsecondary courses. It still lags behind Malaysia which placed no restrictions on the number of private colleges, citing a willingness to let market forces play out in the private education sector.

Much concerns have been raised by the Singapore government that if it allows private institutions to offer postsecondary education, institutions may be driven by profit motives and offer dubious education thus damaging the government's mission of positioning the country as an a global education hub. Perhaps, this can be resolved somewhat with the accreditation of the courses by reputable international accreditation agencies.

Increasingly, aspects of the marketing ethos have corrupted the process of education in the institutions of higher learning. The principles of marketing are applied to the universities in general, as apparent from the daily advertisements of the government universities such as the National University of Singapore, the National Technological University and the Singapore Management University. Pressured by competition from the government universities, the private institutions have adopted various marketing strategies, sometimes unethical, to increase their student base.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership is defined as the ability to get all members of the organizations to perform tasks required to achieve the organization's goals and objectives (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Good leadership is essential if

private schools are to improve. Exemplary leadership creates a sense of excitement about teaching and learning within the school and community by focusing on dreams and expectations of students, parents and the community.

Cuban (1998) refers to leadership as an influence process. Leadership, then refers to people bend the motivations and actions of others to achieve certain goals. It shows that the process of influence is purposeful in that it is intended to lead to specific outcomes.

Stoll and Fink (1996) use the concept of "invitational" leadership to explain how leaders operate in schools. "Leadership is about communicating invitational messages to individuals and groups with whom leaders interact in order to build and act on a shared and evolving vision of enhanced educational experiences for pupils".

Greenfield and Ribbins (1993) note that leadership begins with the character of leaders, expressed in terms of personal values, self-awareness and emotional and moral capability. Day, Harris and Hadfield (2001) studied 12 schools in England and Wales which focused on heads who were deemed effective by the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED). They conclude that good leaders are informed by and communicate clear sets of personal and educational values which represent their moral purposes for the school. The leaders possess the following qualities: respect for others, fairness and equality, caring for the well being and whole development of students and staff, integrity and honesty.

Principals should be able to work with others to implant the vision into the structures and processes of the school. They should be able to communicate the vision to the staff of what their schools should become (Alexander, Rose and Woodhead, 1992). A study by Bolam et al (1993) for the School Management Task Force illustrates a number of problems about the development and articulation of vision in English and Welsh schools. Their study of 12 "effective schools" shows that most school heads were able to describe "some sort of vision" but "they varied in their capacity to articulate the vision and the visions were more or less sophisticated". The study casts doubt on the ability of school heads to communicate the vision effectively and to ensure that it is shared by staff.

Within the field of educational administration, a recognition is developing of the role played by culture in the formulation and exercise of leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996). Culture refers to more than the climate of the school and includes the broader societal culture which the school is located and functions. Hallinger & Leithwood (1996) hypothesized that societal culture exerts a significant influence on administrators beyond that of the specific organization's culture.

Murphy and Seashore Louis (1999) recognized a shift in the organizational structure in schools. These included educational leadership shifts in roles, relationships and responsibilities. Senege (1990) noted that systems that change require a variety of leadership styles at different times in organizational development. Principals have the central task of building schools that promote teaching and learning for all students (Peterson, 2002). Several research studies have identified the critical role of principals in recruiting, developing and retraining teachers, in creating a learning environment within the school (Leithwood & Duke, 1999, Leithwood et al., 2004; Pounder, Ogawa, & Adams, (1995)

The work of principals is becoming more complex (Murphy, 1992; Johnson, 1994; Thompson &

Legler, 2003; Hayes, 2004; Levine, 2005). Sergiovanni (2001) citing Doud & Keller (1998) suggests that the areas of principals' responsibilities have reportedly risen in percentage in the following areas:

1) marketing / politics, etc, to generate support for school and education

2) working with social agencies

3) planning / implementing site-based staff development

4) development of instructional practices

5) curriculum development

6) attention to legal issues

Principals are facing a complex environment and they have to change their roles to meet the changing external environment. They must coordinate the services offered to their students, and to ensure that these services reach those with the greatest needs; and at the same time to ensure that there is no disruption of the teaching and learning process in school (Goldring & Sulllivan, 1996). School principals must serve as change agents of the schools (Lashway, 2003b). They are to lead change in schools to fulfill the requirements that society has largely demanded. Robin Brooke-Smith (2003) identify five control parameters that determine the state of the system in which change agents function. These are rate of information flow, connectivity, diversity, power differentials and anxiety. These are all related to what Fullan (1999) describes as the "quality of relationships among organizational members".

Goldhammer (1971) comments that in schools that are extremely good, we inevitably find an aggressive, professionally alert and dynamic principal who is determine to provide the kind of educational program he/she deems necessary. Hechinger (1981) adds that he has never seen a good school with a poor principal or a poor school with a good principal. Their views are reflected by Ubben and Hughes (1987) who note that it is the leadership of the school that makes the difference between mediocrity and excellence.

Effective leadership involves the alignment of people within the school. Aligning people means getting people to share the same vision and moving forward in the same direction. Aligning people with the same vision and a set of strategies for school improvements help produce the changes needed to cope with the changing environment (Kotter, 1990). Leadership development occurs when individuals become more skilled in getting people to work together as a team and when they have opportunity to develop high-performing work teams. Teams should be the basic unit of performance regardless of the size of the organizations (Kazenbach and Smith, 1993). School leaders must learn not to lead from the apex of the organizational pyramid but from the nexus of a web of interpersonal relationships, *with* people rather than *through* them (Murphy, 1992).

Lubienski (2005) concludes that competition in the educational marketplace results more in innovative marketing than in real innovative improvements in instructional practice. A review of the daily Straits Times showed that educational institutions are among the most aggressive advertisers in Singapore. This has also lead to much criticism of the state universities as to whether they should allocate the huge advertising budgets to subsidy students' fees or to carry out more research and development activities.

The emergence of market forces in educational systems has led to more competitive environments for schools (Foskett, 2002).Key elements in this marketisation process include open enrolment, choice, diversity of school provision, competition among educational providers and demand-driven funding (Woods, Bagley & Glatter, 1998). School principals have to give much priority to the marketing of their schools, i.e., to enhance the school's image, recruitment and retention of students (Foskett, 2002; Hanson, 1996). The survival of many schools depends on their ability to recruit new students and retain existing ones, mobilization of resources, student achievements and on their successes in making their programs attractive (Davis & Ellison, 1997; Grace, 1995; Kotler & Fox, 1995). Schools operating in competitive environments tend to incorporate various forms of marketing strategies to recruit prospective students (Foskett, 2002; Oplatka & Hemsley-Brown, 2004).

In most schools, the principal is responsible for marketing, and teachers' explicit commitment to market their school is low (James & Philips, 1995). Marketing of the school is essential as it promotes the school to prospective students and parents.

Several studies have noted that privatization of schools have lead to such achievements as lower student-teacher ratios, increased teacher autonomy, increased attendance, greater student access to computers and better-maintained facilities in schools under private management (GAO, 1996; Edwards, 1997; Peeler and Parham, 1994). However, most studies have noted the lack of evidence of student achievement gains under privatization models (Asher, 1996; Asher, Fruchter & Berne, 1996; GAO, 1996; Richards, 1996; Ligas, 1998).

Enhanced supervision and discipline may deter behaviour at schools by increasing the probability of punishment for violation or disciplinary problems on school grounds (Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore, 1982; Bryk, Lee and Holland, 1993).

Private schools in Singapore are all set up by entrepreneurs. These entrepreneurs have to show strong leadership, managerial skills and are generally motivators. Leadership describes the behavior of the school leader by task orientation, relationship orientation and change orientation. Managerial skills refers to the way the school leader resolve problems and make decisions. Motivational skills can be viewed from three dimensions: achievement motivation, affiliation motivation and power motivation.

Many private school principals believe that the growing knowledge about effective education is not well reflected in government policy. The educational outcomes of many of the reforms over the last five years have been disappointing because the reforms have not taken into account the problems faced by private schools. Some school principals contend that recent government policies have deliberately adopted regressive policies that support increased equality between the larger and the smaller private institutions, and also between the government-funded and private institutions. Many educators see politics as antithetical to education and may wish that political pressures might diminish so that they can get on with their work (Levin & Riffel, 1997). This distrust of politics is also one of the motivators to use markets as vehicles to solve educational problems (Plank & Boyd, 1994). This is exactly the case of Singapore private education sector where many schools are subjected to the various competitive forces in the market.

Private school principals, however, realized that there is no chance whatsoever of politics disappearing from education. The end has been very much in the opposite direction. More regulations are

expected to be introduced in the near future to regulate private schools. Educational leadership is evolving to meet with the changes to the educational environment brought on by increasing external pressures from various quarters.

Strategic leadership is the main role of the principal while pedagogical leadership is the responsibility of the teachers (Crowther et al., 2000, 2002; Smylie-Hart, 1999). Their relationships have been described by Crowther et al. (2000) as "parallel leadership". Teacher leaders and administrator leaders work in parallel and develop new roles and relationship within the school.

Bolger (2001) describes the principal as a mover to improve the general feelings of teachers. He observes that it is through transformational leadership and participative behavior that principals motivate the teachers. The influence of transformational leadership is also stressed by Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood and Jantzi (2001). Their study demonstrates the direct effects of transformational leadership on teachers' commitment to school reform and indirect effects on teachers efforts through teacher motivation. They conclude that the extra commitment and efforts of teachers result in changes in their interactions with students and this have a positive influence on students' outcomes (Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood & Jantzi, 2002).

Teacher quality has a significant impact on student's academic performance (Mwamwenda and Mwamwenda, 1989; Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991). More importantly, teacher quality is intertwined with teachers' perception on their work life (Perry, Chapman and Snyder, 1995). Teacher job satisfaction is often regarded as an important determinant on the educational outcomes such as students' achievement (Heller, Rex and Cline, 1992; Leslie, 1989).

Louis and Miles (1990) note that teacher leaders required a high tolerance for complexity and ambiguity. As the largest group of educators working within the school environment and those closest to their students, teachers are considered critical change agents in building professional communities and working towards school improvement (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996, 2001)

Effective learning requires good communication between teachers and students. Hansen (1979) noted that it was not possible to understand exchanges between students of a classroom without knowledge of the cultural repertoire of the participants. It was not possible for a teacher to address the issues of communication with every student of a multicultural classroom. However, the teacher could be aware of the cultural differences and could make adjustments of his or her communication technique accordingly.

There is little agreement of what it means to be a good teacher (Squires, 1999; Stronge, 2002: Turner-Bisset, 2001). Some scholars prefer to focus on effective teaching (Cooper & McIntyre, 1996; Cullingford, 1995; Kyriacou, 1997; Perrott, 1982), some on creative teaching (Woods & Jeffrey, 1996), some on quality teachers (Stones, 1992), and some on good enough teachers (Cullingford, 1995). Hellfritzsch (1945) and Rostker (1945) demonstrated the importance of attitudes towards teaching. Stronge (2002) has shown the following attitudes to be necessary for pre-service teachers to become successful teachers: caring, fairness, respect for students, peers, parents and the general community, enthusiasm, motivation, and dedication to teaching. Darling-Hammond (1997) noted that while teachers need to understand cognitively the differences that exist among students, in terms of culture, language, and family structure, they also need an attitude of sensitivity towards students' experiences.

Trust affects teachers' willingness to work with innovations introduced by school administrators. Relational trust is the result of repeated interactions with others. While personal relationships may be limited, individuals who interact repeatedly with the same individuals, leads to expectations specific to that individual or group. Low level of relational trusts lead to low levels of performance on outcomes such as student achievement (Hoy et.al., 1992; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1997), parent collaboration (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999) and teacher burnout (Friedman, 1991). Even in schools with higher trust levels, relationships between teachers and administrators are less trusting than those among teachers (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Leaders create relational trusts by involving subordinates in planning, implementing, and making adjustments in the change as it is carried out (Driscoll, 1978). In order to bring about successful reform within the classroom environment, educational leaders need to have an understanding of the process of change within the classroom teacher and this in turn, requires a greater understanding and appreciation of teacher knowledge (Hopkins, 2001; Keys, 2003a, 2005).

Change can take place at two levels: the organizational level and the individual level (Kotter, 1996; Lewin, 1952; Richardson & Placier, 2001). Change at the organizational level addresses issues such as organizational development and organizational climate (Senior, 1997). Change at the individual level addresses issues such as motivation, human behavior and beliefs and the relationship of the impact of these beliefs on the organization (Richardson & Placier, 2001)

The concept of instructional leadership was defined as consisting of direct and indirect behaviors that significantly affect teacher instructions and as a result, student learning (Liu, 1984). Hopkins (2001) pointed that the prime function of leadership for authentic school improvement is to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. Research by Murphy (1995) indicated three instructional leadership processes undergird reform initiatives at the school level: (1) defining and sustaining educational purpose, (2) developing and nurturing educational community, and (3) fostering personal and organizational growth. Girvin (2005) viewed the instructional leadership role as one that promotes the school's goals and objectives with a view to enhancing student achievement. She organized the principal's role into three broad categories:

- the principal as visionary, establishing practices in keeping with broader perspectives and issues,

- the principal as organizer, working to develop an action plan with related goals and timelines,

- the principal as cheerleader, conveying support through personal visibility and involvement in reviewing student assessments and achievements

Sheppard (1993) classify the concept and definition of instructional leadership into narrow and broad. The narrow definition focuses on instructional leadership as a separate entity from administration (Murphy, 1988). In the narrow view, instructional leadership is defined as those actions that are directly related to teaching and learning. The broader view entails all leadership activities that affect students' learning. Smith and Andrews (1999) conclude that principals who display strong instructional leadership usually has the following characteristics:

- Places priority on curriculum and instructional issues

- Is dedicated to the goals of the school

- Is able to rally and mobilize resources to accomplish these goals

- Creates a climate of high expectations in the school, characterized by a tone of respect for teachers, students, parents and community

- Continually monitors student progress towards school achievement and teacher effectiveness in meeting those goals

- Effectively hold consultation sessions with faculty and other groups in school decision processes.

Hallinger and Murphy (1998) states that instructional leadership comprises three broad categories:

- Defining the school's mission

- Managing the instructional programme

- Promoting school climate

Blase and Blase's (1998) research of 800 principals in United States elementary, middle and high schools suggests that effective instructional leadership behavior comprises three aspects:

- Talking with teachers

- Promoting teachers' professional growth

- Fostering teacher reflection

Leithwood (1994) claims that instructional leadership images are no longer adequate because they are heavily classroom focused and do not address "second order changes" such as organizational building. Leithwood et al (1996) suggest that transformational leadership is more appropriate for principalship. Principal roles in schools have become more facilitative in nature to improve school culture and to enhance professionalism.

Leithwood et al (1999) provide a detailed definition of transformational leadership

"This form of leadership assumes that the central focus of leadership ought to be the commitments and capacities of organizational members. Higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals and greater capacities for accomplishing those goals are assumed to result in extra effort and greater productivity".

Transformational leadership approaches contrast with transactional leadership. Miller and Miller (2001) define:

"Transactional leadership is leadership in which relationships with teachers are based upon an exchange for some valued resource. To the teacher, interaction between administrators and teachers is usually episodic, short-lived and limited to the exchange transaction. Transformational leadership is more potent and complex and occurs when one or more teachers engage with others in such a way

that administrators and teachers raise one another to higher levels of commitment and dedication, motivation and morality. Through the transforming process, the motives of the leader and follower merge."

Leithwood (1994) conceptualizes transformational leadership along eight dimensions:

- Building school vision

- Establishing school goals

- Providing intellectual stimulation

- Offering individualized support

- Modeling best practices and important organizational values

- Demonstrating high performance expectations

- Creating a productive school culture

- Developing structures to foster participation in school decisions

Greenfield and Ribbins (1993) attempt to combine the description from different scholars into five dimensions of a leading professional. He or she will be one who:

- Has undergone a lengthy period of professional training in a body of abstract knowledge

- (Goode, 1960; Coulson, 1986; Hughes, 1985). He will have relevant experience, such as teaching.

- Is controlled by a code of ethics and professional values (Barbe, 1963, 1978; Coulson, 1986; Hughes, 1985)

- Has a strong philosophy and clear vision (Hodgkinson, 1991; Coulson, 1986)

- Is committed to the core business of the organization, ie. The quality of student learning (Coulson, 1986)

- Is politically adept and aware of the external environment (Hughes, 1985).

Spillane (2006) adopted a cognitive perspective when offering the distributed leadership framework as a diagnostic and design tool to help practitioners explore how the practice of leadership is "stretched over" multiple leaders, followers and situation. He suggested that leadership practice is constructed in the interactions between leaders, followers and their situations. Spillane highlights *who* takes responsibility for a task (he *wh*o leads is dictated by the task and not by his hierarchical position) and *how* the task is accomplished through interactions of multiple leaders and followers. Heck and Hallinger (1999) examined how leaders and others in the organization create shared understanding about their role and participation in school.

An important contribution of Spillane's theory is his analysis of the socio-cultural context of leadership (*situation*) that constitutes and defines leadership practice and influences interactions between leaders and followers. Situation includes routines, tools and structures through which people act – the *how*

of leadership is fundamentally enabled or constrained by situation.

Brown & Isaacs (1994) defined a Professional Learning Community (PLC) in an educational setting, characterizing it as a school organization in which all stakeholders are involved in joint planning, and assessment for student growth and school improvement. Harris (2003) described PLCs as places where a shared sense of purpose was developed as teachers engage in collaborative work and accept joint responsibility for the outcomes of their work. She stressed the importance of an infrastructure that supported collaboration and a culture that reinforced mutual learning.

Lambert (2000) Ogawa & Bossert (2000), Harris (2003) contend that collaborative leadership seldom exists in schools. Ogawa & Bossett (2000) proposed that current school leadership was still based on the traditional hierarchical structures which prevented substantive collaboration among the school professionals. Emihovich an Battaglia (2000) found that most principals still perceived their primary roles to building and program managers rather than collaborative professionals.

Molinaro and Drake (1998) proposed that principals who wish to share leadership must overcome their mindset of "control over" with "support for" teachers and present them with opportunities to grow and develop. Teachers need to have autonomy over instructional practices and be empowered to solve problems. With autonomy and responsibility, the teachers are also held accountable for their actions.

Principals have to possess charismatic qualities. House (1977) noted that charisma influences an affective dimension – the followers look up to and respect the charismatic leaders. Charismatic leaders tend to be energetic, supportive and optimistic (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Bass 1985). Followers aspire to be like their charismatic leaders, and as a result, this affective process can result in role modeling the behavior they observe (House, 1977). An underlying assumption in charismatic leadership theories is that they rely on the expressions and alignment of emotions, values and self-concepts between leaders and followers (Connelly, Gaddis, & Helton-Fauth, 2002).

Another important aspect of charismatic leadership theories is the identification process (Conger, 1989; Willner, 1968; House, 1977; Shamir, et al., 1993; Bass, 1988). The identification process involves a deeper psychological bond in which it involves more intimate psychological involvement in which the follower's belief about a leader becomes self-defining (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). Followers can project themselves into their leader's situation and likely to experience similar feelings (Bandura, 1969; Stotland, 1969).

Astin and Astin (2001) research showed the importance of self-knowledge (self-awareness) particularly in terms of change and transformation in an organization. They implied an awareness of the particular talents and strengths that one brings to the leadership effort. Self-knowledge enhances authenticity and respect. Empathy is also enhanced by self-knowledge since understanding of others requires some understanding of one's self. Gardner (1996) claimed that our understanding of nature and processes of leadership is most likely to be enhanced as we come to understand better the arena in which leadership necessarily occurs – namely the human mind.

Hoy and Miskel (2001) classify traits associated with effective leadership into one of the three categories. The first is personality (self-confidence, stress tolerance, emotional maturity, integrity). The

second is motivation (task and interpersonal needs, achievement orientation, power needs expectations). The third category is skills (technical, interpersonal, conceptual, administrative).

School leadership is the foremost concern arising from this study. The importance of this concern is reinforced by the recognition of two findings from studies on school improvement:

a) the realization that the school is the unit of change (Lezotte, 2005) and;

b) the importance of principal leadership in promoting participation in school improvement efforts (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1997; Huffman & Jacobson, 2003). As with most school review processes, the measure of school leadership focused on perceptions that staff, parents and students provided.

Leadership requires the principals to accept and promote teachers competence by providing teachers with opportunities to lead. This shifts the traditional hierarchical model in matters relating to teaching and learning. Principals must balance the hierarchical approach of an adhocracy with the hierarchical approach of a bureaucracy (Beairsto, 1999). Principals take on the role of co-learner and collaborator at certain times and that of supervisor and school authority at other times.

Moral leadership assumes that the critical roles focus of leadership ought to be on the values and ethics of principals themselves. Sergiovanni (1984) says that "excellent schools have central zones composed of values and beliefs that take on sacred or cultural characteristics". The moral dimension of leadership is based on "normative rationality; rationality based on what we believe and what we consider to be good."

METHODOLOGY

Research methods can be classified as either quantitative or qualitative. The motivation for qualitative method is opposed to that of quantitative method. Qualitative method is designed to help researchers understand people and the social and cultural contexts which they live. Kaplan and Maxwell (1994) argue that the goal of understanding of a phenomenon from viewpoints of participants and its particular social and institutional context is largely lost when textual date is quantified. Qualitative research involves the use of qualitative data such as interviews, documents and participant observations.

The methodology used in this research inquiry is case study. Using multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative date, the study endeavors to examine leadership improvement among private school principals in Singapore. Data collection primarily involves oral narrative inquiry interviews (Clandinin & Connelly, 1999). Narrative inquiry scholars such as Heilbrun 91988) argued that the narrative is "the linguistic form uniquely suited for displaying human existence as situated action".

A series of telephone and face-to-face interviews were conducted with directors, principals and administrators of 15 private schools. The participants in the study consisted of 10 practicing principals, 3 assistant principals, and 5 key office personnel. The schools offer language courses (6 schools) and management courses (7 schools) and arts courses (2 schools). Each interview session lasted approximately 60 minutes. The researcher seeks to make sense of the respondents' personal stories pertaining to school

development and the ways in which these stories intersect (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). The researcher also sought to understand the respondents own frame of reference accepting that there were multiple ways of interpreting experiences (Bogdan & Bilken, 1992)

> a. The interview questions were open-ended and guided by a naturalistic inquiry paradigm (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The questions are open-ended yet specific in intent, allowing individual responses. These questions are reasonably objective, yet it allows for probing, follow-up, and clarification (McMillan 2000). The interviews were managed as purposeful conversations where their contents and evolution were not defined a priori, so that there was variations among the interviews (Paton, 2002). Respondents were not directed by the interviewer, but probes were used to encourage respondents to expand on their thoughts about the private education environment and their experiences within their past and present administrative roles.

The site visits were designed to provide a qualitative understanding of how individual director, principal and administrator approach the task of managing the school. Topics that have been discussed include how schools defined its goals; how these goals related to its broader mission; how it designed and implemented its strategies; what techniques it used; how it interacted with its broader communities; how it defined and measured progress towards its goals; and what it viewed as major challenges in the industry.

The methodological approach focuses on four distinct phases of the evaluation:

Phase 1: Establishment of the study framework

The setting up of the survey framework and structure consisted of:

- Preliminary identification of all relevant key documentation (secondary data)

- Formulation of 22 key evaluative questions (Appendix 1). This led to:

    1. Breakdown of key evaluative questions into simple intermediate questions

    2. Set up types of analysis and indicators

    3. Identify sources of information

    4. Identify types of results

- Establish quantitative and qualitative indicators

- Define proposals on the basis of the evaluative questions for the appropriate methods of analysis

Phase 2: Collection of primary and secondary data

Data were collected and analysed using a variety of qualitative techniques. Among these techniques were document analysis, interviews and questionnaire survey. The primary data is that directly collected from the respondents via the interview. The secondary data is comprised of the reference documents concerning the research subject.

The researcher visited individual schools, explaining clearly to them the objectives of the research and contents of the questionnaires. Each of the participants was interviewed for a period ranging from fifteen minutes to half an hour. The scheduled questions were asked and their answers were recorded in writing.

We use existing data on both the national and local levels in our studies. Secondary data sources include:

1.   Bureau of Statistics

2.   Ministry of Education

Phase 3: Analysis of data collected

The study is based on a relative extensive reliance on existing information and data produced at local levels. Information coming from primary sources has been examined taking into consideration the socio-political context of the interviewed person, prior to drawing any final conclusion. Erickson (1986) noted that to analyse data from qualitative studies is to "generate an evidentiary warrant" for these assertions by systematically searching for disconfirming as well as confirming data and analyzing negative cases. Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data and builds grounded theory from it (Strauss & Corbin, 1997)

Phase 4: Synthesis and recommendations

The researcher follows the procedures suggested by Marshall and Rossman (1999) in managing data:

1)   Organising the data

2)   Generating categories, themes and patterns

3)   Coding the data

4)   Testing the emergent understanding

5)   Searching for alternative explanations.

From the analysis, the researcher hopes to achieve the following:

▪ Detecting and identifying problems, as well as good practices

▪ Highlighting the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of the sector

▪ Drawing conclusions from the analysis in a final report

▪ Formulating policies and recommendations that can be applied to remedy the weaknesses identified and improve the situation

▪ Making strategic recommendations that will strengthen the private educational sector

The organization of the data was achieved by carefully analyzing the responses of the interviewees. This enables the researcher to categorise patterns of thinking or behavior, words or phases and events that appear with regularity or for some reasons appear noteworthy (Wiersma, 1995). As categories of meaning emerge, the researcher searches for those that have internal convergence and external divergence (Guba, 1978). These categories enable the researcher to summarise the data in a succinct and accurate manner.

The findings were examined using both within-case analysis and cross-case analysis method. Each interview was transcribed and comments were clustered together within a given theme. The research uses both qualitative methods such as open-ended questions and quantitative methods such as requesting respondents to rank their views about a specific question in the questionnaire. The questionnaire is the most widely used type of measure in education. In questionnaire survey, researchers administer questionnaires to some sample of population to learn about the distribution of characteristics, attitudes, or belief (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). Questions are examined for bias, sequence, clarity and validity.

In order to avoid the case when the respondent will be forced to give an inaccurate response when his or her real attitude towards the statements was a natural or middle choice, five responses ranging from 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree, were given. The statements were scripted as follows;

● Teachers will have opportunities to take initiative and lead where appropriate

● Principals will expect teachers to significantly contribute towards improving student learning

● Principals will nurture teachers' capacities to significantly contribute towards student learning

● There is a shared commitment throughout the staff to the achievement of the school's vision

In the qualitative section of the survey, participants commented upon their expectation as to what leadership skills principals should possess. They are asked to identify the characteristics that would distinguish them, and the attitudes and skills that they themselves expected would define the efficiency as principals. Questions asked were as follows:

● Identify attitudes that will distinguish these individuals as leaders

● List the attitudes and skills that will distinguish you most as an effective principal

The combination of both research methods may be the most effective way in achieving our

research objective due to their complementary strengths (Lieberman 2005; Mahoney and Goertz 2006). It is acknowledged that both quantitative and qualitative analysis suffer from certain specific shortcomings. A mixed methods design aims to combine the advantages of both methods in one single framework.

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003) divided mixed method designs into two main categories: mixed model research and mixed method research. *Mixed model research* involves qualitative and quantitative studies being mixed in more than one stage of the study. *Mixed methods research* involves the collection or analysis of quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially and only the data is integrated at one or more stages in the process of the research.   The overview by Teddlie and Tashakkori is mainly intended to list the various sequences. It does not address the substantive goals of mixed research.

Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989) listed five purposes of mixed-method evaluation designs: *triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation* and *expansion*.   Triangulation aims to establish convergence of results between different research methods. *Complementarity* studies is one in which is method is used to complement the other method. For instance, in this research study, the qualitative study can complement the quantitative study. In *development* mixed methods, one method is used to inform the other study. In *initiation* mixed methods, the different methods contradict each other, giving rise to fresh insights. Lastly, the *expansion* mixed method is used for different aspects of a study, such as different outcomes that are to be evaluated.

The validity of the research is enhanced through the triangulation of methods and sources. Different sources of collecting data: principals, vice principals, administrators and heads of departments and different techniques were employed. The data were cross-reference and cross-validated to check their validity. Triangulation is used to enhance the validity of assertions. It involves the use of divergent means for gathering information across a range of different sources and techniques. Merriam (1988) describes it as the use of "multiple investigators, multiple sources of data, or multiple methods to confirm the emerging findings". Patton (1990) states that multiple source of information are sought and used because no single source of information can be trusted to provide a comprehensive perspective on the program. By using a combination of observations, interviewing, and document analysis, the researcher is able to use different data sources to validate and cross-check findings.

Composition of Private School Participants

Study Group	Number	Percentage
Language	6	40%
Management	7	47%
Arts	2	13%
	15	**100%**

Composition of Participants

Position Title	Number	Percentage
Owners / Principals	10	55%
Vice Principals	3	17%
Administrators	3	17%
Subject Heads	2	11%
	18	**100%**

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The schools in this research were mainly small to medium sized, with student population of less than 250. They are selected consciously and may not be truly representative of the whole private education sector in Singapore. Bearing these limitations, the study nevertheless provides important information both about the constraints faced by private schools and the strategies they adopt in this competitive environment.

It is necessary to describe the characteristics of the schools and the respondents to facilitate a better understanding of the research findings.

1) Characteristics of the schools

2) Characteristics of the respondents

Characteristics of the schools:

Language Schools – These schools are generally considered small, with an average of four classrooms. It is run by private individuals who are also principals of the schools. The number of students average 120. Four schools in the research study specialise in English Language while the remaining two schools specialise in Chinese Language. All the schools studied have been established for more than five years. The schools employ an average of 4 staffs.

Management Schools – These schools have student enrollment of between 150 – 250 students. They are more structured than the language schools with a Principal, a Vice Principal, an Administrator and Subject Heads. Four schools have been established for more than five years while the remaining three schools have less than four years of history. The schools have average staff strength of 10.

Arts Schools: These schools have student enrollment of between 30 - 60 students. They are considered small with average staff strength of 8. The owners of the school are also the Principals.

The three main findings the research questions include:

1. The state of leadership among private school principals

2. The principals' perception of their leadership roles

3. The constraints and difficulties that the principal face when he takes up these leadership roles

The state of leadership among private school principals

Participants' responses were significantly different across the different levels of private schools. As expected, principals feel that they are the most important individual in the organization. They see "profit motive" as the key objective. This is largely expected as private schools do not receive any funding from the government. The principals feel that there is little need to consult organizational members and normally comes up with the final decision alone. This could be due to the differing interests of the principals and the teachers. Teachers normally would want to make requisitions on various equipment (hardware and software) which could make their work easier while principals may see such requests as making unnecessary investments into equipment.

Responses from the other participants (teachers and administrators) describe their principals as:

1) "having positive attitude" (65%),

2) "being compassionate" (58%),

3) "having the ability to communicate clearly the school's vision and mission" (65%)

4) "possessing the knowledge of curriculum" (60%)

5) "possessing ethical values and professional behavior" (75%)

6) "possessing competency as principals" (60%)

7) "supportive of teachers' needs" (63%)

The principals' perception of their leadership roles

Principals see themselves as:

1) formal leaders of the schools

2) possessing positive disposition and being supportive of teachers' needs

3) having the power to exercise decisions that impact student learning

4) introducing reforms when necessary

The constraints and difficulties that the principal face

1)   Being active listeners, recognizing concerns and creating a climate of honesty may sometimes be difficult as any decisions made will have implications on the profitability of the schools. They believe passion, humor and empathy may dilute their authority in the eyes of the students and teachers.

2)   Empowering others through recognition and acceptance may be difficult for some principals who see themselves as having the power to control the teachers and other employees. To them, sharing power and decision making reflect their own weaknesses. They see soliciting the input of others as a sign of admitting their own incompetencies.

3)   Managing the day to day operations of the school has taken up most of their time and there is very little time left for "strategic planning". They see the daily administration, budgeting and managing conflicts as top priorities. Staff training and strategic planning as of secondary concerns.

The findings from this study revealed three important strategies that appear to be critical in successfully positioning private schools in an increasingly competitive environment. These include creating a culture of change, valuing collaboration and sharing leadership.

a) *Creating a culture of change:*

i)   Like all other organizational change, implementing a successful school improvement process is a challenging and demanding tasks. Internal commitment by the school's stakeholders coupled with a strong leadership is the key for the improvement process. Private school improvement efforts include the introduction of new programs and procedures that will transform the schools. New curriculum materials and new methods of instructions are heralded as examples of school improvement. Focusing on schools personnel is the most effective way to improve schools. The key to school improvement is the willingness and ability of principals to assume the role of staff developers.

b) *Valuing Collaboration:*

School management is an important factor affecting teacher job satisfaction than the physical facilities of the schools. Teachers placed high emphasis on remuneration incentives rather than the professional development as an element of their job satisfaction because most of them do not view the teaching profession as their lifelong career. However, teacher job satisfaction is closely intertwined with non-remunerative incentives such as school management, principal leadership and professional development.

School policies are largely determined by the principals. In all the schools studied, the principals and supervisors are the same person. The principals are the key decision-makers in the schools. Teachers are usually not involved in decision-making processes.

Many private schools see the concept of marketing as indistinguishable from poaching, selling and even deception. There is a close connection between marketing and potential slander of another school. Principals, directors and employees of one school will often belittle another school so that the other school will be viewed by prospective students as of lower quality.

Private schools due to their smaller student numbers have better opportunities to offer holistic learning to their students. Holistic learning is an approach to learning that is all inclusive in terms of subject areas and the allocation of sufficient time for learning. It encompasses not only subjects that are measurable but also a more spiritual and ethical depth of learning. According to Duffy (1994), holistic learning includes a world view and a focus on humaneness of the individual.

Teachers' job satisfaction is positively related to participative decision making and to transformational leadership (Maeroff, 1988; Rossmiller, 1992). Overall, teachers report greater satisfaction in their work when they perceive their principals as someone who shares information with others and keeps open the channels of communication with teachers.

c) *Sharing leadership:*

Principals sharing leadership skills with their teachers will enhance overall efficiency of the schools. Many of the performance benefits of sharing leadership are motivational in nature. Leaders help the team to approach the task more effectively by ensuring that there is a high level of commitment among teachers to school's objectives. Successful leaders have a strong positive influence on teachers' levels of identification, which in turn fosters teachers' willingness to exert extra efforts to accomplish school goals (Eisenhardt & Tabrizi, 1995)

A number of owners and principals of private schools have no recognized university qualifications and they receive little training as school administrators or as teachers. They are business entrepreneurs who run the schools according to their previous experience. Neale (1981) has proposed in the Partnership Model of School Improvement, that the principal should play a leading role in a partnership group and be a link to district-level resources and authority. The principal is one of the key elements in identifying local school improvement goals and to plan strategies to achieve these goals. As some of the principals in the sample studied are not trained professionally, they may not be able to utilize their resources effectively for improvement of their schools. Moreover, teachers in private schools are usually not encouraged to take up training. The main reason for this is that almost all the private schools engage part-time contract teachers and do not see training as an important element in their overall school policies. The principals strongly believe that teachers will leave after receiving professional training, thus wasting their financial resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1)   The quality of education in private schools can be enhanced in four areas: School Administration and Management, Curriculum, Pastoral Care and Home-School Cooperation.

Private school principals should be encouraged to take up training courses to improve their level of competencies to manage the schools properly and have higher sensitivities towards teachers and students. A certification scheme for private schools principals should be considered to raise the professionalism of principals in Singapore. The school principals need to increase their own knowledge base, in order to respond to new challenges.

2)   Private school principals should move away from school-centred education to learner-centred success and from teaching subjects to teaching learners. The principals should develop a school improvement evaluation plan. Program evaluation plans must be developed and implemented parallel with the action plans and improvement goals. Regular monitoring and assessment need to be introduced to provide a detailed, systematic and ongoing profile of the progress of all students.

3)   End the practice of price competition. Instead of competing on prices, private schools should focus on delivering quality education. Smaller classes, new technology and personalized teaching instructions are a few examples that have long-term positive impacts on student learning.

4)   Institute a sense of empowerment, growth and self-development for staff. Use evaluation methods for improvements of staff, and not for fault-findings. The principal needs to motivate staff so that they share the vision and mission of the school. They should learn to apply human development theory and motivational theories to the learning process. It is important to draw attention to high expectations and targets as characteristics of effective schools (Mortimore, et.al 1988; Sammons, Hillman & Mortimore, 1994; and Scheerens, 1992). High expectations are assisted by the setting of national or system-level standards that embody challenging goals. These expectations need to be manifested at the level of the school and teachers.

5)   Principals can play a key role in developing teacher leadership. They must see teachers as assets and understand how encouraging teachers to become leaders will affect their behavior. They may also have to change their behaviors and be comfortable as facilitators when teachers are leading. However, delegation may be tricky and teachers' willingness to participate sometimes depend on their relationship with the principal. If teachers perceive principals to be open, facilitative and supportive, teachers' participation increases (Murphy and Louis, 1994)

6)   Breaking down barriers between classes, levels, departments and administration levels. Teamwork and openness are the key factors of success. Because employees' enthusiasm, determination and pride for their jobs will affect the organization's success, it is important to create an ideal and efficient work medium for staff. Formation of a satisfying institutional climate depends on display of integrity and objective management by the school leader. Principals need to develop the ability to be a good listener. Sustaining reform demands that the principals recognize the legitimacy of everyone's concerns and the value of everyone's resources. The successful principals will take advantage of diversity and view diversity as a resource. They must recognize the strengths of others and utilize them for the good of the private schools. While giving a voice to all people is the foundation of an organization that is willing to experiment and

learn (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997), these voices are often silenced because they create disequilibrium in the organization. As such, principals must be bold enough to protect these voices so that differing points of view are heard.

7)   More supervision should be given by the Ministry of Education to deter errant players from tarnishing the image of private schools. Regular school visits should be conducted to determine that the schools enroll genuine students and not individuals who hold Student Visa but do not attend schools. The reputation of the private school industry can be damaged as a result of unethical behaviors. Followers expect their leaders to be trustworthy, honest, open and sincere. The leaders have to display a high level of ethical standards and volunteer for this kind of behavior (Duncan 1991). The principals need to possess clear sets of educational and personal values as well as a clear personal vision (Moos, Mahony and Reeves, 1998). Principals need to possess passion, humor and empathy. Good leaders have both wisdom and common sense, and they are viewed as trustworthy and reliable. The Ministry of Education should also be more accommodative to private school principals who dare to think "out-of the-box", taking risks and breaking new grounds. The advantage of private schools as compared to public schools is that business decisions can be made quicker and with less bureaucracy. However, the implementation of such business decisions may often be delayed by the regulatory approvals given by the Ministry.

8)   School principals must create an environment that promotes change. Change is inevitable if schools are going to improve. The principals must exude energy for and commitment to school improvement. They should encourage more communication between them and the various stakeholders – teachers, students, parents and community. Teachers have to believe that they can make a difference and have a commitment to do so. Principals have to have the ability to motivate the teachers. Recent research in the field of cognitive science have shown that almost all students can engage in higher-order learning given the right conditions (Odden, 1995). This belief needs to be supported by teachers who have a clear understanding of how students learn.

9)   Principals must be willing to accept the risks and ambiguity that develop as they embrace new visions, based on new knowledge. New ideas may threaten some staff but they also offer opportunities for those willing to put the visions into practice (Murphy and Louis, 1994). Principals as well as staff must develop a change-enabling culture to adapt to the ever-changing competitive environment.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

This study had the following limitations:

1)   This study included participants from private schools who are more willing to share their experiences and give their views regarding the private school industry in Singapore. The private schools in this study are considered small with less than 200 students each.

2)   The sensitive nature of the information and responses obtained from the respondents

may have an effect on participants' responses. Participants may be unwilling to respond to questions relating to their competitive strategies and long term plans. As private schools are in a competitive relationship among each other, the principals may be unwilling to disclose full information, especially those relating to student numbers, class structure and staff salaries.

3)   The study assumes that teachers' perception of their principals and of their occupation contribute significantly to the explanation of the variance in job satisfaction. However, teachers' perception are subjective, and it may be that their perceptions are affected by other variables such as working conditions and salary packages.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Future research could focus on a larger sample of private schools from a wider variety of backgrounds. It would be interesting to interview parents and students from different schools to gain more insights into their perspectives on their assessments and opinions about these schools. Further studies need to be conducted to look at how leadership training can improve the performance of private school principals.. A comprehensive and demanding training of aspiring principals is needed for improvement of leadership preparation in Singapore.

In spite of these limitations, this study provides an important overview of the environment in which private schools operate in Singapore. In general, private school principals have to adopt various strategies which are similar to most private businesses in order to survive in Singapore's competitive environment.

CONCLUSION

Effective principals are community builders. They are able to nurture the development of open systems in which parents and members of the community are able to voice their opinions. The challenge for most principals is to foster a "community of learning" among professional staff (Zeichner & Tabachnich, 1991). They are central agents of change in the system for improving school performance. An effective principal is a necessary precondition for an effective school. The principal's leadership sets the tone of the school, the climate of teaching, the level of professionalism and the morale of the teachers and students. The principals' influence in both the supervisory and instructional domains is strongly related to that of teachers' active participation in decision making, suggesting the benefits of mutuality in school leadership. As community builders, principals must encourage others to be leaders in their own right.

The most common for all private schools is financial success – a particular profit or return on investment. Other goals may include improving the educational curriculum, providing a conducive environment and developing good teachers and students relationships. To achieve these goals, the principal must set up any number of sub-goals compatible with its primary goals. These tend to be more specific and usually more immediate in nature. For example, to achieve more student enrollment, private schools may offer discounts in school fees or other incentives such as personal computers or PDAs. Private schools

principals should focus on improvement strategies which are sustainable in the long term. Price competition is a short-term approach and can be detrimental over a longer period.

As many of the government regulations such as the Service Quality Class seem to impede the development, operations and competitiveness of many private schools, private school principals should be more fully involved in the reforms of the school policies so as to ensure greater adaptability in private school management. They need to have the ability to plan and develop curriculum that enhances teaching and learning for all students. The ability to use educational research, evaluation and planning process to improve student performance is something that all principals need to focus on.

Principals need to possess a high level of moral leadership. This study suggests that vey often, moral leadership has been compromised for financial gains. Moral leadership acknowledges that values and value judgments are the central elements in the selection, extension and day-to-day realization of educational purpose (Harlow, 1962). Principals need to possess a portfolio of beliefs and values in issues such as justice, equity, community and schools that function for the main purpose of education. Principals need to engage participants in the organization and the community in reinterpreting and placing new priorities on guiding values for education. Leadership as moral stewardship means seeing the moral implications of the many daily decisions made by each school administrator (Beck & Murphy, 1994). Principals need to build ethical schools while meeting the moral imperative to provide real learning opportunities to students (Osin & Lesgold, 1996). Principals who become too focused on managing the day-to-day activities can unwittingly neglect the important role they can play in helping to create a shared vision for change.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R., Rose, J. and Woodhead, C. (1992), *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom*

Practice in Primary Schools: A Discussion Paper, London, Department of Education and Science.

Ascher, C. 91996). Performance contracting: A forgotten experiment in school privatization. *Phi delta Kappan* 77. pp. 615-621

Ascher, C., Fruchter, N. & Berne. R. (1996). *Hard lessons: public schools and privatization.* New York, NY: Twentieth century Fund.

Astin, A., & Astin, H. (2001, January). Principles of transformative leadership. American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Bulletin. Retrieved March 2003 from http: www.aahebulletin.com/public/archive/transformative_leadership.asp

Barber, B. (1963) "Some problems in the sociology of the professions'

Daedalus, 92, 669-688.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1988). Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N Kanungo (Eds), Charismatic leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Beairsto, B (1999). Learning to balance bureaucracy and community as an educational administrator. In B. Beairsto and P. Ruohotie (Eds.), *The education of educators: enabling professional growth for teachers and administrators.* Tampere, Finland: University of Tampere.

Beck, L.G., & Murphy, J. (1994). Ethics in educational leadership programs: An expanding role. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Blase, J. and Blase, J. R. (1998), *Handbook of Instructional Leadership: How Really Good*

Principals Promote Teaching and Learning, London, Sage.

Bogdan, R.C., & Bilken, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education* (2nd ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Pocklington, K. and Weindling, D. (1993), *Effective Management in Schools,* London, HMSO.

Brooke-Smith, R. (2003). *Leading Learners, Leading Schools*. London: Routledge almer.

Brown, J., & Isaacs, D. (1994). Merging the best of two worlds. In P.M. Senge, A. Kleiner, C. Roberts, R.D.Ross, & B.J.Smith (Eds), *The fifth discipline fieldbook* (pp. 525-529). New York: Doubleday.

Bryk, Anthony S., Valeries E. Lee, and Peter B. Holland (1993*) Catholic Schools and the Common Good.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard: University Press.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Clandinin, D., & Connelly, M. (1999*). Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Coleman, James S., Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore (1982). *High Schol Achievement: Public, Catholic, and Private schools Compared.* New York: Basic Books

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. Academy of Management Review, 12(4), 637-647.

Connelly, S., Gaddis, B., & Helton-Fauth, W. (2002). A closer look at the role of emotions in transformational and charismatic leadership. In B. J Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead (pp. 255-283). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Cooper, P., & McIntyre, D. (1996). *Effective teaching and learning*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Coulson, A. (1986) The Managerial Work of Primary Headteachers"

Sheffield: Sheffield Papers in Education Management, 48 Sheffield Hallam University

Couturier, L. (2003). *Globalizing with a Conscience: The Implications of privatization in Higher Education.* Teachers College, Columbia University

Crowther, F., Hann,L. & McMaster, J. (2000) *Leadership for Successful School Innovation: Lessons from the Innovation and Best Practice Project (IBPP).* A Report from the Innovation and Bets Practice Project (IBPP) to DETYA

Crowther, F., Kaagan, S., Ferguson, M. & Hann, L. (2002) *Developing Teacher Leaders: How Teacher Leadership Enhances School Success.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Cuban, L. (1988), *The Managerial Imperative and the Practice of Leadership in Schools.* Albany, NY, State University of New York Press

Cullingford, C. (1995). *The effective teacher.* London: Cassell.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, B., & Ellison, L. (1997). *Strategic marketing for schools.* London: Pitman Publishing.

Day, C., Harris, A. and Hadfield M. (2001), Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4 (1), 39–56.

Driscoll, J. W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. The Academy of Management Review, 21(1), 44–56.

Duffy,D. (1994). Holistic Thinking in education in Australia. In d.Duffy and H.Duffy (Eds.) *Holistic Education: Some Australian Explorations.* Belconnen, ACT: Australian Curriculum Studies Association (ACSA)

Duncan, A. H. 2005. The twenty-first century executive leader. http://ebscohost2.htm/ (accessed September 19, 2005).

Edwards, D.L. (1997). *The private management of public schools: the Dade County, Florida experience.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Eisenhardt,K.M. & Tabrizi, B.N. (1995). Accelerating adaptive processes: Product innovation in the global computer industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 40, 84-110

Emilhovich, C., & Battaglia, C. (2000). Creating cultures for collaborative inquiry: New challenges for school leaders. *International Journal of Ladership in Education*, 3(30, 225-238

Filgo, David and Ludwig, Jens (2000) Sex, Drugs and Catholic Schools: *Private Schooling and Non-Market Adolescent Behaviors.* Teachers college, Columbia University

Foskett, N. (2002). Marketing. In T. Bush & L. Bell (eds.). *The principles and practice of educational management* (pp. 241-257). London: Paul Chapman.

Fullan, M. (1999). *Change Forces: The sequel.* London: Falmer Press.

Friedman, I. (1991). High and low-burnout schools: School culture aspects of teacher burnout.

Journal of Educational Research, 85(5), 325–333.

Gardner, H. & Larkin, E. (1996). Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership. New York: Harper Collins

Geijsel, F., Sleegers, P., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2002). Transformationalleadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 228-256.

General Accounting Office (1996). *Private management of public schools: Early experiences in four school districts.* Washington, DC: Author

Girvin, N. (2005*). The principal's role in k-12 professional development.* Retrieved from http//:www.askasia.org

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researcher: An introduction.* New York: Longman

Goldhaninier, k. (1971). *Elementary school principals and their schools.*

Eugene, OR: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon

Goldring, E.B., & Sullivan, A.V. (1996). Beyond the boundaries: Principals,

Parents and Communities shaping the school environment In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration.* pp. 195-222). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers

Goode, W(1960) "Encroachment, charlatanism and the emerging professions: psychology, sociology and medicine9 *AmericanSociological Review,* 25, 902-913

Grace, G. (1995). *School leadership: Beyond education management*. London: Falmer

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 9(2), 157-191

Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, L. (1996). Culture and educational administration: a case of finding out what you don't know. Journal of Educational Administration, 34 (5), 98-116

Hansen,J.F. (1979). Education as process. In J.Hansen (Ed.) *Sociocultural Perspectives on Human Learning: An Introduction to Educational Anthropology.* Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Hanson, E.M. (1996). *Educational administration and organizational behavior*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Harlow, J.G. (1962). Purpose-defining: The central function of the school administrator. In J.A. Culbertson & S.P.Hencley (Eds), P*reparing administrators: New perspectives.* Columbus, OH: Council of Educational Administration

Harris, A (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy or possibility. *School Leadership and Management* 23(3), 313-324

Hechinger, RM. (1981). Foreword. In J.M. Lipham, *Effective principal,effective school* Restoa, VA:

National Association of Secondary School Principals

Heck, G., & Hallinger. P. (1999). Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore Louis (Eds), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed). (pp. 141 – 162). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers

Heifetz, R.A. & Laurie, D.L. (1997). The work of leadership. Harvard Business Reciew, 75(1), 124-134

Heilbrun. C. (1988). *Writing a woman's life*. New York: Ballantine

Heller.H.., Rex,J.C., and cline,M.P.(1992) Factors Related to Teachers Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction. *ERS Spectrum*, 10 (1), 20-24

Hellfritzsch, A. G. (1945). A factor analysis of teacher abilities. *Journal of Experimental Education, 14,* 166-169.

Hodgkinson, C. (1991) *Educational Leadership: The Moral Art,* New York: SUNNY

Hopkins, D. (2001). School improvement for real. London: Routledge Falmer.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge (pp.189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hoy, W., Tartar, J. C., & Witkoskie, L. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: Linking the principal with school effectiveness. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 26(1), 38–45.

Hoy, W., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1997). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. Journal of Educational Administration, 36(4), 1998.

Hoy, W., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. Journal of School Leadership, 9(2), 184–208.

Hoy, W.K. and Miskel, C.G. (2001). *Educational Administration.: Theory, esearch and Practice (6*h Ed.),* Singapore: McGraw-Hill

Huffman, J.B., & Jacobson, A.L. (2003). Perceptions of professional learning communities. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 6(3), 239-250

Hughes, M. (1985) 'Leadership in professionally staffed organizations* in

Hughes, M., Ribbins, P. and Thomas, H. (Eds) *Managing Education: the System and the Institution,* Eastbourne: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

James, C., & Philips, P. (1995). The practice of educational marketing in schools. *Educational Management and Administration*, 23 (2), 75-88.

Johnson, N. (1994). Education Reforms and Professional Development of Principals: Implications for Universities. *Journal of EducationalAdministration* 32(2): 5-20.

Kaplan B & Maxwell, J.A (1994): Qualitative Research Methods for Evaluation Computer Information Systems. In Anderson J G, C E Aydin and S J Jay (eds) (1994): Evaluating Health Care Information System: Methods and Applications. Sage. Thousand Oaks, CA, pp 45-68

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 246-255.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K., (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. New York: HarperCollins

Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (1996). *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Leadership development for teachers*. Thousand Oaks,CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2001). *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders* (2nd edition ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Keys, P. M. (2003a). Primary and secondary teachers shaping the science curriculum: The influence of teacher knowledge. Unpublished Dissertation, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.

Keys, P. M. (2005). Are teachers walking the walk or just talking the talk in science education? Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice, 11(5), 499–516.

Kotler, P., & Fox, K.A. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press

Kotter, J. (1996). Leading change. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kyriacou, C. (1997). *Effective teaching in schools*: Theory and practice. Cheltenham, England: Stanley Thornes.

Lambert, L. (2000). Framing reform for new millennium: Leadership capacity in schools and districts. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy,* (14).

Lashway, L. (2003b). *Role of the School Leader. Trends and Issues.* Retrieved 9th June 2006 from ERIC.

Lee, M (2006). What makes a difference between two schools? Teacher job satisfaction and educational outcomes. *International Education Journal*, 2006,7(5), 642-650

Leithwood, K. (1992), The move towards transformational leadership, *Educational Leadership,* 49(5), 8–9.

Leithwood, K. (1994), Leadership for school restructuring, *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 30(4), 498–518.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. and Steinbach, R. (1999), *Changing Leadership for Changing Times,*

Buckingham, Open University Press.

Leithwood, K., Tomlinson, D. & Genge, M. (1996) Transformational school leadership, In Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, Ph. And Hart, A. International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Leithwood, K., & Duke, D.L. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy and K.S.Louis (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. San Francisco: Josey-Bass. pp.45-72

Leithwood, K. (2001), School leadership in the context of accountability policies, *International Journal of Leadership in Education,* 4(3), 217–35.

Leithwood. K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, & Wahlstrom. (2004). *Executive Summary: How leadership influences students learning. Learning from the Leadership Project:* The Wallace Foundation

Leslie,K.(1989) Administrators Must Consider and Improve Teacher Satisfaction. *NASSP Bulletin,* 73,19-22

Levin, B. & Riffel, J.A. (1997). Schools and the changing world: Struggling toward the future. London: Falmer

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating School Leaders.* New York: Teachers College, The Education Schools Project.

Lewin, K. (1952). Field theory in social science. London: Tavistock.

Lezotte, L.W. (2005). More effective schools: Professional learning communities in action. In R.Dufour, R.Eaker, & R.DuFour (Eds)*, On common ground: The power of professional learning communities* (pp. 177-191). Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service

Lincoln, Y., 7 Guba, E. (1985), Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury: Sage

Ligas, M.R. (1998). S*ylvan Learning Systems, Inc.: Program evaluation*. The School Board of Broward County, Florida

Liu, Ching-Jen (1984). An identification of principals' instructional leadership behaviour in effective high schools. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

Lockheed, M. and Vespoor, A. (1991) *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries.* Oxford: Oxford University press

Lubienski, C. (20050. Public schools in marketized environments: Shifting incentives and unintended consequences of competition-based educational reforms. *American Journal of Education* 111, 464-486

Maeroff, G. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press

Marshall & Rossman (1999). Designing Qualitative Research, 3rd Ed.

McMillan (2000). Essential Assessment concepts for Teachers & Administrators. Corwin Press

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study Research in Education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco:

Jossey Bass.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, T.W. and Miller, J.M. (2001), Educational leadership in the new millennium: a vision for 2020, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4 (2), 181–89.

Molinaro, V. & Drake, S. (1998). Successful education reform: Lessons for leaders. *International Electronic Journal For Leadership in Learning, 2(9)*

Moos, L., Mahony, P. and Reeves, J. (1998), What teachers, parents, governors and pupils want from their heads, in MacBeath, J. (Ed.), *Effective School Leadership: Responding to Change*, London, Paul Chapman

Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D., & Ecob, R. (1988). *School Matters: the junior years*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Murphy, J (1992). *The Landscape of Leadership Preparation: Reframing the Education of School Administrators.* Newbury Park: Corwin Press, Inc.

Murphy, J. (1988). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 10(2), 117-139.

Murphy. J. & Louis, K (1994). *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Murphy, J. and Seashore-Louis, K. (1992). Framing project: Introduction. *Handbook of research on educational administration, 2nd ed. American Educational Research Association,* xxii

Murphy, J. (1995). Rethinking the foundations of leadership preparation. *Design for Leadership: The Bulletin of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 6, 1, 1-4.*

Murphy, J (2008). Reculturing he Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints: Educational Administration Quarterly, 38 (2), 176 -191

Mwamwenda, T., and Mwmwenda, B. (1989) Teacher Characteristics and Pupils' Academic Achievemen in Botswana Primary Education, *International Journal of Educational Development,* 9(1). 31-42

Neale, D., Bailey,W., and Ross,B.(1981): Strategies for School Improvement. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., London

Odden, A. (1995). *Educational leadership for America's schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Ogawa, R.T., & Bossert, S.T. (2000). Leadership as an organization quality. In T*he Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 38-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Oplatka, I. (2002). The emergence of educational marketing: Lessons from the experiences of Israeli principals. *Comparative Education Review*, 46 (2), 211-233.

Oplatka, I., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2004). The research on school marketing: Current issues and future directions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 375-400.

Osin, L. & Lesgold, A (1996). A proposal for reengineering of the educational system. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 621-656

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.* Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications

Paton, M.Q. (2002), *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Peeler, T.H. and Parham, P.A. (1994). A public-private partnership: Suth Pointe elementary school of Dade county, Florida. In S. Hakim. P.Seidenstat, & G.W.Bowman (Eds.), *Privatizing education and educational choice: Concepts, plans and experiences* (pp. 195-204).M Westport, CT; Praeger

Perrott, E. (1982). *Effective teaching: A practical guide to improving your teaching.* London: Longman.

Perry, P., Chapman,D., and Snyder, C. (1995). Quality of teacher worklife and classroom practices in Botswana, *International Journal of Educational Development,* 15(2). 115-125

Peterson, K. (2002). The professional development of principals: Innovation and opportunities. Educational Administration Quarterly, 38 (20: 213-232

_____*The professional development of principals: A portrait of programs.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Plank, D. & Boyd, W.L. (19940. Antipolitics, education, and institutional choice: The flight from democracy. *American Educational Research Journal,* 31(2), 263-281

Pounder, D.G., Ogawa, R.T., & Adams, E.A. (1995, November). Leadership as an organization-wide phenomena: Its impact on school performance. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 31(40, 564-588

Richards, C. (1996). *Risky business: Private management of public schools.* Washinton, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute

Richardson, V., & Placier, P. (2001). Teacher change. Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 905–947). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Rossmiller, R.A. (19920. The secondary school principal and teachers' quality of work life. *Educational Management and Administration*, 20(30, 132-146

Rostker, L. E. (1945). The measurement of teaching ability. *Journal of Experimental Education, 14*, 5-51.

Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1994). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A*

review of school effectiveness research. London: Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED).

Senege, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday/currency Publishing, 213-218

Senior, B. (1997). Organisational change. London: Prentice Hall.

Sergiovanni, T. (1984), Leadership and excellence in schooling, *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 4–13.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (2001). *The Principalship: a Reflective Practice Perspective.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4(4), 577-594.

Smith, W. and R. Andrews. (1989), Instructional Leadership – How Principals Make a Diiference, ASCD, Alexandria, Virginia

SMylie, M. & Hart, A. (1999) School leadership for teacher learning and change – A human and social capital development perspectives. In *Handbook on Research on Educational Administration,* pp. 421-41. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Spillane, J. (2006) *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass

Squires, G. (1999). *Teaching as a professional discipline*. London: Falmer.

Stogdffl, R. M. (1981). Traits of Leadership: A Follow-Up to 1970. In B. M. Bass (Ed.), *Stogdills Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 73-97). New York: Free Press

Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996), *Changing our Schools,* Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Stones, E. (1992). *Quality teaching: A sample of cases*. London: Routledge.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc

Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria,VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Taylor, D., & Tashakkori, A. (1997). Toward an understanding of teachers desire for participation in decision–making. *Journal of School Leadership,* 7, 609-628

Thompson, M.A., & Legler, R. (2003). *Principalship in the Midwest: The role of principal preparation programs.* NRCEL Policy Issues, issue 14. Retrieved 22nd February 2006 from http://www.ncrel.org/policy/pubs/html/pivol14/aug2003c.htm.

Turner-Bisset, R. (2001*). Expert teaching.* London: David Fulton Publishers.

Ubben, G.C. & Hughes, L.W. (1987). *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools.* Newton, MA:AIiyn & Bacon.

West-Burnham, J. (1997), Leadership for learning: reengineering 'mind sets', S*chool Leadership and Management, 17(2),* 231–243.

Wiersma, W. (1995). Research methods in education: An introduction (6th ed). Boston: Allyn and

Bacon

Williams, R.B. (20060. Leadership for School Reform: Do Principal Decision-Making Styles reflect a Collaborative Approach? Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, Issue No. 53, 1-22

Willner, A. R. (1968). Charismatic political leadership: A theory. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, Center for International Studies.

Winch-Dummett, C. (2006). Successful pedagogies for an Australian multicultural classroom. *International Education Journal,* 2006, 7(5),778-789

Woods, P., & Jeffrey, B. (1996). *Teachable moments: The art of teaching in primary schools.* Buckingham: Open University Press.