

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND SCHOOL CULTURE

Moe Moe Aung¹ and Hnin Yu Yu Khaing²

Abstract

This study focused on the relationship between principal's leadership behaviours to academic achievement and school culture at selected High Achieving and Low Achieving High Schools in Mandalay. Mixed research method was used in this study. The sample schools which had limited to the schools by using two criteria: two years consecutive Matriculation Examination Pass Rate of Mandalay District and the participants who had been at least two years at the current school. Four principals and 309 teachers at different levels in high achieving and low achieving high schools participated in this study. For this study, *Leadership Orientation Survey* (Self and Other) designed by Bolman and Deal (1991, as cited in King, 2006) was used to investigate the principal's leadership behaviours and *School Improvement Questionnaire (SIQ II)* developed by Webb and Pajares (1996, as cited in Clear, 2005) was also used to explore the levels of their school culture. According to quantitative research findings, principal's leadership behaviours and school culture were positively and moderately correlated in both high achieving ($r=0.419, p<0.01$) and low achieving schools ($r=0.573, p<0.01$). Qualitative research findings are further provided to complete the quantitative findings for the teachers' perceptions on their principal's leadership behaviours and school culture of selected high and low achieving schools. Based on the related literature and findings of this study, it was recommended that, principals should know about how to operate all four frames of leadership behaviours depending on the conditions and how to shape and change positive school culture for student achievement and schools' success.

Keywords: Leadership behaviors, School culture, Academic achievement

Introduction

Principals must show strong leadership no matter what their styles. Strong principal leadership is defined as having knowledge of teaching and learning processes and the power to motivate other members of the organization to achieve and work toward the common goal of the school (Clear, 2005). Public schools need leaders who are experts in educational leadership, including instructional leadership, who can work in all four frames, multi-frames or reframe as the need arises (Bolman and Deal, 1997, as cited in Poniatowski, 2006). Bolman and Deal (1984, as cited in Pourrajab & Ghani, 2016) took the position that a successful leader must understand and integrate the subcultures of an organization. They discussed four frames of an organization: *Structural Frame, Human Resource Frame, Political Frame and Symbolic Frame*. All of these frames are found in varying degrees in all organizations. An effective leader must possess the wisdom to identify and successfully use each frame within that particular organization.

Similarly, the principal is essentially responsible for shaping school culture (Snowden & Gorton, 1998, as cited in Martin, 2009). According to Phillips (1993, as cited in Smith, 2014), school culture is defined as the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours that characterize a schools in terms of: How people treat each other; the extent to which people feel included and appreciated; and rituals and traditions reflecting collaboration and collegiality. The importance of building school culture is primarily concerned with achieving of school education. The culture of this school will affect the motivation of teachers in work and teachers job satisfaction. Efforts to

¹ Lecturer, Department of Educational Theory, Sagaing University of Education

² Senior Teacher, Basic Education High School, Shwe Pyi, Singue Township

develop an organizational culture in school are primarily concerned with the principal's roles as leader and manager of the school (Mukhtar, Ali, & Rusmini, 2017).

Education today requires a leader who is willing to foster student achievement in some of the most complex environments. The leader must balance varying leadership styles and relationships among members of the organization for the goal of student achievement (Moffitt, 2007). Ash and Persall (1999, as cited in Clear, 2005) noted student learning must be the focus of educational efforts, while school leaders create systematic change to pursue higher levels of student achievement. Therefore, this study attempted to explore the relationship between principal's leadership behaviours to academic achievement and school culture as assessed by teachers in selected high achieving and low achieving school. The result of this study will contribute to the knowledge of how principal respond to school improvement and student achievement.

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between principal's leadership behaviours to academic achievement and school culture at selected high achieving and low achieving high schools in Mandalay.

The specific objectives are as follows:

- To explore the perceptions of teachers on their principal's leadership behaviours in high achieving and low achieving schools and,
- To find out the differences between perceptions of teachers from high achieving and low achieving schools on their principal's leadership behaviours,
- To examine the perceptions of teachers on their school culture in high achieving and low achieving schools,
- To find out the differences between perceptions of teachers from high achieving and low achieving schools on their school culture, and
- To explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal's leadership behaviours and school culture in high achieving and low achieving schools.

Research Questions

The following research questions guide the direction of the study:

- What are the perceptions of teachers on their principal's leadership behaviours of high achieving and low achieving schools?
- Are there any differences in the perceptions of teachers on their principal's leadership behaviours between high achieving and low achieving schools?
- What are the perceptions of teachers on their school culture in high achieving and low achieving schools?
- Are there any differences in the perceptions of teachers on their school culture between high achieving and low achieving schools?
- What is the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal's leadership behaviours and school culture in high achieving and low achieving schools?

Definition of Key Terms

- **Leadership Behaviours** refer to the principal's interpersonal influence, exercised in situations and directed through the communication process, toward the attainment of a special goal or goals (Huber - Dilbeck, 1988). In this study, principal's leadership behaviours will be examined by four frames of leadership developed by Bolman and Deal (1991, as cited in King, 2016): *Structural Frame*, *Human Resource Frame*, *Political Frame* and *Symbolic Frame*.
- **School Culture** is the underground stream of norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and rituals that have built up over time as people work together, solve problems, and confront challenges (Deal & Peterson, 1999, as cited in Clear, 2005). In this study, school culture will be examined six dimensions developed by Webb and Pajares (1996, as cited in Clear, 2005): *Collegiality*, *Collective Efficacy*, *Personal Efficacy*, *Job Satisfaction*, *Policy Say So*, and *Teaming*.
- **Academic Achievement** is the performance outcomes that indicate the extent to which a person has accomplished specific goals that are the focus of activity in instructional environments, specifically in school, college, university (Steinmayr, Meibner, Weidinger, & Wirthwein, 2017). In this study, the student academic achievement is student pass rate of matriculation exam.

Theoretical Framework of this Study

Bolman and Deal's (1997, as cited in Elliff, 2012) four frames model is used as the theoretical framework for leadership behavior in this study. This framework assumes that successful leaders must be able to frame and reframe experiences to lead effectively and deal successfully with organizational challenges (Elliff, 2012). This model is the result of a consolidation of the major schools of organizational theory (Bolman and Deal 2003, as cited in Roddy, 2010). To provide a more concrete understanding of organizations, Bolman and Deal (1984, as cited in Little, 2010) synthesized the organizational theory into four perspectives, or frames: *Structural*, *Human Resource*, *Political*, and *Symbolic*.

Organizational culture theory underlines the critical role for leaders in the creation of culture in the organization (Schein, 1985, as cited in Roddy, 2010). Understanding the cultural issues enables one not only to see what is going on in the organization, but to identify the priorities of the leader and leadership structure of the organization (Schein, 1985, as cited in Roddy, 2010). In other words, understanding the culture of an organization is necessary to analyze the leadership of the organization (Little, 1982, as cited in Roddy, 2010). School culture was assessed through the "School Improvement Questionnaire" (Webb & Pajares, 1996, as cited in Clear, 2005). The six school climate factors were "Collegiality", "Collective Efficacy", "Personal Efficacy", "Job Satisfaction", "Policy-Say So", "Teaming".

Review of Related Literature

The purpose of leadership is to facilitate group goal attainment by establishing and maintaining an environment favorable to group performance. Successful leadership involves using social influence processes to organize, direct and motivate the actions of others. It requires constant task-directed efforts, effective task strategies, and the artful application of various conceptual, technical and interpersonal skills (Massawe, 2014). Leadership can be defined as the nature of the influencing process – and its resultant outcomes – that occurs between a leader and

followers and how this influencing process is explained by the leader's dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions and attributions of the leader, and the context in which the influencing process occurs (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004). Bolman and Deal (2002, as cited in Roddy, 2010) also state that school administrators are most successful when they are able to look at things from more than one angle.

Bolman and Deal's Four-Frame Organizational Theory

Organizational leadership theories commonly placed leadership behaviours within a single framework; for example the trait-skills, transformational, contingency, path-goal, and psychodynamic leadership theories were all based upon central leadership behaviour (Northouse, 2004, as cited in Tillman, 2012). Bolman and Deal's (2003, as cited in Higgins, 2008) frame theory proposes to be a defense against cluelessness, postulating that learning to use four frames for organizational analysis provides enhanced understanding and potential for more creative problem-solving. The four frames are rooted in both managerial practice and social science research. To provide a more concrete understanding of organizations, Bolman and Deal (1984, as cited in Little, 2010) synthesized the organizational theory into four perspectives, or frames: *Structural*, *Human Resource*, *Political*, and *Symbolic*. Bolman and Deal (1991, as cited in Little, 2010) define the term frame as a window, or image, through which individuals view the organization. Additionally, frames function as tools for navigating the organization, its problems, its climate, and its culture (Little, 2010).

Structural Frame

The structural frame defined by Bolman and Deal (2008, as cited in Al-Omari, 2013) is frame that focus on structural with an organization. Those who use the structural frame use the structure of organization to allocate to areas of responsibility which can create problems with condition and control. This frame is goal-oriented and geared toward managing the external environment through the development of specialized roles and formal relationships within the organization. This frame seeks to clarify lines of authority and focuses on logic and processes appropriate to solving problems by identifying the situation and formulating the task based on facts rather than emotion or personality (Bolman and Deal, 1991, as cited in Poniatowski, 2006).

Human Resource Frame

The human resource frame focuses on the interaction between individual and organizational needs. Human resource leaders value relationships and feelings and seek to lead through facilitation and empowerment (Boff, 2015). Bolman and Deal (1991, as cited in Livengood, 2012) defined this frame as focusing attention on human needs and assumes that organizations that meet basic human needs will work better than those that do not.

Political Frame

The political frame emphasizes conflict among different groups and interest for scarce resources. Political leaders are advocates and negotiators who spend much of their time networking, creating coalitions, building a power base, and negotiating compromises (Bolman & Deal, 1992a, as cited in Boff, 2015).

Symbolic Frame

Bolman and Deal (1984, 2003, as cited in Livengood, 2012) defined the symbolic frame as seeing a chaotic world in which meaning and predictability are social creations, and facts are interpretative rather than objective. This frame attempts to tap into the underlying motivations of workers as shown through charisma, meaning, culture, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, and heroes.

School Culture

Brown (2004, as cited in Mukhtar, Ali, and Rusmini, 2017) states that culture refers to a set of common values, attitudes, beliefs, and norms, some of which are explicit and some of which are not. Peterson (2002, as cited in Mukhtar et al., 2017) defined school culture is the set of norms, values and beliefs, rituals and ceremonies, symbols and stories that make up the persona of the school. In this study, school culture will be examined by using School Improvement Questionnaire (SIQ II) developed by Webb and Pajares (1996, as cited in Clear, 2005) which consists of six dimensions as *Collegiality*, *Collective Efficacy*, *Personal Efficacy*, *Job Satisfaction*, *Policy - say so*, and *Teaming*.

Teacher Collegiality refers to the cooperative relationships among colleagues. It is often used interchangeably with 'collaboration'. Jarzabkowski (2002, as cited in Shah, 2012), however, tries to differentiate between collegiality and collaboration by defining collegiality as teachers' involvement with their peers on any level, be it intellectual, moral, political, social, and/or emotional.

Collective Teacher Efficacy is characteristic of a faculty team that takes responsibility for student learning. Individual members believe in the ability of the members of the organization to accomplish set goals even as they pursue attainment of their own goals, which align with the organization. School staff teams with high levels of perceived efficacy set challenging and worthwhile goals in which they exert relentless efforts to meet these goals (Freeman, 2008).

Teachers' Self-Efficacy is an individual's belief about his/her capability to manage responsibilities. More specifically, teacher self-efficacy is about the desired learning objectives of a teacher to improve his/her students' learning. Self-efficacy of teachers is also related to teachers' content knowledge in their classes, students' academic adjustment, patterns of teacher behaviour and practices related to classroom quality, and factors underlying teachers' psychological well-being, including personal accomplishment, job satisfaction, and commitment (Parlar, Cansoy, & Turkoglu, 2017).

Teachers' Job Satisfaction increases when teachers feel valued as professionals. When teachers have an active role in planning the school's goals and making decisions concerning curriculum and instruction, satisfaction is higher. Teachers are empowered and know that their professional judgment is respected and valued (Clear, 2005).

Policy-Say So addresses shared decision making and empowerment; it is a process by which administrators share powers and help others use it in constructive ways to make decisions affecting themselves and their work (Sackney, 1998, as cited in Clear, 2005).

Teaming is the collaboration of two or more teachers who share the same group of students. Teaming at high school level emphasizes improved student achievement through teacher collaboration Spraker (2003, as cited in Nalls, 2011).

Methodology

Research Methodology

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in this study.

Population and Sample

The population of the study was all high schools' principals and at different levels of teachers at Basic Education High Schools in Mandalay District. By using purposive sampling method, schools were selected by adjusting two criteria that got high and low matriculation examination pass rate from (2016-2017) to (2017-2018) academic years of Mandalay District. The participants had been at least two years at the current schools. Three basic education high schools were chosen as low achieving schools because there are three high achieving schools. Out of these six high schools, one for high achieving school and one for low achieving school were used for pilot study. The sample for this study consisted of 309 teachers at different levels in four selected high and low achieving high schools in Mandalay. Moreover, by using random sampling method, (24) teachers from different levels in four selected high schools were selected to interview.

Research Instruments

Questionnaire of "*Leadership Orientation Survey (Self and Other)*" developed by Bolman and Deal (1991, as cited in King, 2016) was used to investigate the principal's leadership behaviours, and "*School Improvement Questionnaire (SIQ II)*" developed by Webb and Pajares (1996, as cited in Clear, 2005) was used to investigate the school culture.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected by using questionnaires. After taking permission from the responsible person, questionnaires were distributed to four selected schools in Mandalay on 6th November, 2018 and collected them after lasting ten days. Data collected were listed by each school and data obtained from this study were scored. Based on the responses of teachers from selected schools, this study was conducted in order to explore the relationship between principal's leadership behaviours and school culture in high achieving and low achieving selected high schools. In pilot study, principal's leadership behaviours included four dimensions and the internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha (α) was .89. Similarly, School Culture includes six dimensions and the internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha (α) was .61.

Data Analysis

The collected data were coded, categorized and analyzed by using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were calculated and the decision rules for interpreting the levels of the principal's leadership behaviours data were that the mean value 1-1.49 was defined as never; 1.5-2.49 for rare; 2.5-3.49 for sometimes; 3.5-4.49 for often, and 4.5-5 was defined as always (Mohammed, 2017). According to Landell (1997, as cited in Idrus & Abdullah, 2018), the decision rules for defining the levels of school culture data were that the mean value from 1 to 2.33 was low, from 2.34 to 3.67 was moderate and 3.68 to 5 was high perception. Independent Sample t test was also used to determine whether there is a significant difference in principal's leadership behaviours and school culture between high achieving and low achieving schools or not. In addition, *Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient* was utilized to know the relationship between principal's leadership behaviours and school culture in high achieving and low achieving

schools. Responses from open-ended and interview questions were categorized and analyzed to complement quantitative findings on principals' leadership behaviours and school culture.

Findings

Quantitative Research Findings

Table 1 Mean Values for Perceptions of Teachers on Principal's Leadership Behaviours of High Achieving and Low Achieving Schools (N = 309)

School		Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
High	Mean	4.37	4.23	4.17	4.39
	SD	.721	.798	.707	.680
Low	Mean	4.32	3.92	4.12	4.18
	SD	.692	.821	.739	.755

Scoring: 1.00-1.49=never, 1.5-2.49=rarely, 2.5-3.49=sometimes, 3.5-4.49=often, 4.5-5.00=always

Based on the findings shown in Table 1, teachers from high achieving and low achieving schools perceived that their principals **often** performed four frames of leadership behaviors: *Structural*, *Human Resource*, *Political*, and *Symbolic* in their schools.

In order to investigate whether or not there was a statistically significance difference in the perceptions of teachers at different levels about four frames of principal's leadership behaviours in high achieving and low achieving schools, the independent samples *t* test was also calculated.

Table 2 Independent Samples *t*-test Result for Perceptions of Teachers on their Principal's Leadership Behaviours in High and Low Achieving Schools

Dimension	Schools	Means	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Mean Difference
Structural	High	4.37	.511	307	.610	.041
	Low	4.32				
Human Resource	High	4.23	3.376	307	.001**	.313
	Low	3.92				
Political	High	4.17	.544	307	.587	.045
	Low	4.12				
Symbolic	High	4.39	2.585	307	.010*	.213
	Low	4.18				

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

According to teachers perceptions shown in Table 2, there were statistically significant differences in *Human Resource* and *Symbolic* in leadership behaviours in high achieving and low achieving schools. However, there were similar perceptions of teachers on two leadership behaviours, *Structural* and *Political*.

Table 3 Mean Values for Dimensions of School Culture Perceived by Teachers in High Achieving and Low Achieving Schools (N=309)

School		Collegiality	Collective Efficacy	Personal Efficacy	Job Satisfaction	Policy-Say So	Teaming	School Culture
High	Mean	4.38	4.33	4.03	3.68	4.09	4.03	4.04
	SD	.455	.481	.409	.495	.518	.465	.367
Low	Mean	4.21	4.20	3.93	3.57	3.89	3.88	3.90
	SD	.495	.500	.404	.578	.506	.466	.383

Scoring: 1.00–2.33= Low Level, 2.34–3.67= Moderate Level, 3.68–5.00= High Level

According to Table 3, all six dimensions of school culture were the high levels in high achieving schools, and five dimensions of school culture such as *Collegiality*, *Collective Efficacy*, *Personal Efficacy*, *Policy - Say So* and *Teaming* were the high levels and dimension of *Job Satisfaction* was moderate level in low achieving schools.

Table 4 Independent Samples t-test Result for School Culture Perceived by Teachers in High Achieving and Low Achieving Schools

Dimensions	Schools	Means	t	df	p	Mean Difference
Collegiality	High	4.38	3.176	307	.002**	.173
	Low	4.21				
Collective Efficacy	High	4.33	2.310	307	.022*	.130
	Low	4.20				
Personal Efficacy	High	4.03	2.295	307	.022*	.107
	Low	3.93				
Job Satisfaction	High	3.68	1.789	306.624	.075	.109
	Low	3.57				
Policy-Say So	High	4.09	3.462	307	.001**	.202
	Low	3.89				
Teaming	High	4.03	2.968	307	.003**	.158
	Low	3.88				
School Culture	High	4.04	3.257	307	.001**	.140
	Low	3.09				

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

According to Table 4, there were significant differences in teachers' perceptions on dimensions of their school culture including as *Collegiality*, *Collective Efficacy*, *Personal Efficacy*, *Policy-Say So* and *Teaming* in high achieving and low achieving schools. But there was no different perception in dimension of *Job Satisfaction*.

Table 5 Correlation between each Dimension of Principal's Leadership Behaviours and School Culture in High Achieving Schools (N= 140)

Dimensions	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
Collegiality,	.328**	.320**	.355**	.394**
Collective Efficacy	.291**	.235**	.347**	.351**
Personal Efficacy	.308**	.311**	.350**	.371**
Job Satisfaction	.257**	.302**	.336**	.336**
Policy-Say So	.306**	.535**	.310**	.380**
Teaming	.177*	.232**	.272**	.277**
School Culture	.278**	.323**	.328**	.352**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 5, it was found that, *Structural Frame* was moderate positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.328, p<0.01$). Beside, *Structural Frame* was low positive correlation with *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.308, p<0.01$), and *Policy-Say So* ($r=.306, p<0.01$) *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.291, p<0.01$), *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.257, p<0.01$), and *Teaming* ($r=.177, p<0.01$) in high achieving schools. Similarly, *Human Resource Frame* was moderate positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.320, p<0.01$) and *Policy-Say So* ($r=.535, p<0.01$). Beside, *Human Resource Frame* was low positive correlation with *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.311, p<0.01$), *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.235, p<0.01$), *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.302, p<0.01$), and *Teaming* ($r=.232, p<0.01$) in high achieving schools.

Moreover, *Political Frame* was moderate positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.355, p<0.01$), *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.350, p<0.01$), *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.347, p<0.01$), *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.336, p<0.01$). But *Political Frame* was low positive correlation with *Policy-Say So* ($r=.310, p<0.0$), and *Teaming* ($r=.272, p<0.01$) in high achieving schools. Additionally, *Symbolic Frame* was moderate positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.394, p<0.01$), *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.371, p<0.01$), *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.351, p<0.01$), *Policy-Say So* ($r=.380, p<0.01$), and *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.336, p<0.01$). But *Political Frame* was low positive correlation with *Teaming* ($r=.277, p<0.01$) in high achieving schools. Therefore, it was found that *Symbolic Frame* of principal's leadership behaviours was moderate positive correlation with school culture and *Structural, Human Resource, Political frames* were low positive correlation with school culture in high achieving schools.

Table 6 Correlation between each Dimension of Principals' Leadership Behaviours and School Culture in Low Achieving Schools (N= 169)

Dimension	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
Collegiality	.473**	.495**	.511**	.527**
Collective Efficacy	.479**	.492**	.515**	.533**
Personal Efficacy	.423**	.429**	.441**	.454**
Job Satisfaction	.177*	.216**	.246**	.212**
Policy-Say So	.433**	.616**	.477**	.497**
Teaming	.508**	.522**	.535**	.561**
School Culture	.416**	.359**	.454**	.464**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 6, *Structural Frame* was moderate and positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.473, p<0.01$), *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.479, p<0.01$), *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.423, p<0.01$) *Policy-Say So* ($r=.433, p<0.01$) and *Teaming* ($r=.508, p<0.01$), but there were low positive correlation between *Structural Frame* and *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.177, p<0.01$) in low achieving schools. Similarly, *Human Resource Frame* was moderate positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.495, p<0.01$), *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.492, p<0.01$), *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.429, p<0.01$), and *Policy-Say So* ($r=.616, p<0.01$) and *Teaming* ($r=.588, p<0.01$) in low achieving schools. Beside, *Human Resource Frame* was low positive correlation with *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.216, p<0.01$), in low achieving schools.

Moreover, *Political Frame* was moderate positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.511, p<0.01$), *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.441, p<0.01$), *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.515, p<0.01$), and *Policy-Say So* ($r=.477, p<0.01$) *Teaming* ($r=.535, p<0.01$) in low achieving schools. But *Political Frame*

was low positive correlation with *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.246, p<0.01$) in low achieving schools. Additionally, *Symbolic Frame* was moderate positive correlation with *Collegiality* ($r=.527, p<0.01$), *Personal Efficacy* ($r=.454, p<0.01$), *Collective Efficacy* ($r=.533, p<0.01$), *Policy-Say So* ($r=.497, p<0.01$), and *Teaming* ($r=.561, p<0.01$). But *Political Frame* was low positive correlation with *Job Satisfaction* ($r=.212, p<0.01$) in low achieving schools. Therefore, it was found that all four frames of principal's leadership behaviours were moderate positive correlation with school culture in low achieving schools.

Qualitative Research Findings

Open-ended responses

Teachers were asked *to describe their opinions about the leadership behaviours that the principal should have to lead schools successfully.*

In high achieving schools," (26.09%) of teachers expected that the principal should be a skillful manager, (18.48%) of teachers stated that the principal should be free from bias in managing school functions, and in cooperating with teachers, (16.30%) of teachers responded that the principal should have family spirit and concern for teachers' needs and feelings, (15.22%) of teachers indicated that the principal should make decisions and directions clearly and logically, (11.96%) of teachers expressed that the principal should collaborate with teachers, parents and community. (8.69%) of teachers responded that the principal should be a qualified leader, and (3.26%) of teachers indicated that the principal should establish clear goals and disciplines for teachers and students and also be persuasive to others."

In low achieving schools," (32.18%) of teachers responded that the principal should be free from bias in managing school functions and in cooperating with teachers, (21.84%) of teachers indicated that the principal should have family spirit and concern for teachers' needs and feelings, (16.10%) of teachers stated that the principal should make decisions and directions clearly and logically, (12.64%) of teachers responded that the principal should be a skillful manager, (11.49%) of teachers expressed that the principal should collaborate with teachers, parents and community, (3.45%) of teachers indicated that the principal should cooperate with School Board of Trustees, parents, NGO and School Committee, and (2.39%) of teachers stated that the principal should establish clear goals and disciplines."

Next, teachers were asked to *describe the idea, opinions, behaviours and difficulties of culture practiced in schools.*

In high achieving schools "(28.57%) of teachers responded that they are trying to engage the students in teaching-learning process because they are not keen to learn, (22.86%) of teachers stated that they cooperate with each other and with parents for school improvement, for increasing student achievement, and for solving difficulties and problems, (14.28%) of teachers expressed that they have no difficulty in their current school culture, (11.43%) indicated that they should teach co-curricular subjects for their students' physical and mental development, (11.43%) of teachers responded that they should learn continually and seek new ideas and teaching methods in order to keep in pace with curriculum reform, And (11.43%) of teachers stated that they should have chances to express their opinions, ideas, feelings, and needs.

The responses of teachers from low achieving schools can be summarized as follows:" (66.04%) of teachers stated that they cooperate with each other and parents for school improvement, for increasing student achievement, and for solving difficulties and problems,

(20.75%) of teachers expressed that they have no difficulty in their current school culture, (7.55%) of teachers responded that they cannot focus on their teaching because many ceremonies of the township are held in their schools, and (5.66%) of teachers indicated that they are trying to engage the students in teaching-learning process because they are not keen to learn.

Interview Responses

Interview was also conducted with 12 teachers from high achieving schools and 12 teachers from low achieving schools by using seven interview questions.

Teachers were asked, ***“Which principal’s behaviours is the most influential to your work? Why? (a) Structural, (b) Human Resource, (c) Political, and (d) Symbolic”***

The teachers (83.33%) of high achieving schools, (83.33%) of teachers responded *“Structural Behaviour is the most influence form of administrative structures of their principals”* and teachers (58.33%) of low achieving schools said *“Human Resource Behaviour is the most influence on administrative structures of their principals because their principals interact with family spirit, allow to discuss and negotiate their difficulties, and also reward for outstanding and dutiful teachers,”* and (41.67%) of teachers answered *“They believe that their principals practice Political Behaviour is the most influential administrative structures because they get a chance to discuss their opinions, ideas, feelings, difficulties, and problems to their principals and the principals never use legitimate power.”*

Teachers were asked ***“How does your principal treat the relationships that have been stressed in your organization among faculty members, parents, and community?”***

In high achieving schools, (66.67%) of teachers said *“Their principals haven’t difficulty because they interact with family spirit and help each other. They also collaborate with parents to improve student learning.”* Next, (33.33%) of teachers answered *“Although their principals often challenge some difficulties and problems, they can solve with the help of School Board of Trustees, Parent-Teachers Association, and School Disciplinary Committee.”* In low achieving schools, (83.33%) of teachers said *“There isn’t difficulty for principals because they interact each other with family spirit and discuss and negotiate with teachers and parents in every efforts of school improvement.”*

Teachers were asked ***“Does your principal collaborate for school improvement? How? ”***

In high achieving schools (75%) of teachers answered *“Their principals cooperate with School Board of Trustees and School Council for repairing and constructing school buildings, school toilets, and all the needs for school improvement,”* Again, (25%) of teachers said *“Other commercial companies such as Champs, Ovaltine, and Premier also give the sponsor for students’ physical and mental development.”* In low achieving schools, (50%) of teachers answered *“Former students have supported for school improvement by giving sponsor for all ceremonies such as School Family Day, Academic Prize-rewarding Ceremony, World Teachers’ Day, and so on.”* (50%) of teachers said *“Their principals collaborate with School Board of Trustees for all efforts of schools’ problems, difficulties, and school improvement.”*

Teachers were asked ***“Does your principal motivate the teachers to put their hearts and minds into their work? How? ”***

In high achieving schools (75%) of teachers answered that *“Teachers are motivated to try their best in teaching, to get higher pass rate of matriculation examination than last year, and*

also their principals usually visit classroom and aid teaching-learning materials.” (25%) of teachers said “No need to motivate them because they are responsible and accountable for school improvement themselves.” In low achieving schools, (50%) of teachers said that “They are encouraged to make hard- work of their teaching jobs to be a role model school in their district, to be clean and green in school campus, and to teach all-round development of students.” Besides, (50%) of teachers answered “They are motivated to try their best in teaching, to get higher pass rate of matriculation examination than last year, and also their principals usually visit classroom and aid teaching-learning materials.”

Teachers were asked **“How does your principal manage the tasks and duties in order to collaborate among teachers?”**

In high achieving schools (41.67%) of teachers said “Their principals assign to their duties and tasks in accordance with five houses of School Council.” (33.33%) of teachers said “Their principals allocate the duties to them alternatively.” (25%) of teachers said “Their principals need not to instruct the tasks and duties because they follow likewise the traces and cultures of the former principal.”

In low achieving schools, (41.67%) of teachers answered “They are charged as groups such as School Library, Arts and Handicraft, School Health and so on and the members work together happily and cooperatively within those groups.” (33.33%) of teachers answered “Their principals assign to their duties and tasks in accordance with School Council.” (25%) of teachers said “Their principals bring call teacher leaders meeting to order and teachers are instructed by teacher leaders.”

Teachers were asked **“Do you have job satisfaction in the current school?”**

In both high achieving and low achieving schools, (83.33%) of teachers answered that “They have job satisfaction in their schools because they have no stress within working school activities, they enjoy and interest in teaching, in modifying and adjusting the teaching for better understanding of students according to the reformed curriculum and they are also former students of those schools.” And then (16.67%) of teachers from high achieving schools said “Their principals do not interact with family spirit, use legitimate power, do not stand for teacher, and teachers have no time for self-study as they performed unimportant duties, they do not satisfy in working school activities.”

Teachers were asked **“How does your principal interact with teachers?”**

Teachers from both high achieving and low achieving schools, teachers (87.5%) answered “The staffs in those schools and principals collaborate with each other, offer suggestions and advice in solving problems, support teaching methods and ideas for better understanding of students, and have family spirit.” Again, (12.5%) from high achieving schools said “Their difficulties, feelings, needs, and concerns are neglected by their principals and they are administered by using legitimate power.”

Conclusion and Discussion

The aim of this study was to analyze the relationship between principal’s leadership behaviours and school culture. In this study, teachers from both high achieving and low achieving schools perceived that their principals often perform four frames of leadership

behaviours. There were statistically significant differences in the teachers' perceptions on their principal's leadership behaviours related to *Human Resource* and *Symbolic frames* between high and low achieving schools. Teachers' perceptions of all six dimensions of school culture were at the high levels in high achieving schools. However, in low achieving schools, teachers' perceptions indicated that five dimensions of school culture such as *Collegiality*, *Collective Efficacy*, *Personal Efficacy*, *Policy-Say So* and *Teaming* were the high levels and dimension of *Job Satisfaction* was moderate level. There were positive and moderate correlations between the principal's leadership behaviours and school culture in both selected high achieving and low achieving schools. This finding is found to be consistent with Piotrowsky (2016) who found that leadership does have a statistically significant impact on school culture. And also this is consistent with Clear (2005) who found that school culture and leadership are significantly related to student achievement. The more effective and positive in the use of leadership behaviours and in the school culture, the more increase in academic achievement.

Interview responses of the teachers from high achieving schools were that *Structural*, *Political*, and *Symbolic behaviours* were the most influence forms of principal's behaviours from high achieving schools. This is consistent with Bolman and Deal(1991, as cited in Tillman, 2012)study indicated that symbolic and political frames were used likely to predict effectiveness of the leaders. Although teachers collaborate with each other, and with parents to improve their students learning, they cannot study for their academic subjects and teaching methods to improve their teaching because principal assign unimportant duties and tasks. They are frustrating in their schools since their principals often use legitimate power and neglect their needs and feelings. Interviewing responses of teachers from low achieving schools was that *Structural*, *Human Resource*, and *Political behaviours* were the most influence forms of principals from low achieving schools. They cooperate together for their school improvement, for increasing student achievement, and for solving the problems. Teachers from low achieving schools told that they had no time to focus on their teaching because they had extra jobs and duties to do.

Recommendation for Further Research

This study conducted only in urban BEHSs in Mandalay District, therefore, further research should explore as comparative study on leadership behaviours of principal and schools culture in rural areas in Mandalay Districts and other Regions.

Acknowledgements

We would like to offer our respectful gratitude to Dr. Saw Pyone Naing (Rector), Dr. Myat Myat Thaw (Pro-Rector), Dr. Khin Mar Yee (Retired Professor), Dr. Zaw Win (Retired Lecturer), Dr. Zin Nwe Than (Associate Professor and Head of Department), Sagaing University of Education. Finally, we are intended to all people who supported to complete this study.

References

- Al-Omari, A. A. (2013). Leadership frame preference of Jordanian schools principals' as perceived by their teachers: The Bolman and Deal four frame model. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 38 (2), 252-262. Retrieved from <https://www.europeanjournalofsocialsciences.com>
- Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258221548/download>
- Boff, C. (2015). *A quantitative study of academic library administrators using Bolman and Deal's leadership orientation framework*. Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send-file%3Faccession%3Dagsu1446731663%26disposition%3Dinline>

- Clear, E. A. L. (2005). *Relationships among leadership styles, school culture, and student achievement*. Retrieved from www.purl.fcla.edu
- Elliff, D. S. (2012). *Staying power: The relationship of public school superintendent tenure to leadership frames*. Retrieved from <https://tamucc-ir.tdl.org/handle/1969.6/413>
- Freeman, C. (2008). *Teacher efficacy and its impact on student achievement*. Retrieved from <https://epublications.regis.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1015&context=theses>
- Higgins, B. C. (2008). *An evaluation of the relationship of nursing school administrators' leadership frame orientation to faculty perceptions of job satisfaction and leadership effectiveness*. Retrieved from <https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/5502/research.pdf>
- Huber-Dilbeck, D. (1988). *A study of principals' leadership behaviours in one suburban school district*. Retrieved from <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu>
- Idrus, H., & Abdullah, M. R. T. L. (2018). Implementation of PBL to enhance the soft skills of engineering students. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 53 (03008), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185303008>
- King, B. W. (2016). *Relationship of principal's leadership behaviours to academic achievement and school improvement efforts*. Retrieved from <https://drum.lib.umb.edu>
- Little, S. D. (2010). *Perceptions or reality? A frame analysis of leadership behaviour, style, and effectiveness among selected community colleague administrators*. Retrieved from <http://libres.uncc.edu/ir/unccf/little-uncc-o694D-10156.pdf>
- Livengood, J. A. (2012). *The leadership orientations and effectiveness of college and university career services directors*. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/62889768.pdf>
- Martin, S. T. (2009). *Relationship between the leadership styles of principal and school culture*. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1269&context=3Detd>
- Massawe, D. (2014). *Assessment of leadership practices at school level in community secondary schools: A case of selected schools in Kinondoni Municipality, Tanzania*. Retrieved from <http://repository.out.ac.tz/579/11Dissertation-Doreen-14-11-2014.pdf>
- Moffitt, J. R. (2007). *What works: Principal leadership behaviours that positively impact student achievement in elementary schools*. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.Georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1264&context=3Detd>
- Mohammed, M. (2017). Which method should I use to present the mean of a 5-point likert scale? Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/post/Which-method-should-I-use-to-present-the-Mean-of-a-5-point-Likert-scale>
- Mukhtar, Ali, H., & Rusmini (2017). Teacher's job satisfaction: An analysis of school's principal leadership and school culture at the state Islamic senior high school in Jambi province. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2 (5), 404-415. doi:10.21276/sjhss
- Nalls, M. A. (2011). *The influence of teaming on the academic achievement of ninth grade students in a comprehensive suburban high school*. Retrieved from <http://www.mhsl.uab.edu/dt/2011p/nalls.pdf>
- Parlar, H., Cansoy, R., & Turkoglu, M. E. (2017). Examining relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5 (5), 765-772. doi:10.13189/ujer.2017.050509
- Poniatowski, D. (2006). *The relationship of student achievement to principals' self-reported use of the four frame theory*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/47715021>
- Pourajab, M., & Ghani, M. F. B. (2016). Four-frame leadership and students' academic achievement. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 10 (1). Retrieved from <https://umexpert.um.edu.my/file/publication/00007485-139101>
- Piotrowsky, M. J. (2016). *The impact of leadership on school culture and student achievement*. Retrieved from <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2624&context=all-dissertations>
- Roddy, T. (2010). *Frame analysis of the self-perceived leadership orientations of headmasters of the independent schools association of the southwest, southern association of independent schools, and the association of independent schools of greater Washington member schools*. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi>

- Smith, B. J. (2014). *The effect of school culture on student achievement*. Retrieved from <http://thescholarship.ecu.edu/bitstream/handle/10342/4499/Smith-ecu0600E11207.pdf>
- Shah, M. (2012). The impact of teachers' collegiality on their organizational commitment in high- and low-achieving secondary schools in Islama bad, Pakistan. *Journal of Studies in Eduaction*, 2 (2), 130-156.
- Steinmayr, R., MeiBner, A., Weidinger, A. F., & Wirthwein, L. (2017). *Academic achievement*. doi: 10.1093/OBO/9780199756810-0108
- Tillman, P. S. (2012). *Leadership orientations of female school superintendents: A multidimensional framework perspective*. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/407%3Futm_source%3Ddigitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu%252Fetd%252F407%26utm_campaign%3DPDF_CoverPages