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Abstract

This study examines the role of the head teacher in Saudi primary schools. It looks at their ability to lead and manage school act activities, the extent of their authority to enhance the learning environment (e.g through acquisition of resources), their role in staff development, relationships with staff, education authorities, parents and the wider community, power sharing, budget management and freedom to initiate changes. Quantitative data were collected from head teachers, deputy heads and teachers (200 in total) randomly selected from primary schools in Medina. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain complementary quantitative data from 2 head teachers, 3 deputy heads and 4 teachers. It is shown that head teachers work in strict and complex environment, subject to a bureaucratic centralised system, leaving them little decision-making autonomy. Within these limitations, they undertake responsibilities for managing staff and pupils and staff development, and are the main point of contact between the school and other stakeholders. They understand the notion of power sharing, working closely with deputy heads and delegating some roles to teachers. However, there is evidence of conflict in some schools, over the relative roles of heads and deputies. Moreover, it is not clear to what extent heads’ performance is affected by personal characteristics and by external factors such as selection processes. These are suggested as fruitful areas for further research.
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Chapter One

Background to the Study

1.1 Introduction

This is a study of the head teacher’s role in primary schools in Saudi Arabia. The head teacher’s tasks and responsibilities have a fundamental effect on school performance and children’s achievement. Although the head cannot lead and run the school effectively without the help of other teaching and non-teaching staff, still the head’s role seems to be crucial in determining the school performance (Cook and Mack, 1971; Bernbaum, 1976; Crow, 2005).

Although this study is not concerned with investigating the head’s personal traits, the literature, as we shall see, is very concerned about the head’s personal characteristics as a leader and a manager. At this point it should be noted that while some authors view leadership and management as essentially different, others find the distinction unhelpful. The ideas of leadership and management in the head’s role are discussed in Chapter Three. The head’s leadership and management may differ when viewed in cultural context. In a developed culture the head may have autonomy to decide the policy of the school, including the way of management, the financial budget and teaching (Brundrett, 1999) while in a highly centralised system such as the one under investigation, the head may have little margin of freedom to lead and manage the school. The question with such a system is how far the head can go to achieve the school objectives, and how far the head can adopt his own or other members of staff’s initiatives for change and development. In all cases the head teacher in Saudi schools is a civil servant, taking his salary from the government, and he has to implement the policy of the government. Nevertheless and despite the limitation of his chance to lead and make changes, still some talented heads run their schools smoothly and effectively, while others may make a school like a prison. Between these extremes, there is always a space where some heads create a good learning environment.

Accordingly, the head teacher plays a role that could affect the school’s history, and because this role is essential for the school’s well-being, the current researcher is very
interested in the head’s performance, even in an environment that poses many restrictions.

1.2 The Research Problem

Studying the head teacher’s role in school management and leadership would help in understanding the reasons behind the success or failure of the school, as the head plays central role in determining the school activities and policy. Although there are theories focussed on headship in terms of “power sharing” “collegiality”, “division of labour”, and “multi-layered leadership” (Whitaker, 1998; Southworth, 1998), the head is still a central player in all aspects of schooling.

The Saudi educational system is centralised, which means all the school activities, curriculum, the finance and the policy are determined centrally. The head teacher, as well as teachers, has to follow the highly prescriptive instructions on how to run the school. The head in this sense leads the school with restrictions, but should have some margin of freedom to move forward, to adopt a style of management and determine the school organisation. This study investigates the authority primary school heads and how they lead teaching and non-teaching staff. The question may arise, why the head teacher? It is because the head teacher is the main pillar of the educational process, regardless of the type of educational system; developed, underdeveloped or transitional, all systems recognise headship as a position fundamentally essential for school management. Researchers in this field have borrowed theories (as we shall see in the literature review) from business administration and industrial administration to apply to education, because they believe that effective headship would create an effective school and vice versa. However, our vision for school management and development of the staff totally depends on the head’s quality, his ability to manage and lead. For all that and for a better management and leadership, this study was conducted to find out the way in which Saudi Primary head teachers lead and manage their schools, and how far they can go for development and success.
1.3 Main Objectives

This study investigates the Saudi primary school head teacher’s role in managing and leading the school. Specific questions and issues of focus were derived from literature on the head’s role in a variety of contexts, and from the researcher’s personal experience as a head teacher, and as a parent of children in both Saudi and English primary schools. Issues raised include: How far can the head teacher affect and colour the school’s daily activities? How much do heads intend to share power with other staff, and how much power do they have over staff, finance and planning? Is there any way that Saudi head teachers in primary schools can exercise their power to create a learning environment and make change? To what extent can they lead to create a collaborative system and maintain professional development for themselves and their staff? To help shed light on these issues, the investigative objectives are to evaluate the head teacher’s role in relation to:

- Their ability to manage and lead school activities, e.g. management of pupils (absence, progress and discipline), reward, punishment, and extra-curricular activities.
- To what extent they can exercise their authority to create a better learning environment, e.g. through maintenance of buildings and acquisition of resources.
- How much freedom they have to exercise their own initiatives to make changes
- How far they can offer in-service training for their teaching staff to maintain professional development
- To what extent they maintain relationships with staff, parents, LEA, and the local community
- How far they practise “power sharing” with other staff
- How much discretion they have to manage the school’s budget
- How they can fulfil their tasks under the pressure of the centralised system

1.4 Importance of the Study

The head teacher role and school administration in general have received a lot of attention in Saudi literature, but as far as the researcher knows, there are no empirical studies concerned exclusively with the head teacher’s role. On the other hand, there are more empirical studies in relation to teachers’ performance, teaching problems,
curricula, pupils’ problems, achievement, motivation and development. Five published studies related to head teachers and school administration have been selected for review, which may support the decision to focus on the head teacher’s role empirically. The first and most important study is Al-Surasary and Al-Arif’s (2003) “The School Administration, Theory, Practical and Empirical Investigation”. This study covered the head teacher’s role comprehensively, but all the content was theoretical. The first chapter discussed head teachers, how they are chosen and prepared, and tenure. The second chapter is about school administration and its effectiveness. It comprehensively covers the head’s activities, leadership of the head, the head and the school council; the head and school work planning, the head and the school timetable, the deputy head’s role and the deputy and the school plan. Chapter Three is about the school administration and supervision activities. It focuses on the local education supervisors, their tasks and how they coordinate their work with schools’ administrations. Chapter Four focuses on the nature of the school, and this chapter covers the role at the head as a supervisor, manager and evaluator. Chapter Five contains appendices. This study is very rich in terms of providing the head’s information in relation to central government legislation about the head teacher’s role and activities. Head teachers, according to this study, face many problems; among them, they are allowed to stay only four years in office, and could be transferred to another school or made to step down with no clear reason. They come under such pressures that they often leave school and look for other jobs.

The second study is that of Altaweel (1999), “The Educational Administration: Concepts and Prospects”. This book is totally theoretical. It emphasises the concept of educational administration and its development, school leadership and their skills, the needs theories and educational administration. Its content in general reflects western thinkers and scholars. There is not even a single example of a local education system; it looks like an English book, but in Arabic.

The third study is by Rabih (2006), “The Successful Head Teacher”. This book might be expected to provide the reader with empirical evidence about the head teacher’s effectiveness, but, unfortunately, it provides only a theoretical description of the head teacher based on the western literature. The book consists of nine chapters; the first one about the concept of the school administration, the second and third chapters are about the head teacher’s skills and tasks. Chapters Four, Five and Six are about the head teacher’s leadership, activities and communication. The last three chapters are about the
head and decision making and the supervision system in school. No conclusions or recommendations are offered; thus the reader really comes to an end with no clear vision about how to be a successful head.

The fourth study is Abdin’s (2005) “The Modern School Administration”. This book consists of eleven chapters. The first focuses on the concept of school administration; chapters two, three and four concentrate on the school and types of school administration. Chapters five and six are devoted to the head teacher and his tasks. The remaining four chapters are on the effective school and effective school administration. This book, like the previous ones, is theoretical and most parts are translated from English literature.

The fifth study, by Mohammed (2008), is titled “The Psychology of Educational Leadership in the School and how to Develop it”. This book consists of eight chapters, covering all aspects of the school administration with focus on the head teacher’s role and accountability. This book is very similar in content to the other books that have already been reviewed.

These books have similar principles and contents. All of them depend mainly on English literature in this field. What is missing in these books and many others similar to them in the Arabic library, and what the researcher aims to provide, is real field work investigating the opinions of the heads, their actual role in school life and their problems. None of these studies contained deep investigation of the real life tasks, accountability, and power of the head. That is why we try to add some extra effort to what others have done theoretically, to see how the head teacher’s are working, thinking and practising in the field, not in theory. From all these issues, this study acquires its importance.

1.5 Methods

In order to explore, explain and understand the issues raised above, reading of both Arabic and western literature on the head teacher’s role was carried out. In addition, primary data were collected by means of a questionnaire survey, complemented by semi-structured interviews. Target populations for both the survey and interviews included not only head teachers, but also deputy heads and teachers, as these groups also can be expected to have observed and formed opinions on the head’s role. It should
be noted that the primary data were collected from boys’ primary schools. This is because Saudi Arabia maintains strict gender segregation in education, and it would be culturally unacceptable (and therefore practically unfeasible for a male researcher to enter a girls’ school or conduct interviews with female teachers. A detailed account of the research instruments and methods can be found in Chapter Four.

1.6 Location of the Study

This study investigates the head teacher’s role in Saudi Arabia. The study was conducted among a sample of primary schools in Almedena Almonawara (Medina). The city is located in the north west of the country and enjoys a good infrastructure, commercial and religious sites, which make the city more prosperous than any other city in the country after Mekka. The city is one of the oldest urban cities in the Arabian Peninsula, and it is the city of the “Messenger of God” P.B.U.H. making it the second holiest city (after Mecca) in Saudi Arabia. Its student population is about 1.46 million in 1993. It contains 404 primary schools (Ministry of Education, 2009).

1.7 Structure of the Dissertation

The rest of the study contains five chapters. Chapter Two sets the study in context by outlining the history and structure of the Saudi Education System. Chapter Three is a review of literature on the roles and responsibilities of head teachers. The methods used to carry out the fieldwork are explained in Chapter Four. Chapter Five presents the research findings. The research outcomes are summarized and recommendations suggested in Chapter Six.
Chapter Two

Development of the Saudi Education System

2.1 Introduction

The modern educational system in Saudi Arabia was established in the last few decades. Although the system has been rapidly developed qualitatively and quantitatively, still most of its components are affected by the socio-cultural traditions, which may reduce the effectiveness of the system in terms of quality of planning, teacher performance, teaching-learning interaction and curriculum provision. In the last three or four decades, the system has improved dramatically. However, periodic reports and articles in the Saudi press suggest that the system still falls short of the nation’s aspiration and may not meet the standard of the developed nations.

The educational authorities are now trying hard to achieve qualitative improvement, after an earlier emphasis on quantity. They are also attempting to replace expatriate teaching staff with qualified local staff. Nevertheless, the system still encounters serious problems and difficulties which may reduce the opportunities to keep up with international standards. The margin of freedom, for instance, given to individual schools is very limited. The finances of all state-run schools is centrally determined, the curriculum, the syllabus, the test and examinations system, the administrative roles are all determined centrally, so the school has no chance to participate in planning or determining the policy or the way in which the curriculum is implemented. Individual school initiatives (if any) would have to go through a long, rigid bureaucratic system, and could be set aside at any point in the process. Thus, to understand the whole educational system and its effectiveness, we need to view its development historically.

This chapter begins, therefore, with a historical overview of the development of education in the Kingdom, followed by an account of girls’ education (which developed separately from and later than that of boys). Then the structure of the education system is explained. There follows a specific focus on the primary stage, including the curriculum, tests and examinations and problems of primary education. The characteristics of Saudi head teachers, and the tasks assigned to primary heads are also outlined.
2.2 Historical Development of Saudi Education

Socio-economic factors may play an essential role in educational development. The Saudi economic situation was very poor before the discovery of oil (Al-Ajlan, 1989). The people of the Arabian Peninsula were mostly nomads, who lived by pasturing, hunting and diving. Resources were very limited. Besides, the Ottoman Empire, which partially ruled the region for about four centuries, did nothing to develop the socio-economic aspects and totally ignored the educational system. Only the rich people used to send their children to traditional schools, which used to take place in the mosques, to learn basic reading, writing and mathematics. The development of the formal educational system can be viewed in four stages as follows:

1. The first stage (1889-1923):

   In this stage, before the unification of the Kingdom, the traditional system was the only system available. It consisted mainly of small groups of children learning reading and writing, called “katateeb”, or a circle of a few children learning religious studies and Islamic law in the mosque (Al-Gamdi and Abdul-Jawad, 2002). There were only a few traditional private schools for the children of the elite, which taught Arabic language, arithmetic and religious studies. The schools were only in urban centres, very few in number and of very poor quality (Al-Sinbil et al 2004). There were also a few Turkish schools in the main urban centres but the people ignored them and refused to send their children to those schools, because they taught in Turkish, and the people thought they were established in order to “Turkishize” the Arabs, so the schools were abandoned. However, in this stage, a few private schools set up by philanthropists were forerunners of the modern educational system, especially in Mecca (Al-Hamid et al, 2007).

2. The second stage (1924-1952):

   This stage, beginning shortly after the unification of the Kingdom, witnessed the birth of the modern Saudi educational system. The first step towards modernization and systemization of the education system started in 1925 with the establishment of the Education Directorate, which took place only two years after the unification of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Al-Buraidi, 2006). The newly born “Directorate” totally changed the traditional system into a modern one that aimed to provide basic education to all Saudi boys, provide learners with skills needed to cope with the change in the economy and social life, and inculcate Arab and Islamic beliefs, traditions and socio-
cultural values (Albaadi, 1994). The first “Education Committee” was established in 1926, which aimed to “set up an educational system that could be able to unify the education system in the Kingdom and make primary education compulsory and free” (Al-Sinble et al, 2004, p.141).

The Education Directorate took control over all education in the country and set up the first national curriculum for boys’ primary education in 1935. At the same time an attempt was made to establish and develop technical education, which formed the basis for higher education (Mougharbel, 2001). Intensive efforts were made, from 1945 onwards, to establish new schools and by 1951 there were 226 boys’ schools (mostly primary) with almost 30,000 students (SA Information Centre, 1996). At this stage there was no formal education provision for girls, due to opposition from conservatives who feared that sending girls to school would expose them to moral danger.

3 Third stage (1953 – 1970):

This stage can be described as the time of expansion, during which the technical and legislative bases for the educational system were set. In 1953 the Ministry of Education was established and immediately started to study the educational system and its problems. The Ministry’s main focus in early years was on primary education and eradication of illiteracy, which a 1950 UNESCO publication had estimated at 92-95 per cent (Al-Saloom, 1995). District Education Offices were set up to supervise and administer education at the local level. At this stage the Ministry of Education realized that the four stages of education (preparatory or kindergarten, primary, intermediate, and secondary) determined by the Education Directorate, should be supported with higher education in order to provide the national schools with qualified manpower. Thus the first university King Saud University was established in 1965. Meanwhile, approval for girls’ education was eventually secured, subject to girls being taught separately from boys in segregated schools, and their education being overseen by the religious authorities. The establishment of the General Presidency of Girls’ Education in 1960 is regarded as a turning point in girls’ education in the country (Al-Gamdi and Abduljawad, 2002). The Ministry of Education organizational framework (shown in figure 2.1) covered all aspects of education, including the highest committee for educational development and directors for each educational stage, besides the finance, curricula and scholarships.
Figure 2.1: Organisational Structure of Ministry of Education
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In a short period, the Ministry of Education achieved great deal of its objectives, qualitatively and quantitatively (Al-Hamid et al, 2007).

4 Fourth Stage (1971-2008):

Since the establishment of the Ministry of Education, the priority had been to open new schools wherever there were enough pupils were available to start, or to offer free transport for the areas that had no schools, so students could join schools in other areas. Within five years the number of primary schools in the country increased from a few schools to 518, with 79274 pupils and 3085 teachers (Ministry of Education, 1985). The number was doubled in the next five-year period to 1072 primary schools with 7802 teachers and 174514 pupils (Al-Sinble et al, 2004). During the period 1970-1985, the quantitative development in education was remarkable, as shown in Table 2.1. Indeed, in 1997, it was claimed that there was no children in the country without education (Ministry of Education, 1997)

The rapid quantitative expansion of primary schools caused some problems, as it was not matched by qualitative development. Thus the Ministry of Education reviewed the whole education system and decided to pay more attention to equilibrium between qualitative and quantitative development. It made great efforts to reinitiate the national curriculum and provide schools with qualified teaching staff (Ministry of Education, 1986).
Table 2.1: Development of Primary Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>12157</td>
<td>267529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>20454</td>
<td>391677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3638</td>
<td>28156</td>
<td>517079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4413</td>
<td>45405</td>
<td>688170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4806</td>
<td>55381</td>
<td>919949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5404</td>
<td>72333</td>
<td>1027842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5881</td>
<td>85743</td>
<td>1138847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6603</td>
<td>104171</td>
<td>1257277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3 Primary Education for Girls

Most resources concerning educational development in Saudi Arabia specify 1960 as the first official step for girls’ education in Saudi Arabia, when the General Presidency for Girls’ Education was established in order to direct and supervise girls’ education in the Kingdom. Before that there were only 15 private schools for girls in the whole country, so girls’ education lagged behind boys’ education. Because of the strict traditions which opposed girls’ education, the government faced pressure to keep girls excluded, but eventually by putting girls’ education under direct supervision of the highest religious scholars, the government overcame the social objection and opened the way for girls’ education (Al-Sinble et al, 2003).

The General Presidency for Girls’ Education was put in charge of planning, supervising and curricula setting for girls’ education from kindergarten to university. The following table shows the rapid development in girls’ education.
Table 2.2: The Development of Girls’ Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>12227</td>
<td>114775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>20521</td>
<td>215454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>28365</td>
<td>311862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2139</td>
<td>29723</td>
<td>344924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2754</td>
<td>43106</td>
<td>466353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3527</td>
<td>44817</td>
<td>760521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6714</td>
<td>111851</td>
<td>1175783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The figures reveal that in about four decades the numbers of schools, teachers and students increased by more than 200%, reflecting the government’s aspiration to catch up with other developed nations.

2.4 Educational System Structure

The educational system in Saudi Arabia consists of five stages, namely, kindergarten or pre-school education which covers children aged 3-5 years; primary education which covers the ages of 6-11 years, intermediate (12-14 years), and secondary education which covers the age group of 15-17 years, then for successful graduates, higher education.

Education is still not compulsory, but is free; the government is responsible for all the school wages and other relevant materials (Ministry of Education, 1992). The Ministry of Education supplies schools with the needed facilities, teachers and ancillary staff. It
also sets the curricula and provides guidance on teaching, including all aspects of pedagogy including the daily timetable, tests and examinations, and all other relevant activities (Al-Hamid et al, 2007). The Ministry of Education is the dominant provider of education in the country. Although there are a few schools sponsored by private individuals and organisations, or by other government bodies, they are still supervised by the Ministry of Education and required to conform to the ministry’s standards and regulations (Saudi Arabian Cultural mission, 1991). Thus, the system is highly centralized. All aspects of education are subject to government supervision and control. Policy is regulated by the Education High Committee, while curricula and syllabuses are centrally approved and uniform throughout the Kingdom.

2.5 Primary School Curricula

Al-Hamid et al (2007) indicated that the first modern curricula appeared in 1926, one year after the establishment of the education directorate. These curricula focused predominantly on religious studies, which was politically and socially required at that time. In 1970, the education policy documents of the government identified in Article 206 the principles for curriculum setting as follows:

1. Must be derived from our Islamic culture.
2. In association with the needs of the nation’s objectives.
3. Must be suitable to the age and ability of students.
4. Should be in line with the educational objectives.
5. Must be balanced, flexible and suitable for the social environment.

On these principles the curriculum was set up, paying more attention to religious studies than other subjects as shown in Table 2.3. The curriculum reflects an educational policy which aims not only to provide academic education but also to socialize children into Islamic and national norms and values (Education High Committee, 1970; Al-Hakeel, 1986).
Table 2.3: The Early Curriculum for Primary Schools in Saudi Arabia: Lessons per Week by Subject and Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Class (i.e. Grade/Year group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic language</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This curriculum has been modified several times, but the main principles and subjects remain the same. The focus on religious studies, which is given more time than other subjects, has continued, but recently, in 2005, English language was included in the curriculum only in class six. The curriculum is the same for boys’ and girls’ schools (Al-Hamid et al, 2007), except that girls study domestic science instead of P.E.

2.5.1 Tests and Examinations

The test and examination system is based on monthly tests which are used as an assessment of the pupils’ abilities in mastering the knowledge and information transmitted in the classroom, and two main examinations in the middle and end of the academic year. Pupils pass if they score 50% and over; otherwise they have to repeat the year. If a pupil fails two years in succession, he/she will be excluded, and this is one of the main problems of the system (Al-Gamdi and Abduljawad, 2002). The tests and
examinations are carried out by the teachers. The school sets out the test type and timing, except for the last year, when examinations are set centrally and carried out nationally at the same time. The test outcome would determine who moves on to the next stage (intermediate school) and who remains behind. (Al-Hamid et al, 2007).

2.6 Problems of Primary Education

Primary education in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia faces a number of serious problems, some of them school related, others related to the family, community and local authority. Some of these problems are discussed below:

1. Children outflow, which means a sizable proportion of children leave school before they finish the primary stage; the proportion is estimated at 2.9% of boys and 5.8% of girls. The local authorities cannot do anything to avoid this problem since there is no legislation to force parents to keep their children in school. Those children leave school either to join the labour force to help their families who have no income, or because some parents do not care about their children’s education (Al-Hamid et al, 2007).

2. Failures – children who fail the final exam and repeat the year. When this happens two years in succession the school has to exclude them according to the educational regulations (Al-Gamdi and Abduljawad, 2002). In a study conducted by the Ministry of Education in 1997, it was found that the average percentage of failures was 10.8%, which is a high proportion (Ministry of Education, 2000).

3. School buildings. Because of the rapid expansion in the basic education, the government was unable to build enough new schools to cover all the children, so it leased some houses and converted them to schools. This is not ideal for the teaching-learning process. Even the purpose-built schools have no regular maintenance and some of them lack basic facilities because of the rigid bureaucratic system (Al-Sinble et al, 2004).

4. The deficiency of some teachers’ performance. Despite the encouragement of the government bodies in rewarding teachers and supporting them financially and materially, most teachers are still doing their job in a traditional way,
showing no initiatives no creativity, and no development. This all affects the process of learning (Aqil, 2005).

5. Centralized educational system. All the decision-making in relation to education is in the hands of the central authorities. The school heads, teachers or staff have no opportunity to express their opinion about the school building, equipment, text books, curriculum and teaching methods. Although there are local education offices all over the country, even those have no real authority; they only transmit the central authority’s instructions and regulations. This makes the teaching-learning process more complicated and reduces the school capabilities to plan and make changes for the benefit of the children (Aqil, 2005).

6. The weakness of the family-school relationship. School staff realize the importance of the relationship with parents, but the cooperation between them seems to be at a very low level. The schools are partially responsible, but the parents also show little interest as they believe the school will do the job without their interference. The school administration often complains of poor response when they ask parents officially to visit the school because of a problem with their children. (Al-Sinble et al, 2004).

2.7 Characteristics of the Head Teacher in Saudi Arabia

The Ministry of Education sets a general specification for choosing head teachers, preparing them and their tenure in office (Ministry of Education, 1993).

A. Specification for choosing head teachers:
   1. The candidate should have a University qualification or over for primary school
   2. A postgraduate qualification, such as MEd or PhD, is preferred.
   3. The candidate should have experience as a deputy for no less than four years.
   4. The candidate should have an excellent report for the last three years.
   5. The candidate should pass the interview (Rabih, 2006).

The educational qualifications specified represent Saudi Arabia’s on-going efforts to upgrade teacher preparation generally. However, the criteria generally are very broad
and there is a lack of specification of particular character traits, skills or experiences considered necessary or desirable.

B. Organisational arrangement

1. A special committee appointed by the Ministry of Education has to look in the records of each head or deputy at the end of each scholastic year to decide whether or not they are able to carry on in their positions.
2. Any head or deputy that obtains a less than excellent report from the committee must step down.
3. If three supervisors recommend that the head or the deputy is unable to run the school, they must step down.
4. Ministry of Education decree no. 1442/31 determines that a period of four years is the usual term of office for heads or deputies.
5. Exceptionally, a head or deputy may carry on for another year or two if the committee finds it necessary for the benefit of the school (Al-Surasary and Al-Arif, 2003).
6. Head teachers and deputies must be transferred to another school when they have spent six years in a position.

C. Preparation

The Ministry of Education sets out a comprehensive training programme for head teachers and deputies before they take over. The programme is not a very long one; it takes a week or so, but helps to enrich their experience through intensive activities, such as enabling the new heads or deputies to meet to exchange experiences, lectures on school administration, presentations, school visits and meetings with supervisors, administrators and experienced head teachers (Abdin, 2005).

D. Mechanisms for dismissal or transfer of the head or deputy

1. Dismissal: If the head requests it, or, if he has made an unacceptable mistake, or, is found negligent.
2. Transferring to another school: According to personal request; for the benefit of the educational process; if the head is not suitable for the school size or he cannot achieve the school’s objectives.
E. In-service training

The Ministry of Education ordered the local educational authorities to establish in-service training programmes for newly appointed heads, those who obtained a less than excellent report and those who did not satisfy the supervisors. The LEA started such programmes in 1996, all over the country (Al Surasary and Al-Arif, 2003).

2.8 The Head Teacher’s Task in Saudi Schools

As we have seen earlier, one of the most significant problems facing the head teachers to fulfil their commitments in schools is the bureaucratic style, which is derived from the hierarchy of the Ministry, and minimises the role of the head teacher. In this regard, Al Gamdi and Abduljawad (2002) indicated that the bureaucratic system in Saudi Arabia works against initiative. Although the government is responsible for financing schools, all teachers, head teachers and staff in each school have the same rate, with no exception and no head teacher can ask for more than the standard budget that every school receives. If the school for any reason needs extra finance, then the head teacher has to go through the bureaucratic channels for months before their request is granted, which may bury any initiative. The highly centralised system works as a super power and the local education authorities, as well as the school’s administration, have only an executive role; in other words, all aspects of education, such as the curriculum, the pedagogy, tests and examinations, the time for starting and finishing the school day and semesters are all prescribed from the top and the school administration have to follow instructions. Thus, Aqil (2005) said:

“Despite the existence of local educational authorities, as a representative of the Ministry of Education, to run the education system, the centralised system makes these local educational authorities like puppets following the instruction of the centre, and lose the initiative to change and improve the education system” (p.204).

Al-Sinble et al (2004) asserted that the local educational authorities have no margin of freedom to decide, plan or finance schools, they are only authorised to fulfil the centralised authority’s instruction, which prevents these authorities from proposing any initiative that will enable them to plan for better opportunities for development. Besides
all that, Aqil (2005) emphasised that the relationship between the school and children’s parents is not often positive; parents rarely attend any parent evenings, or school parent committees and most of them hardly visit school unless there is serious problem that threatens their children’s future.

Another problem that directly affects the head teacher’s role and the school administration in general, is that of incompetent local education authorities, who sometimes work against the head teacher’s aspiration and disable their capability to make any desirable changes. They use the instructions from the centre to turn down any new ideas or initiative, which may frustrate head teachers and prevent them from attempting to make changes. As a result, head teachers in primary schools in Saudi Arabia have quite a limited role in developing the school as a learning organisation. Thus, the main role of the head teacher could be to:

- Organise the school time-table
- Monitor the teaching-learning process
- Supervise the implementation of the centrally prescribed curriculum.
- Contact the local authorities, parents and other social forces outside the school.
- Run regular meetings with the staff.
- Evaluate teachers’ performance and present the annual report.
- Provide teachers with feedback.
- Nominate teachers for in-service training (Rabih, 2006; Abdin, 2005).

All these are administrative tasks; there is no scope for head teachers to plan, improve the quality of teaching, reward or control the full process without permission from the higher authorities. Accordingly, the head teacher’s role is far less than “autonomous” and far from practising a “leadership” role, because leadership needs not only personal characteristics, but also the freedom to manage and lead, unimpeded by heavy restrictions from top-level educational authorities.
2.9 Summary

This chapter has been devoted to the Saudi educational system. We reviewed the system since the establishment of the modern Saudi Arabian state in 1924. It was explained how arbitrary the educational system was before this date, and how it was very limited and confined to religious studies, and the principles of reading and writing. The first step in the establishment of the modern Saudi system was in 1925 when the “Education Directorate” was born as the first official institute, which is regarded as a turning point in the modern education system in the country. Although the education system developed steadily and on a solid basis, the development was not adequate, because prior to the oil revolution in the early 1970s, the country was very poor with no resources to finance the education system. In 1951 the Ministry of Education replaced the Education Directorate. Its activities were to continue the work of the ‘Directorate’ and direct dramatic qualitative and quantitative changes, especially after the oil price revolution in the early 1970s. Up to 1950, the Saudi government focused on pre-University education, but in 1957, the first University was established. In 1960, the first official institute for girls’ education was established. In 1970 the education system entered for the first time a stage of comprehensive planning connected with the general five-year development plan.

Quantitative development was rapid; the number of buildings, teachers and pupils in less than three decades increased by 200% but the system was still inadequate qualitatively. Within this context, the head teachers’ activities, preparation and characteristics were restricted by the heavy bureaucratic system as a result of the centralised educational system. Thus, head teachers’ contribution in developing schools, delivering initiatives and making changes are very limited. In the next chapter, the head teacher’s role will be discussed based on the literature.
Chapter Three

Literature Review: Head Teacher’s Role

3.1 Introduction

A school is a learning organization sharing the same rules of organizational structure function and management as other organizations. Organization effectiveness depends on the competency of the organization’s head. As the old Chinese proverb says, “A lion leading thousands of foxes is better than a fox leading thousands of lions” (Sun-Tzu, 1998). If this proverb is suitable for military organizations, it is equally applicable to other organizations, such as learning organizations. If needed, the school head can safeguard the school or otherwise.

The head teacher’s personality, qualification and experience are vital for the school as a learning organization. However, these personal competencies are not, on their own, sufficient to determine the success of the teaching-learning and disciplinary process. The socio-cultural structure may play a crucial role in determining the way in which any school head performs in the school. In a self-managed school, such as the ones in England, the head teacher’s experience, qualification and personality may play an essential role in the school management and outcomes, but in a less developed cultural context such as the one in Saudi Arabia, the head’s qualification, personality and experience, may help, but to a lesser degree, as the head has to implement and follow the guidelines of the local government prescribed curricula. This chapter explores the head teacher’s role, drawing on literature from the West (where there is a large quantity of literature on which to draw) and Saudi Arabia. It begins by identifying two main roles, as manager and leader, and elaborates on these roles. Then, the roles of the primary head teacher in England and Saudi Arabia are outlined.

3.2 The Head Teacher’s Role

The head teacher’s role can be viewed from two main perspectives:

1. As a manager or administrator.
2. As a leader.
In reality the head teacher’s role seems to be more or less one of managerial accountability. Although teachers have direct responsibility in class, responsibility for the school as a learning organization rests with the head teacher (Bell and Rhodes, 1996). Within this context, Peters (1976) indicated that modern schooling needs heads conceived as “managers”. This view is derived from and stimulated by the managerial experience in business and industry, which has proved its effectiveness. Good managers could use their powers to develop the potential of their colleagues, and in turn the organisation they work for. This view would be of great benefit for teachers who work as managers (Gane & Morgan, 1992). In practice, management theory has been developed to fulfil the requirements of industrial and commercial activities, which many see, however, as fundamentally different from the requirements of educational activities. Such a view does not mean there is no common ground between running a business and running a school. Indeed, control, communication, departmental autonomy, and budget determination are common to a number of sophisticated organizations including schools (Taylor, 1976).

Nevertheless, one can understand that, while there are differences and similarities between business and school activities and management, one should not take the similarities into account too far, in order not to lose sight of the differences. At the same time, however, one should not underestimate the similarities in management principles which could be crucial if the school intends to provide the best possible services to its pupils (Whitaker, 1998).

Jones (2005) indicated that in schools and other similar organizations, the head should conduct regular performance management reviews in order to assess three fundamental elements of performance: contribution, capability and continuous progress. In his words:

“The main intention behind the introduction of performance management in England, for example, is for schools to demonstrate a commitment to: develop all teachers effectively to ensure job satisfaction, high levels of expertise and progression of staff in their chosen profession” (p.139).

As a manager, the head teacher’s responsibility is to make sure that not only is the performance of the school going well, but also that of individual staff, and that can only
be accomplished if the head shares decision-making authority with teachers, and sometimes with parents and other members of the local community (Levacic, 1995). Watts (1984) asked why head teachers should share the responsibility and said that British heads often enjoy extensive power, like the captain of a ship. However, he noted that the situation has dramatically changed, and the school is no longer isolated from the surrounding society, but has to cooperate with a diverse array of bodies, imposing a burden on head which necessitates delegation skills.

This may explain why most head teachers claim that their decisions are made with the participation of other school staff rather than by the heads and their deputies alone. Indeed, teachers have to work collectively to create an atmosphere that encourages pupils to respond positively to the lessons' objectives and to the school culture in general. Ensuring a collective action among teachers is a responsibility of the headteacher who is supposed to develop his/her school policy from individual to professional team work. This policy is not the only way, but the best way to meet the requirements of the modern school, according to Bell (1990).

The question may be raised here, do schools really need a manager head? Scott (1989) asserted that the rise of the managerialism approach in school could be attributed to two main types of reasons:

1. political or structural reasons.
2. ideological reasons.

However, both reasons are integrated in some way to shift or possibly replace the old fashioned educational value system with a new one, in line with what Scott (1989) said, “More must be done with less” (p15), as an indication of the fast and radical change that entails different policy, restrict regulation and a sophisticated plan to integrate the school curriculum, in order to achieve better outcomes. Structural reasons include the expansion of the school curriculum to cover students who need to stay in school after the leaving age of 16, and for those who need training programmes, to be qualified for the labour market. These reasons are in harmony with the ideological reason, which can be seen as an attempt to change the professional values that were always important in education and replace them with managerial accountabilities; line management instead of professional responsibilities. This view aims to subordinate the traditional professional and collegial solidarity, coordination and integration, and replace it with a
mechanical system, where responsibilities are segmented and individualized. In line with the above, education policy makers in the UK, for example, attempted to market education services in the same way as other economic goods are marketed, which may pollute education with commercial ideas, as Gray (1989) stated:

"Marketing is an important management function, in education as elsewhere it is closely related to the other key functions of an educational organization personal, curriculum and resource management. A central concern is the exploration of ways in which the distinctive characteristics of in education and its management might contribute to an indigenous approach to marketing. Such an approach would build upon the strengths and traditions of the education service, and would disarm critiques of marketing which accuse it of polluting education with alien commercial ideas and strategies incompatible with the fundamental objectives of an education service" (p.54).

School marketing is an objective of the modern educational system. Also, the need to keep the learning process for children and youth going on, in order to empower the human resources development and improve people’s performance level through a variety of skills and experiences, means that the school, as a learning organization, like all organizations, requires planning, command, cooperation, coordination and control. These requirements need to work together and, all have to observe the same principles in order to function effectively (Squire, 1989).

Considering the role of the head teacher in school from the management of education administration view, some researchers (Anthony and Herzlinger, 1989; Parames, 1975) stress the fact that “managers” are responsible for organization, directing staff, planning for progress, attainment and measuring outcomes, setting and observing attainment and assessing results, reviewing work and procedures and making decisions. These principles are derived from business management and applied to education. In this context, Parames (1975) asserted that management in education is solely a responsibility of the principals, who have to exercise their professionalism through certain activities closely related to the school culture and its objectives. Such responsibility, he argues, entails, not doing things, but rather getting them done in cooperation with pre-appointed teamwork rather than by the individual principal. Even those who assign the head teacher ultimate power to control and manage educational
programmes admit that the responsibility of school management is a collective responsibility (Whittaker, 1998).

3.2.1 Management and school performance

The concept of school organization management borrowed its terms from the business enterprise and industrial units, using, for instance, terms such as “input” and “output”. Despite the difference between business and school, the school organization also uses the term input, which can be measured in terms of cost. Cost in school as in business can be measured through the use of resources by a responsible centre, but while in business the outcomes can be measured easily through quality, quantity and productivity, in a school, the output is very hard to measure (Anthony & Herzlinger, 1989).

In practice, organizations including schools have to set up targets of achievement. The management in this context is responsible for determining the broad objectives and the way in which they can be managed (Drucker 1989). Although the output of school basically can be measured through the number of graduates, that is not the ultimate goal, as Anthony and Herzlinger (1989) put it:

"In many non-profit organizations, no good quantitative measure of output exists. A school can easily measure the number of students graduated, but it cannot measure how much education each of them acquired. Although outputs may not be measured, or may not even be measurable, it is a fact that every organization unit has outputs; that is, it does something” (p20).

In fact, in the UK since the Education Reform Act (1988) and introduction of the National Curriculum, attempts have been made to measure and quantify educational outputs, through the institution of Standard Attainment Tests (SATs) at specific stages of the child's education. The results are used to construct "league tables" of school effectiveness. However, this approach has been heavily criticised for placing an excessive burden on pupils, teachers and school management, encouraging teachers to “teach to the test” rather than to each child's individual needs, and ignoring differences between students in quality of input and social context.

Schools, as non-profit organizations, are much more complex than any profit-oriented organization, but in both the main purpose is, in Drucker’s (1989) terms, to encourage ordinary individuals to do extraordinary things. Drucker (1989) emphasized that the test
of an organization is to enable ordinary human beings to perform better than they seem to be capable of doing. In his words:

“The test of an organization is the spirit of performance. The spirit of performance requires that there be full scope for individual excellence. The focus must be on the strengths - on what people can do rather than what they cannot do.” (p.155)

Indeed, the capability to activate individuals within the organization is mainly attributed to the "manager" or "head". In this context, Whitaker (1998) asserted that the first task for anyone in a management role is to determine what needs to be done. Bell (1989) completed the image, when he asked "How shall it be managed? And what type of skills and abilities are, useful, desirable, applicable and necessary? (p.10). The answer he produced was quite relevant to the school manager, who is in a position to encourage collective actions, to create opportunities to enable staff to interact collectively to achieve clear, understandable, and implementable objectives in the areas of: 1- curriculum, 2- school organizing, including, resources distribution, communication and decision–making, 3- staff professional development and 4- the school culture including the relations between the people in and connected with the school environment, such as parents and local authorities (Whitaker, 1983).

Within this context, the fact is that, even though the staff of an effective school tends to work collectively, this does not diminish the ultimate accountability of the head teacher for the overall management of the school activities. At the same time, however, professional colleagues must play a significant role in achieving the school's objectives and improving its performance (Bell 1989). The head teacher as a “manager” needs to share responsibility. In any organization, there is a division of labour. In each work unit there should be a "manager" and the head always needs the creative ideas and opinions of the managers in the organization the "school", which enables him to think, plan and manage correctly.

As Whitaker (1998) puts it, the head teacher as a manager has to achieve the organization’s objectives and improve its performance. In his words:

"Managers need to perform four key roles: managing operations, managing finance, managing people and managing information. Each of these key
Accordingly, the school manager should have a clear vision about what he/she has to do in order to achieve the organization's goal and to maintain the desired level of performance. In this context Gane and Morgan (1992) identified six tasks that the school manager has to achieve, and these tasks can be used as criteria for any successful management in school organizations. They are:

1. Assessing the teachers' achievement and helping them to identify ways to improve their teaching skills and classroom performance.
2. Helping teachers, governing bodies and local education authorities to determine whether a change of duties would help the professional development of school teachers and improve their career prospects.
3. Identifying the potential of teachers for career development, with the aim of helping them, where possible, through appropriate in-service training.
4. Helping school teachers who have some difficulties with their performance, through appropriate guidance, counselling and training.
5. Informing those responsible for providing references for school teachers in relation to appointments.
6. Improving the management of the school (pp46-49).

In practice, such management tasks would positively affect the overall performance of the school. However, the traditional view of the head's role, which assumed that any teacher with appropriate academic qualification and the right sort of personality can be a head, with no need for special training, needs to be reconsidered for the following reasons.

1. the increasing size of schools and their complexity of organization;
2. the increased expectations for big schools;
3. the changing world;
4. recognition that management techniques can be applied to many sorts of organization other than business firms;
5. the realization that a newly appointed head is moving from one kind of job to a new and different one (Bernbaum 1976; p9).

Accordingly, “the managerial function of the head is becoming more and more important. Management by objectives and a conscious style of management are essential in any school” (Bernbaum, 1976, pp9-10). Busher (2003) indicated that the vital role of the head teacher in managing the school organization has increased dramatically since the early 1980s in the UK, where the role of the head teacher is "conceptualized as both leading professional and chief executive" (p85).

Within this context, Hargreaves and Hopkins (1993) indicated that the head as a manager plays an essential role in the determination of the management of the school tasks and activities. They asserted that the school management is likely to be effective when the head inspires commitment to the school mission, which underlines the direction and the purposes of its tasks; when the head coordinates the school’s work; achieves involvement in planning and implementation of changes, learns how to listen and respond, knows how to communicate, to assess the school’s weaknesses and strengths and has the spirit of innovation. All these tasks have to be shared with deputies and senior staff and have to be arranged in an appropriate set of management.

So far we have focused our discussions on the head as manager, but some researchers, such as Fullan (1992), view the head as a leader, which may have a more effective and integral role in school improvement. This view is explored below.

3.2.2 The Head Teacher as a Leader

Fullan (1992) pointed out that

"The image of the principal in the research and policy literature has shifted since the early 1980's from the principal as "gatekeeper" to the principal as "instructional leader"; planned change, school improvement effective schools and staff development all bear the mark of the principal as central for leading and supporting change" (p.82).

Although Fullan emphasised the role of the head teacher as a central figure in managing and controlling change, which leads to school improvement, the leadership of the head
may have far more dimensions. In this context Hughes (1985) indicated that the role of the head teacher is significant in the leadership of professional staff. The leader can be an ideal type model for the group, in terms of attitudes and behaviours to be imitated or avoided. Leaders also can be seen as powerful agents for change (Fullan, 1992). Hargreaves (2005) emphasized sustaining leadership, as a vital activity that makes change last. In educational organizations, the main responsibility of all educational leaders, especially principals, is to sustain learning rather than implementing the government mandate, delivering the curriculum or giving a gloss to how the organization appears. Sustainability is an accumulating process that continues year upon year, from one leader to another. It does not cling to a charismatic individual, it could go beyond individuals in chains of influence that interrelate the actions of leaders to their predecessors and their successors as well.

Within this context, Lambert (2005) believed that sustainable school improvement is so difficult to maintain that some schools return to their old ways when an effective leader leaves, and some schools never reach lasting improvement, even when run by strong leaders. She attributed such deficiency to inadequate leadership capacity.

Leadership capacity in education is typically defined by the leader’s traits, qualities and behaviour. Some leaders are born with internal qualities, which can be easily identified through personality, physical and mental characteristics; some are diligent, work hard and learn to be successful leaders. Although school organization needs diligent managers to improve all aspects of the organization, charismatic leaders in school may push the school beyond expectation (Horner, 2003). Such a leader in Grint's (2003) words is "a leader under any circumstances and it is more than likely that such traits are parts of the individual's genetic makeup" (p.89).

3.2.2.1 Effective Leadership and Effective School

Although the school management and leadership are viewed as two faces of one coin, many strive to differentiate between them. School management may focus on planning, coordinating and organizing the school activities on a day to day basis, while leadership is about running the school organization to achieve common goals (Southworth, 1998). Crawford (2003) strongly supports the interdependence between leadership and management:
"Leaders need to attend more closely to those things that are to do with management if they are to have the capacity to be more creative and effective leaders within a variety of context and changing educational environment." (p63).

Crawford (2003) asserted that leadership in education is viewed by some scholars as a aspect of management, while others see management as part of leadership. However, leadership seems to be vital element and integral component of an effective school. In this sense, Riley and Macbeth (2003) indicated that effective leadership is a key element in resolving school problems, raising the achievement of school goals and effectively dealing with rapid changes. Leigh (1994) outlined the bases for how managers offer leadership. He produced five main areas in which school managers can be effective leaders. They are:

1. Clear sense of direction: which involves all the components that make leaders attractive to followers. The leader in this context may engage in more general objectives rather than detailed targets, which could be left to the deputy head or other management staff.

2. Values: although management and leadership may have integrated roles, nevertheless, the good manager may not always be a good leader; on the contrary, a good leader could be a poor manager. Accordingly, the manager who seeks to be an effective leader needs to set an organizational environment that engenders core values, which should become priority for everyone in the school organization, for example, the core values of a school could be improving the pupils’ achievement, discipline and knowledge.

3. Excitement: to create an effective school, leaders have to exercise their power and capacity to create a climate of excitement that keeps the values and goals of the organization alive.

4. Teamwork. The manager should work with a team; leaders lead and activate the teamwork.

5. Accountability: leaders hand over power to some people in school or organization in order to achieve the common goals. To perform such responsibility throughout the organization depends on the management style (p.18-20).
Within this context Bhindi and Duignan (1998) indicated that modern leadership no longer controls and manipulates organizations, because it has become more sophisticated. Leadership must change its traditional style, which had an over emphasis on general goals, and outcomes rather than ethical and moral accountability. The new fashion should be concerned about authenticity, intentionality, spirituality and sensibility in leadership, which focuses on authentic self through "meaningful relationships within organizational structures and processes that support core, significant values" (p.53). This means that leaders derive their intention from the organization members, and they should accordingly show a commitment to spirituality, and sensitive attention to the needs of others within the organization.

This view is an old idea in a new fashion. Indeed, it is the same principle as the traditional leader who has to share responsibility, hand over power to others and monitor performance, focusing on general goals and working consistently to achieve the desired outcomes.

However, an effective school derives its success from effective professional leadership. South worth (1998) emphasized that from a synthesis of international studies, eleven factors have been listed that determine school effectiveness. At the top of these factors is professional leadership. The other factors could also be determined by leadership, such as shared vision, learning environment, purposeful teaching, positive reinforcement etc, all of which all can be enhanced by the effective leader or undermined by an ineffective one.

Riley and Macbeth (2003) indicated that there is no fixed model of leadership of proven validity for all schools in all contexts, but certainly there is a general recipe that is common in the field of school leadership. As they said:

"It has become increasingly obvious that successful school leaders do not learn how to 'do' leadership and then stick to set patterns and ways of doing things along a prescribed set of known rules. They are willing to change in response to new sets of circumstances and to the differing needs of children, young people and teachers - and they are often rule breakers." (p174).

If that is true, then the head teacher as a leader could play a key role in improving all school aspects, including the school’s general goals, teaching, learning process and management. Within this context, Watts (1980) indicated that in modern schools,
despite sharing power with teachers, deputy heads and other staff, the head teacher still enjoys some powers that cannot be handed over to others. These powers can be seen in several major areas: determining the school objectives and the learning organization’s values; controlling the internal organizational activities; distributing and managing the financial aspects of the school, choosing his or her own staff and managing communication with the outside. In practice, such powers do not reflect the capability of the head teacher as a leader, but are rather in line with managerial behaviour, which is responsible for planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling (Crawford 2003). The exercise of leadership may be a reflection of the talents they possess, which may change the face of the learning organization (Grint 1999).

After a lengthy review of many studies and researches related to school leadership, Southworth (1998) found that three major characteristics have often coincided with successful leadership: strength of school purposes; sharing power, including the participation of the staff in decision-making; and professional authority in the learning-teaching process, including appraising teachers, coordinating staff development and creating a climate of collegial relations.

Specifically speaking, the role of the school head as a leader is uniquely placed to influence the teaching and learning process. The head in this context presumably is able to manage and control and monitor the school activities to make sure that professional and quality teaching and effective use of resources would be delivered in order to improve the standard of learning achievement in a safe, cooperative and healthy school environment (Harris, Busher and Wise 2003). Within this context, Fullan (2003) argued that the principal as a leader would make a difference in individuals (students and teachers) and in the school as well as beyond the school to encompass the region and society through a strong sense of purpose and interplay with other school leaders in order to enrich the scope of their thinking and consequently benefit the whole society.

So far, educational leadership, to some degree, is different from other types of leadership; at least, school leadership derives its impetus from the educational ideal of educational activities, and its main emphasis on school practices. Educational leadership, as Novack (2002) argued, is more than schools, even though the school is a fundamental element for its realization. Rather, school leadership is an ethical practice that aims to develop human potential under all circumstances and has the capacity to manage and control change, making a difference in the learning-teaching field,
communication and supervising. The next sections examine in more detail two specific aspects of the head's leadership role: making and managing change, and professional development.

3.3 Making and managing changes

School leadership is all about making effective changes in the educational environment in order to create an effective school, especially at a time of rapid and extensive change (Poster, 1999). The changes that reform schools could be directly and decisively attributed to the capacity and desirability of the school leaders, as Hopkins and Legerweij (1996) stated:

"The school leader has to show capacities such as functioning as a leader and innovator, being able to tell how changes can be applied in practice, being able to determine the scope of change, the capacity of support and stimulation, and being able to develop skills to foster a learning organization." (p73).

The rapid and unpredicted change in all aspects of social life; new technology connecting schools to local community, homes and other agencies; new learning approaches through different channels; the internet, library, and other public places, may challenge schools, which may no longer be seen as the main venue for providing knowledge (Stoll and Bolam 2005). Such challenges have to be taken into consideration by all head teachers as school leaders. Indeed, the school leader is always facing the problem of helping people to realize the reason for change, deal with it, control it and manage it. In this context, Caldwell and Spinks (1998) argued that the changes that have occurred recently would affect all aspects of social life, and school leaders should take that into account in their planning for learning, rather than concentrating on the achievement of high standards. Such a slogan, as they said, would not help to reduce the deficiency in learning, but could be seen as "a mindless denigration of the efforts of school and their teachers" (p.110). However, head teachers as school leaders have to react to the human side of change, not only the changes that are intentionally made as a part of educational reform, but the circumstances that surround the schools and affect teachers, parents and students alike. Such changes may affect schools more than external factors. The human side of changes may highlight the moral nature of
leadership; how leaders balance between promoting learning and enquiry, building community and making connections depends on their values and beliefs about how they relate to the entire school community (Stoll and Bolam, 2005).

Generally speaking, changes can occur at different levels, which entail an early identification. The change could affect those who are involved in the process of change and the leader’s role is not only to identify the level of change but also to respond correctly in their own attitudes towards change (Blandford 2006). Fullan (1992) indicated that the school principal, as a leader, has to take innovation seriously and be involved in planned change, school improvement, school effectiveness and staff development, which makes the principal the central figure for leading and supporting change. The principal's role should go beyond the problem of implementing a single innovation. The principal’s role in this context should be more than a manager or responder to changes; he or she must be an initiator, capable of dealing with multiple innovations. Such school leaders, as Davies and Davies (2005) said, are crucial for success, and the challenge for them is how to encourage everyone in school to make their own contribution, to understand, interpret and act on change to achieve better outcomes. Fullan (2003), underlining the way in which planning for change works in school, asserted that in order to determine desirable change, we have to locate situations where change seems to be applicable, but as he said, that is by itself not sufficient unless principals

"find examples where a setting has been deliberately transformed from a previous state to a new one that represents clear improvement. We need to know about the causes and dynamics of how change occurs" (p.192).

Indeed, planning for change must be applicable, and this may need examples and ideal-types to follow in order to ensure successful outcomes, real improvement and moving forward in school objectives.

3.3.1 Managing change

School leaders should be prepared for managing changes to be in line with the school and local authorities’ objectives. The school leader should have at least a clear vision about the planned and imposed, wanted and unwanted changes, as either kind can cause
a great deal of disruption in school systems, if the school leader is not be able to manage it effectively. As Garrett (1999) pointed out:

“The ability to manage change is an essential skill for all these in schools, whether they be managing at classroom level, middle management or senior management”. (pp 95-96).

Planned or imposed change, by itself, is not applying any significant move, it is a means to an end, often initiated to enhance improvement, development or reform the learning environment. The school leadership should prove their quality in managing change, a comprehensive vision of the school’s objectives, or the school will be in a chaotic position, emphasising that rapid change management needs strategic leadership that takes into consideration analysing the learning environment, planning, structuring, staffing, directing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating (Garrett, 1999).

These functions cannot be managed by the principal or school leader alone. They need the efforts of all the school staff and teachers, but the quality of the leadership is still crucial to motivate others. In this context, Garrett (1999) asserted that the effective management of change relies on the involvement of all the school staff at each stage of the process, otherwise the change management will never become fully operational and incorporated into daily practice. Hentschke and Caldwell (2005) introduced a new concept of leadership, regarding those who are able to manage changes in education, called “entrepreneurial leadership”. They emphasized that schooling in general, and especially compulsory schooling, increasingly demands a higher quality of schooling and entrepreneurs are able to make the desirable changes and maintain a flourishing learning environment and keeping changes under control, since such leaders could use functions which historically originated with “profit enterprises”. Indeed, the great idea of looking at schools as profitable enterprises would encourage the educational authorities to invest the experience of the venue of essential changes in the learning process.

It is a challenging idea with calculated risks. To manage change, leadership seems to be crucial to maintain the school activity and control the changes. Such leaders could be “entrepreneurs” who can deal with school objectives in the light of profit enterprise to gain desirable outcomes. In more precise wording, Fullan (1992) stated:
"Recent evidence in both business and education indicates that effective leaders have an overall sense of direction, and start into action as soon as possible establishing small-scale examples, adapting, refining, improving, quality, expanding, and reshaping as the process unfolds. This strategy might be summed up as start small; or the way to get better at implementation planning is more by doing than by planning” (p88).

Fullan in this paragraph means that leadership in school, as in business, brings unprecedented success in education in terms of discipline and learning outcomes.

The problem, so far, is not the changes that might occur by societal radical changes or planned ones but how to find heads who possess the characteristics of educators and entrepreneurial leadership, who are able not only to create dramatic changes, but also to manage changes and keep the enterprise profitable and under control.

3.4 Professional Development

Among all the head teacher's tasks a significant role of the head as a leader is to maintain the teaching staff’s knowledge and experience always up to date and keep them developing their teaching skills through a series of activities, such as self-learning, life-long learning, keeping in touch with other teachers in the same field and in-service training on a regular basis. Indeed heads are in a good position to diagnose the teachers’ weaknesses and strengths in order to envisage the teachers’ needs for support and encourage them to attend professional development activities. In this sense Wragg (2001) indicated that the observation of classroom activities and the teachers’ performance is essential to diagnose problems and pinpoint teachers’ need for development.

The head teacher and teaching staff in primary schools require high quality training and skills to meet the demands of early childhood learning, which is regarded as the most important knowledge and behavioural base for the later stages of learning (Pugh 1998). For this reason most developed societies require at least a university degree and qualification for teaching. Saudi Arabia in the last two decades has abolished the old style of qualification and accepts no less than a university degree to start teaching in primary school, in order to establish a modern and effective educational system.
3.4.1 The need for INSET

Teachers' professional development often takes place through in-service training courses (INSET). Since the process of INSET is only conducted for relatively short periods of time, most head teachers have a system focused on the current practice. The head teacher’s task in this context is to monitor, evaluate and pinpoint his teaching staff’s needs in developing their profession. This, as Moore (1991) reported, “by far and away the most effective way of addressing INSET in the primary sector” (p80).

This view is supported by Sachs (2003) who assumed that the head teacher should have a key role in supporting ongoing improvement of their teaching staff and keeping them focused on their intellectual mission. This comes as a result of a series of leadership activities including observing, monitoring and evaluating the classroom activities and the involvement of teachers in activities inside and outside school. INSET, as a process of updating teachers’ practice and improving their teaching experience, would be valuable, as Moore (1991) stated:

“It has provided opportunities for staff development both inside and outside the context of the schools, enabling all teachers to be actively involved both at an individual professional level and at collective group level” (p80).

In practice, the head teacher must always be in a position to identify his/her school’s priorities and establish the means to achieve them. One of these priorities is how to update the teaching staff’s knowledge and experience in order to generate real changes, which create desirable development for both the teaching staff and the children. In such a situation, teacher training can generate real changes which now need to be made within the schools (Bell, 1989).

If the head teacher’s tasks are to identify the school's needs, including the effective professional staff, INSET would be the main supportive action for staff professional development and school improvement. Identifying such needs and promoting action can be done regularly as part of the head’s appraisal mission within the classroom. As Jones et al (1989) stated:

“The INSET provides the necessary oxygen for teachers to survive as educational and trained professionals. Staff development programmes
Indeed, INSET would be not only necessary to feed teachers’ capacity for change, but also it would help to improve performance, which is integral to the professional life of teachers. In this respect the head teachers’ role is to ensure that all the teaching staff have commitment to development, and to strongly support it in a variety of ways to achieve quality teaching. INSET would be quite significant for individual teachers’ aspiration and professional needs and for the learning institution (Kirk, 1988).

Male (2006) indicated that head teachers in the UK have the opportunity to engage in determining, managing, delivering and evaluating in-service activities beyond their own school. These opportunities could be collective or individual, with many key agencies such as the Training and Development Agency (TDA) and General Teaching Council (GTC) or more local agencies such as Learning Skills Councils (LSC). Such involvement of the head teacher would not only create a propitious climate for teachers’ professional development, but could be an additional push toward better performance, competitive schools and a successful learning environment.

Within this context, head teachers who perform as ideal-type leaders could make the INSET attendance of teachers not a frustration reaction to the teacher’s performance in the classroom, but a feedback activity to improve the talented teachers as well as the non-talented. For this reason Clegg and Billington (1997) highlighted the importance of the quality of the heads’ leadership rather than the quality of the INSET course, or the culture of the learning organization. This view emphasises the head’s leadership ability to pinpoint the needs of teachers and schools, and in which areas teachers need enhancement. Southworth (1991) asserted that the head teacher’s role is to consider the teachers’ development in terms of professional and quality performance.

Head teachers, moreover, prove themselves as leaders and administrators through directed contact with teaching staff on a daily basis to realize and evaluate thoroughly the problems not only with their classroom performance, but also their interpersonal problems (Hallet et al 1986). Within this context Everton and Impey (1989) emphasized that head teachers should consider INSET as a typical experience for his/ her teachers when taking management decisions about fresh initiatives in their school, as this experience would be of direct benefit to the pupils. The head teachers themselves may
take part in INSET programmes, which could “give them the chance of personal refreshment and increased credibility in the eyes of their staff” (p58).

In practice the opportunity for head teachers to engage fully in INSET programmes is very limited, because they do not have adequate time for such involvement, and practically it is quite rare to find head teachers taking part in INSET activities. Nevertheless, the current researcher believes that the head teacher has no privilege over the teaching staff; he/she should always be treated as one of them. Accordingly, just as teachers need some refreshment and feedback through INSET, so head teachers should either join such activities or should have a school management and leadership programme with other head teachers to update their knowledge and experience. The head teacher’s responsibility, as Morant (1981) emphasised, is to have a policy which indicates a broad field of action that should be adopted to include continuing professional development for all the school staff.

3.4.2 Development Priorities

Often as noted previously, head teachers are responsible for identification of their teachers’ professional needs. To pinpoint the priorities for staff development heads should have an early plan to determine which teacher or teachers need, for instance, a short course in computers or curriculum studies, which are presumed desirable for the educational well-being of the school (Bell 1991). Within this context, Jones et al (1989) indicated that the head’s accountability is to identify what training is needed for the teaching staff development and who staff development is for. If the head teacher acts as the coordinator body (which they often do) then the policy and the programmes they are involved with must be identified accordingly, which could involve individual teachers, group or all the staff.

Indeed, the whole school as a learning environment depends on the head’s professional performance as a manager and as a leader. If the school is in poor health in terms of cooperation, coordination and management, then one cannot expect the performance of teachers to be improved consistently. Thus the head teacher’s performance in terms of leading and managing could be reflected in the whole educational well-being of the school, whereas the total functioning of the school depends on the sum of the individual
teachers’ contributions (Bell 1991) identified general rules for head teachers in relation to professional development priorities. These are:

1. Specific in-service activities required for developing a planned change
2. Specific in-service activities required for implementing planned change
3. Specific in-service activity could contribute towards the wider educational needs of the school
4. The agency or degree of professional need of the individual teacher
5. The motivation of the individual teacher towards in-service education
6. Availability of finance and time (P.78-79).

Based on all these aspects, the head teacher can make the analysis to take decisions over priorities.

Once again, we should emphasize that heads have no privilege over teaching staff, but rather they should act and behave as a member of a team. This is the only way bring about success. Building on this base, the head teacher is still central to the health of the school and they can plan professional development as a part of their general management planning and system (Needham 1991). In a conclusion, the head teacher’s responsibility is to create a suitable and acceptable learning environment that benefits both the pupils and teachers. Good heads often diagnose school needs earlier and plan for change, and professional development should take the priority to create real change, as Bell (1991) said:

“This approach to professional development assumes that change in schools can be brought about by changing selected or even randomly self-selected individuals within those schools who will then successfully generate change in others to such an extent that the school itself will be transformed” (p8).

The idea of Bell (1991) presumes that the head teacher can adopt a strategy of in-service training courses in all curriculum aspects which can make a big change in the school culture. Such an idea seems to be inapplicable because in that case the school may need to double its teaching staff to keep running. However, we could take this enthusiastic idea as an indication of the significance of the head teacher’s role to make changes in management and leadership, as well as identifying the importance of professional development for the benefit of the teachers and the schools.
Finally, the heads themselves also need refreshment and training on the principles of modern management and leadership. In this context, Southworth (1995) emphasises that heads have to be subjected to a long period of professional socialization, in order to build a professional persona for themselves and to be able to manage and lead a school. However, Southworth (1995) believes that the occupational identity of heads depends on the idea that individuals can make a difference in the lives of teachers and pupils and they can shape the school culture as a whole.

### 3.5 School Principal: Manager or Leader? The Case of England and Saudi Arabia

Despite the cultural differences between the English and Saudi educational systems, in terms of school administration, management and leadership, there should be some common-ground principles. In this context, Riley and Macbeth (2003) pointed out:

> “The growing internationalisation of education has meant that the language of school effectiveness has become amongst researchers, and has shaped the thinking of policy-makers. The climate of global competitiveness which now characterises much national thinking about education is receptive to the “quick-fix” in school effectiveness, as in other areas. “Policy borrowing” reinforced by a belief that education models are transferable, regardless of context, is becoming standard practice.” (p174).

Indeed, the effects of communication technology make the world not only a small village but the size of a matchbox. One can in seconds go all over the place, copying, imitating and borrowing all or part of any educational system. Nevertheless, cultural differences still play a fundamental role in shaping any educational system. However, if we agree that the educational system can be easily copied, still the school leadership within a particular culture and the power of the local education authorities may make an essential contribution to school effectiveness or otherwise.
3.5.1 Head Teacher in England

The head teacher in English schools is viewed as a de facto leader by Her Majesty’s Inspectors and the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTEd). The heads accordingly are the only managers in schools, and have considerable influence and authority over the school performance (Southworth 1998). They play a pivotal role in management, goal achievement, communication and exercise of power. In this sense the head teacher in English schools has been given ultimate accountability for school management with full power to lead (Male 2006). At this point the school head is the control figure for all school activities. Torrington and Weightman (1989) referred to:

“The extraordinary centrality of the head teacher in British schools. There is almost universal focus on this job as being the pivot of all management and organization within schools. We cannot think of any other established organization where this is the case, except perhaps the position of a British Prime Minister in relation to the cabinet” (pp135-136).

The British educational system was pushed harder by the school-based management system toward autonomy. Caldwell (2005) indicated that the self-management of schools in England is the outcome of the 1988 Educational Reform Act and with the release of a “white paper” by the Blair government in 2001. The authority and the management flexibility given to head teachers and the school administration aimed to allow schools to utilize the higher level of funding and self-governing to achieve better outcomes. In Caldwell’s words, “The Blair government declares that ‘the best schools will earn greater autonomy’” (p35). Accordingly, the British educational system moved steadily in the direction of decentralized authority and responsibility. The autonomous system of schooling would allow schools’ administration and head teachers in particular to make decisions related to the allocation of resources within the centrally determined goals. The accountability of the head teacher in this sense covers all the school resources, including power, technology, knowledge, and finance, which gives the heads ultimate power to act and manage the learning organization in term of independent enterprise, to some degree, beyond the centrally determined framework (Glatter, 2005).

The principle of school autonomy does not mean the school works apart from the centrally determined framework, or beyond the local educational authorities’ plan. The heads often have a general framework, which involves local authority governors and parents as clients of schools. They can work together, watch, monitor and sometimes
supervise. The central educational authorities are involved in the following general objectives:

1. The introduction of the National Curriculum for schools and periodic assessment of children’s performance;
2. The establishment of OFSTED with the purpose of checking on the effectiveness of individual schools and, now of local authorities;
3. The training of teachers;
4. The introduction of the local management of schools and changes in the states and functions of school and local authorities;
5. Provision for the increased involvement of parents in the government of schools.
6. The increased integration of pupils with special educational needs into mainstream schools;
7. Provision for under-5s (Thornton 1998; p31).

These roles do not reduce the ultimate authority of the school administration to enjoy the climate of autonomy and self-management over school resources. In this context Hardie (1991) indicated that the 1988 act and then the introduction of OFSTED, with the purpose of evaluation of individual schools, does not mean involving officials from the central government, but rather places emphasis on how heads, teachers, and governors evaluate their performance, with increased accountability of governors. In British schools there is an increased emphasis on school-based management or school autonomy, which is aimed at decentralizing to school level, responsibility for decision-making and redistribution of the power among key stakeholders at school level including heads, deputies, teachers, parents and other community members. All these are to share accountability not only for learning, or achievement, but for the input-output result for the school achievement in comparison with other schools (Raab, 2000).

Despite all the attempts to share power among the key figures at the school level, to get better outcomes, the idea of school management today tends more and more towards the realm of economic enterprise rather than an academic institution. As Clegg and Billington (1997) asserted:

“Schools must aim for efficiency and effectiveness, the curriculum must be delivered, achievement must be monitored and measured, staff must be
appraised, plans must drawn up and schools must compete in the market place” (p13).

This is the view of a researcher fascinated by the economic project, in which the school has to be an economic enterprise; everything must be calculated according to profit and loss. However, the current researcher cannot argue for or against such a view, because the educational system in England reflects the cultural context, which has more emphasis on the philosophy of materialism.

3.5.2 Primary School Head

As a result of the educational reform in the late 1980s, the school leadership became less and less powerful, in terms of accountability, decision-making and resource management of the school. The tasks demanded of the head teacher have been reduced, and there is more involvement of deputies and senior teachers in school leadership, which helps to develop the sense of leadership (Southworth 1998). Nevertheless, the role of the head teacher as a school leader is still significant in determining the effectiveness of the school, as shown by HMI describing the importance of the school leader in “Ten good schools”:

What they all have in common is effective leadership and a ‘climate’ that is conducive to growth. Emphasis is laid on consultation, team work and participation, but without exception, the most important single factor in the success of these schools is the quality of leadership (DES, 1987; .36).

This quotation reveals that despite the shared accountability of members of staff, the most effective factor is the quality of leaders. School leadership in primary schools in Britain is not a totalitarian leadership; it is rather consultative and participative, but on the other hand, remains powerful, pivotal and dominating in the school (Southworth, 1998).

3.5.3 Saudi Head Teacher's Role

While the English educational system tends to be more autonomous, characterized by self-management and school-base management, which provides head teacher with
power and resources to work independently to achieve the national curriculum criteria, the educational system in Saudi Arabia, as we saw in Chapter Two, is more centralized.

This high level of centralized control gives the head teacher less margin of freedom to lead and implement his own policy. The hierarchy of the education ministry depicted in Chapter Two (fig 2.1) shows the expanded bureaucracy which minimizes the role of the head teacher.

There are about one hundred and twenty offices that the head teacher needs to contact if he/she needs to take decision or to make changes in the school. The bureaucratic system is a major obstacle in the development of schools. In this regard, Al Gamdi and Abduljawad (2002) indicated that the bureaucratic system in Saudi Arabia works against initiative. Although the government is responsible for financing schools, all teachers, head teachers and staff in each school have the same rate, without no exception and no head teacher can ask for more than the standard budget that every school should get. If the school for any reason needs more finance, then the head teacher has to go through the bureaucracy channels for months before they get what they ask for, which may bury any initiative. The highly centralized system works as a super power and the local education authorities, as well as the schools' administration, have only an executive role; in other words, all aspects of education, such as the curriculum, the pedagogy, tests and examinations, the time for starting and finishing the school day and semesters are all prescribed from the top and the school administration have to follow instructions. Thus Aqil (2005) said:

“Despite the existence of local educational authorities, as a representative of the Ministry of Education, to run the education system, the centralized system makes these local educational authorities like puppets following the instruction of the centre, and lose the initiative to change and improve the education system.” (p204).

Al-Sinble et al (2004) asserted that the local educational authorities have no margin of freedom to decide, plan or finance schools; they are only authorised to fulfil the centralized authority's instructions. This prevents these authorities from proposing any initiative that would enable them to plan for better opportunities for development. Beside all that, Aqil (2005) emphasized that the relationship between the school and children's parents is not often positive; parents hardly attend any parent evenings, or
school parent committees and most of them hardly visit school unless there is a serious problem that threatens their children's future.

Another problem claimed to directly affect the head teacher’s role and the school administration in general, is that of incompetent local education authorities, who sometimes work against the head teacher's aspiration and disable their capability to make any desirable changes. They use the instructions from the centre to turn down any new ideas or initiative, which may frustrate head teachers and cause them to give up any attempt to make changes. As a result, head teachers in primary schools in Saudi Arabia have quite a limited role in developing the school as a learning organization. Thus, the main role of the head teacher could be:

- Organize the school timetable.
- Monitor the teaching-learning process.
- Supervise the implementation of the centrally prescribed curriculum.
- Contact the local authorities, parents and other social forces outside the school.
- Run regular meetings with the staff.
- Evaluate the teachers' performance and present the annual report.
- Provide teachers with feedback.

All these are administrative tasks, which would not enable head teachers to plan, improve the quality of teaching, reward or control the full process without permission from the higher authorities. Accordingly, the head teacher's role is far less than "autonomous" or self-control and far from practising a "leadership" role, because leadership needs not only personal characteristics, but rather the principles of freedom to manage and lead, unimpeded by heavy restrictions from the top-level educational authorities. Thus, it seems that the head teacher's role in Saudi Arabia school is fundamentally different from that of his or her British counterpart.
3.6 Summary

This chapter provided a literature review in relation to the head teacher’s role. First it considered the head teacher’s role as a manager. It was suggested that a learning organisation needs a head conceived as a manager, a concept borrowed from business and industry literature but used for schools as learning organisations. As a manager, the head teacher has to be creative, coordinative and supportive in order to run the school smoothly. However, management alone could become a mechanical approach, thus the schools may also need a leader. In other words, the effective head is not only an executive manager; he should lead and create a climate that others will follow and implement. Whether the head is working as a manager, a leader or both, he/she should take into consideration (as the literature said) organizational behaviour in terms of power sharing, clear objectives, values, teamwork and sense of accountability. These are the main areas in which the school head can prove his ability to manage and lead in order to achieve the school’s objectives. Within this context, some scholars have emphasised that effective schools derive their success from professional leadership.

Managing or running a school is not sufficient by itself; the head as many claimed should be able to manage change and make changes and must express their active role in their staff professional development, which plays a key role in developing school performance. Thus the head should pinpoint the weakness and strength of the school, especially in relation to staff professional development to arrange proper in-service training, which helps to keep the staff up-to-date and reflective on the teaching process. Preliminary indications have been given that in Saudi Arabia, school principals may lack the autonomy and flexibility needed to play a true leadership role. The next chapter explains the methods used in this study to explore empirically the issues raised in this chapter.
Chapter Four

Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The head teacher’s role as a manager, as a leader or as administrator varies from one individual to another. It depends on many factors; individual characteristics, the organization culture and the nature of the educational system as a whole, in e.g., whether it is of centralised, autonomous or self-controlled. In developing societies such as Saudi Arabia, the system is highly centralised. The head teacher has very limited margin of freedom in planning, assessing and controlling the school activities, but in developed cultures such as England the head teacher has greater freedom to manage and lead the school activities. The technological revolution, which makes the entire globe like a small village, could minimize the differences and make it possible for any educational system to be copied, transferred and adopted in one click. However, another possibility is that cultural forces may act to preserve differences. In order to find out how Saudi heads currently operate and the factors that affect them, it is necessary to adopt a scientific way of investigation; collecting data and comparing results. This is what the current research aims to do in this study. This chapter explains the methods used to collect data, including the instruments used, the validity and reliability of the instruments, sampling and the procedures of data collection.

4.2 The Quantitative-Qualitative Dichotomy

In educational as in most social science studies, qualitative and quantitative methods are often used to collect data. Although there are significant differences between them, they can be used singly or together to obtain data. Each method has its own advantages and disadvantages as we shall see. Non-experimental research is descriptive in nature, where the researcher has to describe the characteristics of a certain sample of individuals or other man-made phenomena. Descriptive research is important in social science research and education in particular, where it involves making careful descriptions of educational phenomena (Gall, Gall and Borg, 2003). This research is descriptive, as it aims to capture the way primary school heads perform their roles.
Descriptive studies often involve quantitative methods of data collection, using mainly questionnaires, but they could also use qualitative methods such as interviews. Quantitative studies include three major types of descriptive research; these are:

1. the description of the characteristics of a sample at one point in time.
2. causal-comparative research design.
3. correlational design.

All these types of research entail quantitative responses or measures on some numerical basis (Creswell, 2003).

On the other hand, qualitative research usually deals with words rather than numbers. In some fields of social science researchers need to explore, describe, and explain feelings, attitudes and opinions, which cannot be measured with numbers (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Qualitative data can be obtained from a variety of sources, such short written responses, interviews, observation, documents, life history, survey and many other approaches.

The value of qualitative methods of data collection is embodied in the fact that there are many problems and phenomena that cannot be investigated by using quantitative methods, but can only be explored by using qualitative methods, such as human feelings, attitudes and opinions. Although some attitudes and opinions can be tested by quantitative methods, such tests would be limited in value. For instance, if one wished like to test students’ attitudes towards their teachers’ performance, their attitudes could be measured on a Likert scale "strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree strongly disagree", but this would not explain why they had these opinions, or capture their experiences. Therefore, investigating the same topic using qualitative methods might yield better, more precise answers that go beyond an "agree or disagree" equation. In this study, for example, using a qualitative approach enabled insights to be captured into the way head teachers and their staff perceived and experienced the head’s role, their feelings about it and the meanings they attached to it. It also offered an opportunity for participants to give illustrative examples that would set the abstract pronouncements of policy into a real-world context (Silverman, 2006). Qualitative research is undertaken in a natural setting to capture reality in direct interaction. It is flexible and gives the researcher a wider margin of freedom to obtain valuable information (Sarantakos, 2005).
Qualitative research is based on a philosophical assumption that differs from the quantitative philosophy, in relation to the nature of reality or truth and the role of the researcher. The quantitative view is that there is a single, objective reality which can be investigated by scientific work. This is totally rejected by the quantitative approach, which assumes that truth or reality is an elusive concept, and individuals or groups would construct their own versions of reality (Creswell, 2003; Collis and Hussey, 2003). Each head teacher, for example, would perceive his/her role in his/her own way. Quantitative advocates have criticised the qualitative approach for being subjective and not able to study relationships between variables and helping to understand the impacts of certain factors on others. Besides, it cannot produce representative results since it is based on small samples. It also cannot produce data that allow comparison, is time consuming and relatively expensive and can produce a large quantity of useless information (Sarantakos, 2005). On the other hand, qualitative advocates criticise their opponents for trying to measure human behaviour in numbers, as they believe it cannot be understood in this manner. They claim quantitative research cannot offer a deep and profound investigation, and researchers cannot obtain real and relevant information. Quantitative research defines reality as objective, but that is wrong; reality is not objective, but interpreted social action. Quantitative method fails to distinguish between the appearance and essence of social events. It is designed to test hypotheses, but the hypotheses are often formed beforehand and restrict the research options. Moreover, it forces respondents to react in the way the researcher wishes, not as the respondents wish (Collis and Hussey, 2003; Sarantakos, 2005).

This study attempts to draw on the benefits of both quantitative and qualitative approaches, and overcomes those disadvantages by combining them (mixed methods or triangulation). A quantitative approach through a questionnaire was used to compile data in a standardized form from a large sample (see section 4.5.2), enabling a broad descriptive picture of the head teacher’s role to be obtained. This was combined with a small number of interviews which sought to elicit more detailed understanding of the way this role was perceived by actors in the school situation, and the meanings they attached to their experiences. In most cases one tool of data collection could be reasonably adequate to assess the head teacher’s role, but in most cases in social and educational research, the researcher may need more than one method of data collection in order to reinforce the outcomes of each other. However, the assessment of the head teacher’s role in developing the school organization may vary even within the same
socio-cultural context, not because of differences in the policy of the local educational authorities, but rather because of the head teachers themselves, in terms of personality, experience and qualification. In the following sections, each method used will be discussed in turn, including the rationale for using it, the development of the related instruments, and the manner of administration and analysis.

4.3 The Questionnaire

Questionnaires are the most popular instrument used to collect data in social science studies. The questionnaire simply is a set of questions designed to collect information (Oppenheim, 1992). Bell (1993) asserted that a questionnaire is a good method for collecting certain types of data in short time and at relatively cheap cost.

The idea of using questionnaires in social science studies is based on the simple rule, that if you would like to obtained information about anything, it is necessary to ask, as McQueen and Knussen (2002) stated. The questionnaire technique has many advantages. The main advantages are, low cost, consuming less time and to some degree being more accurate in descriptive studies (Bryman, 2001). On the other hand, the questionnaire could provide researchers with less valuable information in comparison with, for instance, interviews or observation, and may not be adequate for studying people’s genuine options, attitudes and feelings (Borg and Gall 2003). It can be designed to obtain desired data, which means that the questionnaire could twist the respondents’ answers in a way pre-planned by the researcher, so that biased data will be obtained (Burns 2000).

In this study, however, the disadvantages were overcome by the complementary use of other methods. Moreover, the questionnaire was valuable as it enabled collection of data from a large sample of respondents in dispersed locations, within the time and resource constraints. Another advantage was the ability to collect data in a standardised form, which makes comparison easier.

4.3.1 Questionnaire Construction

The quality of the questionnaire depends on the way in which the questionnaire is worded, related to the problem (Bell, 1993). Various kinds of items are generally used
in the construction of questionnaires. These are: closed-ended, open ended questions and scale items (statements). Closed ended questions allow the informant to choose from two or more pre-determined options. Open ended questions offer no restrictions on the respondent’s reply, the question is only a guideline to answer freely or to express their actual feeling and attitudes, but this type of questioning may be harder and take longer to analyse. The scale statement is a set of items often used to measure attitudes, and accordingly, the respondent can indicate degrees of agreement or disagreement. An example is the five point likert scale “strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, strongly disagree” but the scale could be as long as seven points (Bugardus scale and Thurston scale) or as short as three points (agree, no opinion, disagree). All these forms of questioning are quite often used in social science studies.

The questionnaire of this study adopted a closed ended design. The questions were constructed carefully, based on the literature review and the objectives of the study. Three areas were covered in the questionnaire. These were, first, personal information, such as age, qualification, and service training; second, main responsibilities, such as school management, problem solving, leading and leadership; and third, sharing responsibility, such as dealing with pupils’ personal and academic problems, school maintenance and role conflict. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

4.3.2 Piloting of the Questionnaire

A pilot study is valuable to estimate the variation in the population and also valuable for assessing the study instrument in terms of clarity, simplicity and understandability (McQueen and Knussen, 2002). Thus the questionnaire was administered to a sample of five head teachers of Saudi schools in England. Respondents were asked to rate the items as illustrated in the example from Table 4.1. The outcomes showed that they generally agreed that the questionnaire items were clear, simple and understandable.
Table 4.1: Pilot test of the Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire items</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Simplicity</th>
<th>Understandability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those heads had the advantage of judging the questionnaire in both Arabic and English. Thus, their views could be used to establish the face validity of the questionnaire.

4.3.3 Reliability of the Questionnaire

Testing reliability is a necessary procedure in descriptive studies, to assess instrument stability, consistency and accuracy (Burns 2000). According to Bryman (2004) reliability in education is a significant issue; it concerns the consistency of the measure. The consistency of the instrument would give the research accuracy. Thus, Gall, Gall and Borg (2003), define reliability as “The extent to which other researchers would arrive at similar results if they studied the same case using exactly the same procedure as the first researcher” (p460).

There are three main reliability methods to test questionnaire reliability. These are:

1. Test-retest reliability, the easiest, simplest and the most direct method for demonstrating that a test is behaving consistently, is to test the questionnaire or the scale twice at different times on the same group of respondents and compare the two scores compared by using correlation technique (Mc Queeen and Knussen 2002). This method was rejected for this study because it was impractical to gain access to schools on two different occasions and doing so would have been too great a disruption of their activities.

2. Alternative forms or methods; this means equivalent versions of the same questionnaire items or scale items are applied at the same time and the results correlated (Bell, 1993). This method, too, was unsuitable as many of the questions did not lend themselves to being posed in alternative forms.
3. Internal reliability method; which can be used with multiple item measures, in which the individual items of the test are examined, where respondents’ answers to each item are aggregated for an overall score. In these methods, the researcher should make sure that the items are related to each other. Several methods can be used to estimate the internal consistency, among these, the split-half method, where the test should be split into two subtests, usually by placing all odd items in one subtest and all even ones in another then correlating them (Gall, Gall and Borg, 2003). The correlation coefficient of internal consistency ranges between 0 (no correlation) and 1 (perfect correlation). In social science studies values of 0.8 and over are acceptable. Recently researchers have utilised Cronbach’s alpha technique to test internal reliability. It is an advanced version of the traditional split-half method (Bryman, 2001).

The reliability of this study’s questionnaire was tested by the internal consistency method, using Cronbach’s alpha reliability.

4.4 The Interview

Interviews are an effective and popular method for data collection in social science in general and education in particular. It is a method that requires probing to obtain deep and more effective data compared to the questionnaire. The interview schedule, as Sarantakos (2005) suggests is a questionnaire that is presented verbally. Although this idea might apply for one type of interview ‘structured interview’ other types as we shall see are not questionnaire-like, but rather a discussion of a certain topic or problem, where the interviewer could watch and leave the informants to talk freely. However the types of interviews depend on the problem that needs to be investigated.

4.4.1 Types of Interviews

Most social and educational research methods literature indicates that three major types of interviews are often used in data collection, which are:

1. Structured interviews: this type of interview involves a series closed ended questions such as yes, no or selection of answers from a set of options, such as
agree, do not know, disagree. The questions are not followed up to obtain deeper answers. It is exactly similar to the answers obtained from questionnaires. The advantage of this type over the questionnaire is that the response rate can be increased because the researcher can interact directly with the interviewer to reduce uncertain responses (Gall, Gall and Borg, 2003). Nerveless, since this type of interview is very similar to a questionnaire and the aim was to complement the survey questionnaire with broader and richer detail, this type was rejected for this study.

2. Semi-structured interview is a method that contains structured and unstructured forms with standardized and open ended questions, which provides the respondents with reasonable flexibility and depth (Creswell, 2003). This type is often used in educational and social research, where the interviewers interact and the respondents are given more margin of freedom to express their opinion, feeling and attitudes (Sarantakos 2005). Borg and Gall (1983) suggest the semi-structured interview is the best method to obtain data, because:

“It provides a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often permits gathering valuable data that could not be successfully obtained by any other approach” (p.442).

3. Unstructured interview involves direct interaction between the researcher and the respondents. This type entails preparation of a general area or core concept to ask about, but there is no formal structure of questions, and the interviewer can move from one area to another in any direction within the general area of the topic (Creswell 2003). Thus, this type of interview is often used to explore the field that needs to be studied rather than conducting work to obtain specific data. Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) warned that this type is “highly subjective and time-consuming” (p.240).

In this study, semi-structured interviews were used, in which a list of topics and questions was compiled in advance, in order to keep the discussion focused and relevant, and to make sure all the issues of interest were covered. At the same time, the researcher was free to probe interviewees for more information, to clarify questions, if necessary, and to follow up interesting comments.
4.4.2 Construction of the Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was set up to collect data related to the head teacher’s role and tasks as a manager as a leader responsible for the school (learning organization) as a whole, in Saudi and British primary school. The interview schedule was designed to cover the following aspects:

1. Head teacher’s accountability in relation to
   A. Parents
   B. Governors
   C. Children
   D. Teaching and non-teaching staff
   E. Local educational authority

2. Margin of freedom to lead and manage in relation to:
   A. Leading through experience and practice
   B. Following the guidelines of the central educational authorities
   C. The ideal-type of leading and managing in daily practice

3. Margin of freedom in relation to
   A. Planning school activities
   B. Curriculum implementation
   C. Financial issues
   D. Dealing with changes
   E. Coordinating with teachers, supervisors and others

A separate interview schedule for deputy head teachers was also designed as follows:

1. Who are you mainly accountable to? Where are your boundaries? I mean how you can say, ‘that is the head’s responsibility and that is mine’?
2. How do you work in terms of division of labour, as you are neither a head, nor a teacher?
3. How far are you able to share the decisions with the head (what is your role in decision making)?
4. Do you have a guideline to follow as a deputy, or is that decided between you and the head teacher?
5. How far do you share responsibility to evaluate the school performance?
Teachers were also targeted in this study. Interviews with teachers covered the following aspects:

1. Does the head teacher ask you to share responsibility?

If you do decide to share responsibility, which field would you choose?

   A. Curriculum planning
   B. Teaching pedagogy
   C. Financial issues.
   D. School performance evaluation
   E. Teacher training committee
   F. Parent-school relations

2. With regard to decision-making:
   A. Do the head and deputy ask your view?
   B. Is your relationship like a family or leader and followers?
   C. How can you participate in school development?

4.4.3 Validity and Reliability

Reliability in qualitative research is problematic as the instrument cannot be tested statistically, but some researchers believe that the instrument is the researcher (Patton, 2002), and this raises important questions about the data analysis and interpretation, as different researchers could interpret some qualitative data information in totally different ways (Creswell, 2003).

However, in qualitative research validity can be used to determine whether or not the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Borg and Gall, 1999). Face validity seems to be mostly used in educational and social research instruments especially in qualitative instruments such as interview schedules. For this semi-structured interview schedule, the interview questions were shown to three PhD students in the field of education in Hull University to assess whether or not the questions appeared to measure what they were intended to. All three judges agreed that the questions had been designed and worded carefully to measure the head teachers’
tasks and accountability. After this judgement the academic supervisor gave the researcher her consent to pilot the interview schedule.

4.4.4 Piloting the Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was developed originally in English and translated into Arabic. The English and Arabic versions were both checked by two professors in English literature in the University of Teba in Medina, who went through the translation carefully with the researcher and agreed the two versions were identical in meaning.

Three pilot interviews were conducted in order to check the instrument in the field and to practise how to collect data. The experience was very useful in terms of the semi-structured interview schedule. It was at the pilot respondents’ suggestion that the interviews were extended to deputy head teachers and a sample of teachers, to obtain a more complete picture of the head teachers’ tasks and accountability responsibilities.

4.5 Sample and Implementation Procedures

4.5.1 Location of the Study

This study was conducted in Almadena Almonawara city (known in the west as Medina). It is the second holiest city in Saudi Arabia, and one of the oldest urban centres. It is the city of the Prophet Mohammed P.B.H. The country is divided into thirteen provinces. Almadena province is located in the north-western part of the country, and it is the third largest city in the country, in terms of size, and fifth in terms of population. The population in 1993 was 1.46 million, spread across about 293 square kilometres (Governorate of Almadena, 1995; Alyas, 2005).

4.5.2 Sample

The city of Almadena has about 256 elementary schools, with a total population of 68,977 students, and 6003 teachers in 1990. The number doubled in 2006, and in 2008, the total number of primary schools were 404 (Ministry of Education, 2009). The city was divided into four districts for sampling purposes. Each district was given equal
opportunity to be included in the sample. From each district, half the available schools were selected. The samples were randomly chosen according to Weisberg and Bowen’s (1997) note:

“If a town fell into your sample, for example, you would randomly choose the neighbourhood to be interviewed maybe one area in the northeast corner, another on the near south side and a third in a western suburbs”

(p25).

Thus, the sample covers half the schools in the city, in total a number of 200, which is statistically significant, represents the population of the study (Alneamy, 1992).

The data collection covered the head teachers, some deputy heads, and some teachers. The variety in the sample aimed to involve more educational figures, who share, to some degree, the responsibility with the head teacher to run the school on a daily basis.

4.5.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The implementation procedures, including the questionnaire and the interview, lasted about two months, from 1st January to 28th February 2007. The data collection took place in Al-Medina primary schools as mentioned earlier, with the full help of the local education authorities, who gave permission to conduct the study in schools as well as the help of head teachers, deputes and teachers in all schools in the plan. Questionnaires were delivered and collected personally. Interviews were conducted in participants’ offices or a quiet room made available for the purpose, and were recorded with the permission of the interviewees. Samples of interview transcripts are attached in Appendix B.

The questionnaire data was transferred into the computer, using SPSS. The data was processed, and frequency distribution tables and graphs were produced for analysis.
Chapter Five

Research Findings

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to presentation of the data collected in relation to the head teacher’s role in Saudi Arabian Primary schools. The literature emphasized that the educational system in Saudi Arabia is highly centralised and the direct conclusion one can reach is that the head teacher is restricted and has a very limited margin of freedom to make change in the school environment. If we accept this conclusion, then we would not need to do such an empirical investigation. However, we are only assuming that such a prescribed education system may reduce the head teacher’s ability to initiate activities and performance that bring about many desirable changes in favour of the children, the teacher and the whole teaching-learning process. However, such an assumption may be right or wrong; the data analysis in this chapter would be the only way to assess the reality of the head teacher’s role. The analysis will be divided into two parts, first the questionnaire outcomes, followed by the interviews.

5.2 The Questionnaire

As has been said in Chapter Four, the questionnaire covered five aspects of the head teacher’s accountability. These areas were; managing pupils, managing teachers and staff, school building, curriculum decisions, and dealing with issues inside and outside school. These aspects, as will be seen, involve other bodies in school, such as deputies, and teachers, which can give a clear indication about the specific role of each member of the school’s administration and pinpoint the main tasks and responsibility of the head teacher.

5.2.1 Managing Pupils

This part of the questionnaire contained four questions. The first was about managing pupils’ absence. The data as shown in table 5.1 indicated that the vast majority of the respondents (71%) claimed that this task is the responsibility of the deputy head teacher,
while about 3.5% asserted that this is the responsibility of the head teacher. 12% of the respondents claimed that such task is the responsibility of others, such as teachers and member of staff. From the researcher’s experience as a former head teacher, this task is mainly the responsibility of the deputy head teacher, as part of his main role in school, but in case of illness or any other reason, others may take over this responsibility, and even the head teacher could do this task. Chart 5.1 may shed extra light on this task and the responsibility, which showed the deputy leading other in this manner. Having said that, the head teacher is still the main figure in managing students, as he shares responsibility, his main job as a leader, a manager and a coordinator of a team, is to keep school running by fostering “an atmosphere in which everyone in the school can be used and involved” (Cook and Mack, 1971: p23). Within this context Hall et al (1986), emphasised that head teachers often delegated discipline and pastoral care responsibilities to their deputies, who with other staff cooperation provided the head with information “about pupils to enable the head to appear as though he knew them individually” (pp103-104).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Frequency Distribution of Managing Absence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head teacher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Head teacher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy head teacher, teachers and others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy head teacher and teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy head teacher and others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question two was about educational progress. The data, as shown in table 5.2 and chart 5.2, revealed that the head teacher is the main figure in the school responsible for the pupils’ progress. Precisely, 40.5% of the respondents admitted that the head is responsible for the progress of pupils’ knowledge, behaviour and skills, while only 21% claimed the head deputy, and 29.5% teachers. Indeed, the deputy is responsible to report to the head teacher, pupils’ progress in all schooling activities, then the head would consider how to re-plan his policy to overcome the obstacles. Thus, the head in this sense is a policy planner and the main players are the teachers and deputy. This result comes in line with what Whitaker (1998) described as “accountability” of the head who is supposed to directly or indirectly receive information that enables him to enhance progress in terms of quality of pupils learning, behaviour and manner. Coulson (1976) emphasised that the head’s responsibility is to lead and control the internal organisation and discipline of the school and supervision of the teaching, non-teaching staff and the pupils’ progress.
Table 5.2: Frequency Distribution of Managing Educational Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2: Bar Graph of Managing Educational Progress
Question three focused on the responsibility for managing pupil behaviour, discipline and manner inside and outside the classroom. The data as shown in Table 5.3 indicated that the teacher is the main player in managing the pupils’ behaviour, according to about 51% of the respondents, followed by deputy head 25% and then by the head teacher 15.5%. Although the teacher seems to be the main character in controlling pupils’ behaviour, the deputy may have some role but less than teachers and more than the head, because the teachers deal directly, face to face and instantly with their pupils’ behaviour inside the class, non-class activities and playtime, while the deputy and the head watch, and they may deal with a few cases directly, such as those who misbehave and are referred by teachers. With those pupils, the deputy may try to sort the problem out, but if he is unable to do so then he may refer it to the head, who decides what to do. Chart 5.3 also shows a clear picture of the role players in the process of managing pupils’ behaviour, when the teacher appears to have the highest responses, followed by deputy and then the head. Although most respondents agreed that teachers are the most powerful figures in relation to pupils’ behaviour, in most cases, the head is involved in pupils’ discipline and manner, especially with those who misbehave inside the classroom, but as Coles and Southworth (2005) reported, head teachers are often involved indirectly with the pupils’ discipline.

Table 5.3: Frequency Distribution of Managing Behaviour and Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Players</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher, teachers and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The last question of this part related to “rewards”. The data, as shown in table 5.4 revealed that the teacher has the main role in rewarding and punishing pupils, as 46% of respondents gave this role to the teacher, only 36% to the head teacher and 12.5% to the deputy. Practically, the teacher is the only figure in the school who knows pupils’ abilities and behaviour, and who deserves rewards or punishment. The teachers sharing this responsibility with the head is conducive to development and success; it is, as Whitaker (1998) called it a “shared sense of direction” (p148). So the reward system in school starts with the teacher on a daily basis in order to reinforce the qualities of learning, but the head is informed and performs a similar role on some occasions and for some unique achievements (Cook and Mack, 1971).
Table 5.4 Frequency Distribution of Managing Rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even in the few cases where the head teacher rewards pupils, it is based on the referral of class teachers.

Figure 5.4: Bar Graph of Managing Rewards
This part of the questionnaire (pupils’ management), seems to be fairly divided by the three main figures in the school, head teacher, deputy and teacher. Although other components of the school administration have some roles, they seem to be minor and mechanical roles, while the head, deputy and teachers are at the heart of the responsibility. Although the head teacher seems to be less responsible in term of pupils’ management, but in reality he is the person who holds the reins of power, while the deputy works as a filter between the teacher and the head, but obviously they all work as a team and with the role of division of labour, which makes the school an integrated organisation.

5.2.2 Management of Teachers

The second set of questions focused on the management of teachers. The first question was related to teachers’ absence. According to the data of Table 5.5 the deputy head appears to have the highest score 51% while the head teacher scored 46%. The result showed that some heads take direct responsibility to deal with the teacher’s absence, while some head teachers transfer the responsibility to their deputies. Thus, the responses reflect nearly similar outcomes for both teachers and deputies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 5.6 depicts clear evidence that both head and deputy share the responsibility, with approximately similar responses.
The dramatic change in the head’s role in schools’ accountability makes no doubt that the power-share is an effective way for success (Coles and Southworth, 2005). Moreover, Colgate (1976) asserted that schools differ from most other institutions, and the role of the head teacher is more likely to be managerial as he stated,

“it is true that a school differs from most other institutions, the role of the present-day head, particularly of the large school is primarily managerial. This does not mean, as is sometimes suggested, that he has to be solely an administrator and to leave the pedagogic and pastoral responsibilities to others” (p111).

Indeed, in modern schools the head gives up some of his traditional role and shares some of his responsibility with his deputies and senior staff. Thus it is not surprising to find the deputy exercises some of the head’s roles in managing teachers, but the head always has channels of knowledge and communication to know what is going on in school, although they may turn a blind eye “because this may make development possible” (Cook and Mack, 1971: p21).

**Figure 5.5: Bar graph of management of teachers’ absence**
The second question focused on the management of staff development. The respondents, as shown in table 5.6 indicated that the head teacher is responsible for the staff development. The table information and the chart 5.6 shows that 88.5% of respondents took this view.

**Table 5.6: Frequency Distribution of Management of Staff Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 3.5% said that this was a role for the deputy. It is very clear that the head teacher was the main role player in staff development. If we add “head teacher and others” including the deputy, then the overwhelming majority of the responses were in favour of the head teacher. Indeed, the head is often responsible for staff development, but sometimes he has to consult others, such as his deputy, or senior teachers in order to make the right decision. This result is supported by Stoll and Bolam (2005) who indicated that the school leadership has a responsibility of providing fundamental “*infrastructure support and encouragement for learning, participating in a system learning community***” (p61). This means the staff development will help to enhance pupils’ learning and achieve the organisation’s objectives. However, modern heads should play a less direct role in determining the school activities in order to create an effective climate for staff development. This means leadership should be devolved to other members of staff such as deputies, senior teachers and administrators, which in turn is reflected in the whole school’s development (Southworth, 1998). Stoll and
Bolam (2005) emphasised that school head is responsible for his staff professional development

“in at least two respects: first as instructional leaders, principals maybe expected to coordinate professional progression of their staff, second, they need to manage the learning community as a whole, using development as part of school change” (p55).

Figure 5.6: Bar Graph of Management of Staff Development

Question three was related to “getting specialist teachers for special educational needs”. According to the information in table 5.7 and chart 5.7, the head teacher appears to have most responses as the main figure in school to contact local education authorities to get specialized teachers for special educational needs. Precisely, the informant gave the “head teacher” 77% of their responses against 13.5% for the deputy and 5% for others.
Table 5.7: Getting Specialist Teachers for Special Educational Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the experience of the researcher as a head teacher the school head often contacts the local educational authorities for specialized teachers for special educational needs in person, or may ask the deputy or senior teacher to contact the authorities to provide the school with such teachers. However, the data showed that most heads do it themselves as one of their tasks and responsibilities, and often when the head contacts the local authorities, they send specialised teachers to the school faster.

Chart 5.7 shows the responses in favour of the head teacher very clearly. Within this context, the head has to prove that he is a leader, a channel between the school and other learning organisations and local educational authorities, as Cook and Mack (1971) stated:

“The head’s job is to be the leader, chairman and coordinator of a team of people working together. He is also a sort of liaison between officialdom and his school, filtering through the things that must be done, and applying them in the actual situation” (p22). The head teacher significantly exercises his responsibility as a leader and a manager through internal and external coordination (Terrell, 1999).
Question four concerns the management of rewards of teachers. As shown in table 5.8, the data indicated that the vast majority of the respondents asserted that the head teacher is the main character in the school, directly responsible for the teachers’ rewards and punishment, as 93% said so, against 5% for the deputy and 1% for teachers. Indeed the responsibility for the reward system is one of the main responsibilities of the head teacher, but in a few cases, he has to consult his deputy and sometimes senior teachers to decide the best way to reward teachers; when where and how to do it. In the literature, the head teacher maintains relationships with staff, and creates a reward system that allows teachers to have their chance to initiate and improve their quality of teaching, which has to be appreciated and rewarded periodically (Brundrett, 1999; Middlewood, 2005).
Table 5.8: Frequency Distribution of the Rewards of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.8: Bar Graph of Management of the Rewards of Teachers

Management of the rewards of teachers
5.2.3 School Building and Content Maintenance

This part of the questionnaire consisted of three questions; the first one related to the building repair and maintenance. The data as shown in table 5.9 and chart 5.9 revealed that the overwhelming majority of the respondents claimed that the deputy head teacher is responsible for building repair and maintenance. Precisely 63.5% said deputy, 28% said head teacher, 4.5% others and 4% both head teacher and deputy. The researcher’s experience in this field suggests that the head teacher is responsible for the building and content maintenance, but because of the multiple responsibilities of the head, he often asks his deputy or sometimes any figure of the administration to take over such responsibility. Once again, it is clear that power sharing and systematic division of labour would be at the heart of the school management and success. To maintain good relations with teaching and non-teaching staff would have a great impact on the quality of teaching and achievement of the pupils (Millett, 1999). Indeed, the responsibility of the head could be transferred to his deputy, for less serious tasks, the school maintenance could be done any member of staff, but under any circumstances, the head should be informed and monitor the school as the task comes under his responsibility. However, this result comes in line with the “share power” strategy, which is emphasised by a large number of scholars (Watts, 1976; Riley and Macbeth, 2003; Southworth, 1998).

Table 5.9: Frequency Distribution of the Person who Supervises Repairs and Maintenance of School Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chart also shows clear evidence that the deputy head has the ultimate responsibility for school repair and maintenance.

5.9: Pie Chart Showing the Person Who Supervises Repairs and Maintenance of School Building

The second question concerned the person who is responsible for the budget spending decisions. The data as shown in table 5.10 and chart 5.10 revealed that the overwhelming majority of the informants claimed that the head teacher has direct responsibility for budget spending decisions. In other words 86% said the head teacher, against 9%, the deputy. From these figures it is obvious that the head teacher is the only figure responsible for the budget and the sole decision-maker in this matter. However, the Saudi school has no budget in the real sense, as the general teaching and non-teaching staff are civil servants, getting their income directly from the government. The school, therefore, has no chance to hire teachers or to spend on the building. Where they need to do so, they contact the local education authorities. However, the school has a very small budget, for emergency and for rewarding some pupils. This budget is under the head’s control. In the developed world, the school has its own budget and can hire
teachers and arrange repairs. As Southworth (1998) noted, “The principle of improvement builds upon the principle of learning. Primary schools today are self-managing organisations, having their own budgets to manage” (p47).

Table 5.10: Frequency Distribution of the Maker of Budget Spending Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.10: Bar Graph of the Maker of Budget Spending Decisions

The third question was about the person in charge of ordering supplies, books, equipment for school. The data as shown in table 5.11 and chart 5.11 indicated that the
majority of the respondents claimed that the head teacher is the person in charge of ordering supplies, books and other equipment for the schools. Precisely, 55% said so against 10.5% for the deputy, 17.5% for both head and deputy and 10% said the teacher could do it. Indeed this is in Saudi schools the responsibility of the head teacher, but the head have the authority to ask any member of school to contact the local educational authorities to do the job, including his deputy (more often) or teachers (less often). However, some overloaded head teachers may share responsibility with other members to perform of their roles and to create an integrated organisational accountability, and the team work spirit.

Table 5.11: Frequency Distribution of the Person who Orders Supplies, Books, etc for the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person who Orders Supplies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This result comes in line with what Riley and MacBeath (2003) called “collaborative leadership models”. As they stated;
“Good school leaders are those who are able to maximise the diverse leadership qualities of others, enabling them to take leadership within their areas of expertise. They lead by managing, motivating and inspiring people ... encourage and enable people to play an active part in school life” (p.181).

Indeed, teachers and non-teaching staff are more willing to participate in school decision-making when the school leadership is perceived as more open, so they can spontaneously do whatever the task is (Smylie, 1992).

Figure 5.11: Bar Graph of the Distribution of the Person who Orders Supplies, Books, etc for the School
5.2.4 Curriculum Decisions

This part of the questionnaire consists of six questions; the first question was about the decision maker on the introduction of new teaching methods. The data in table 5.12 indicated that the vast majority of the respondents (65%) asserted that the teacher is responsible for introducing new teaching method. 27% said the head teacher, and 6% said the deputy. Practically, the teacher is responsible for initiating new teaching methods, but first they should be discussed with the head and sometimes with the deputy, but since the teacher has the responsibility for the classroom learning activities, he is entitled to deliver the method he chooses to accomplish his objectives and no authority have the right to stop him.

Table 5.12: Frequency Distribution of Decisions Maker on the Introduction of New Teaching Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a very few cases the head teacher may involve others to discuss the validity of the methods used with teachers, especially, when teaching outcomes are not satisfactory according to the national standards. Chart 5.12 also reveals a clear image on the figure responsible for the delivery of new teaching methods. The head teacher, however, should realise that there are different styles of teaching, and teachers should have full support of the head to fulfil their task, as Cook and Mack (1971) stated:
“One task the head teacher is to be aware of differences in teaching styles, and differences of people on his staff. I think that, fundamentally, a person can only teach in a style which he himself feels to be right for him” (p17).

Indeed the teacher needs to believe strongly his style of teaching is fruitful and no one has the right to interfere with it (Hastings, 1998).

Figure 5.12: Bar Graph of the Distribution of Decisions Maker on the Introduction of New Teaching Methods

The second question focused on the person in charge of introducing new technology to the classroom and to school in general. The data as shown in table 5.13 revealed that the majority of the respondents (62%) claimed that the teacher came in the first place to introduce new technology to his classroom; while 31% of the respondents claimed the head teacher and only 3% said the deputy. From the researcher’s experience as a former head teacher, the head teacher is entitled to order the new technology for the school, and the teacher responsible for introducing such new devices to his classroom. The head and
his deputy may discuss with teachers the value and usefulness of such technology, but no interference with the implementation.

Table 5.13: Frequency Distribution of Decisions Maker on the Introduction of New Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A collaborative climate in school helps to develop strong sense of unity and determine what needs to be done and how to face new technology and changes. The head teacher has no choice but to support teachers when they want to improve some of the curricula, by using new technology or other system of information technology or adopting new methods for change (Fullan, 1992). Introducing new technology means trying out the innovation to make change and that is fundamentally connected with the head teacher’s responsibility as well as the teaching staff and this is what Bennett et al (1992) called the “exercise of authority rather than operation of consent” (p11).
Chart 5.13 shows the responsibility figure (teachers) as having the most response, and indicates that the teacher, rather than the head or his deputy, takes the lead in introducing new technology to the school.

The third question was related to the exam/test decisions. As shown in table 5.14 the data revealed that the vast majority of the respondents claimed that the head teacher is the decision maker about exam/test timing, preparing the class, providing the exam/test material and the type of examination. Precisely, 82.5% of the respondents claimed so, against 9.5% for the deputy and only 3% for the teacher. However, in the researcher’s experience, the head teacher is responsible only for test timing and holding the test papers, but the teachers have to decide the test type, deliver the test and invigilate, while the deputy has supportive role, passing to the classes to make sure everything is going well and there is a sufficient supply of exam papers and stationery.
Table 5.14 Frequency Distribution of Exams/Tests Decisions' Maker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 5.14 also showed the head teacher highest score, which reflects the involvement of the head teacher even with what supposed to be other staff tasks. The head teacher on the other hand reports how well the exam went and decides how long it could take, but not the nature of the exam or how the teacher should do it, because everybody should know what to do. The head teacher is always the policy maker of the school. It is part of his management task to decide the exam timing, prepare the facilities for teachers to do and maintain the exam outcomes. So the head teacher’s task in this sense is to overcome difficulties and facilitate the teachers’ activities in order to gear the school development and management cooperation (Whitaker, 1998).
Question four concentrated on “extracurricular education”. As shown in table 5.15 the data revealed that about half of the respondents claimed that the head teacher is responsible for this, while the deputy and the teacher had about quarter of the responses. In other words 42.5% said the head teacher, 27.5% said the deputy and 25.5% said the teacher.
Table 5.15: Frequency Distribution of Decisions Maker on Extra-curricula Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher, teachers and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, teachers and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the researcher’s experience, the extra curriculum is decided by the head teacher, but after a consultation with the teachers, who are responsible for delivering the extra curriculum, only to help struggling pupils, or those with low attainment. This could be delivered by teachers before the examination to reinforce their information. In most cases it could be an initiative of the teacher, who only has to inform the head teacher or deputy just to let them know why he does it, when and how long. The diagram 5.15 also showed how the responses were divided between the main figures in the school, showing the highest and the lowest scores. This extra activity would not take place or would be useless without a climate of collaboration and positive relationship between the head and the teaching staff, as Leithwood et al (2003) stated, “Teachers exercise informal relations in their schools by sharing their expertise, volunteering for new projects and bringing new ideas to the school” (p.189).
Question five in this series of questions focused on the matter of the weekly time-table planner. Table 5.16 indicated that the majority of the respondents claimed that the head teacher is the master of the weekly time-table plan, where 80.5% of them said so, against 17.5% of them claiming the deputy. Once again the researcher’s experience is different; the head teacher often proposes the teaching timetable himself, but more often he asks the deputy to do it and the head may make some modification on it, especially when some teachers have an objection.
Table 5.16: Frequency Distribution of Planner of Weekly Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner of Weekly Timetable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, however, the data showed that the head teacher is perceived as the person responsible for designing and planning the teaching time-table. Indeed, the designer and planner of the teaching weekly time-table is the head teacher, but the deputy is the one who executes the work, puts it on paper and hangs it on the wall, and often when someone visits the head teacher or their offices, they will find a copy hanging on the wall. It is impossible to say which one is responsible for the time-table; it is a joint effort of the head and his deputy.

Figure 5.16: Bar Graph of the Distribution of Planner of Weekly Timetable
Question six was concerned with the responsibility for the school in general. The data as shown in table 5.17 indicated that overwhelming majority of the respondents claimed that the head teacher is the person in charge of all school work, as 88.5% said so, while only 9% said the deputy and 2.5% said teachers. Indeed the head teacher is the person who leads and accordingly he is in charge not only before the local educational authorities, but also before the school staff and pupils and parents as well. Although the head teacher in most cases is the central player in school management and leadership, there is always a space for others to lead side by side with the head, as Southworth (1998) said, “Leadership should be devolved to colleagues and that heads should try to play a less direct role in certain areas, while exercising leadership in some others” (p49). This view is supported by Bush (2005) who asserted that collegiality is closely correlated with school improvement and increasingly involves teachers in decisions that affect their professional life.

Table 5.17: Frequency Distribution of Planner of School Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram also showed that the head teacher is the ultimate figure in charge of the school work and has the full responsibility for all school work.
5.2.5 Other Activities

The head teacher the deputy have multiple and joint activities, such as meeting with staff, parents, contacting local educational authorities, Ministry of Education and some public organisations. For all of these activities a set of questions was designed to assess which of these activities are the responsibilities of the head teacher.

The first question was concerned with the person responsible for holding meetings with teachers and staff. The data as shown in table 5.18 indicated that the overwhelming majority of the respondents claimed that the head teacher holds meetings with teachers and staff, while only 1.5% of them said the deputy. It is the head in charge, but the deputy can replace him only if he is on leave, ill or has a meeting outside the school.
Table 5.18: Frequency Distribution of the Person who Holds Meetings for the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If both the head and the deputy are on leave or have a meeting outside the school, then a senior teacher can do the job, but in general the head leads the teachers’ meeting.

The diagram may give a clearer indication about the person in charge and the score of the respondents. Watts (1976) indicated that the head teacher controls the internal organisation, in which he holds meetings with staff regularly, has access to the classrooms, determines the curriculum, how the pupils are grouped and who teaches them. He is “the mouthpiece of the school in all public statements” (p.129).

Figure 5.18: Bar Graph of the Distribution of the Person who Holds Meetings for the Teachers
The second question is about “holding meetings with parents”. The data as shown in table 5.19 revealed that more than half the respondents claimed that the deputy holds meeting with parents, while about one third of the sample said the head teacher. As the diagram shows, the conclusion here is that meeting with parents is a shared responsibility between the head and his deputy, whichever is available could do the job. It may also depend on the personality of the head. Sometimes the head is not very popular and the deputy may have a charismatic personality, so he can control the school activities more than the head. As Watts (1976) said earlier, the head is the mouthpiece of the school, so he is in charge of holding meetings with parents and other local community members.

Table 5.19: Frequency Distribution of the Person that Holds Meetings with Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third question in this part is about the person who “deals with local community”. The data as shown in table 5.20 indicated that the overwhelming majority of the respondents claimed that the head teacher has responsibility to deal with the local community. On the other hand, only 8.5% of them said the “deputy”. As the diagram shows, the head teacher most commonly leads the school in its relations with the local community, and the deputy and other staff have a very limited role in this matter. So the conclusion is that the head teacher is the front pillar of the school in dealing with broad activities of the school.

Table 5.20: Frequency Distribution of the Person who Holds Meetings with the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Distribution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher, deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This result has been supported by a number of scholars in this field (Cook and Mack, 1971; Hall et al, 1986; Bell, 2005).

Figure 5.20: Bar Graph Showing the Distribution of the Person who Holds Meetings with the Community

This result is reinforced by the outcomes from the next question, which focuses on the person in charge of contacting the Ministry of Education. The data as shown in table 5.21 revealed that the vast majority of the respondents claimed that the head teacher is the only person dealing with the Ministry of Education when needed. Only four said the deputy. However, the data in the table and the diagram clearly disclose the fact that the head teacher is the person in charge of dealing with entities outside the school organisation. This result is also supported by many scholars (Hall et al, 1986; Dipaola, 2003; Bone, 1982). As Hall et al stated,

“Some of the head teachers’ work takes place outside the school, the presentation of the school to various parts of the world outside has been seen by many commentators as an increasingly prominent part of the head’s role” (p167).
According to this statement the head’s role is expanded beyond the school and the local community to cover communication with local educational authorities and the central (in the Saudi case).

Table 5.21: Frequency Distribution of the Person who Holds Meetings with the Ministry (if a problem arises)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person who Holds Meetings with the Ministry</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.21: Bar Graph Showing the Distribution of the Person who Holds Meetings with the Ministry (if a Problem Arises)
Question five was about “who writes reports to parents”. The data as shown in table 5.22 indicated that over half the respondents claimed that the deputy did this job, while a similar number (a bit less than half the sample) claimed it was the head’s responsibility.

Table 5.22: Frequency Distribution of the One who Writes Reports to Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the researcher knows, this is the head’s responsibility, but more often the head would share the responsibility with the deputy and often the deputy does the reports on behalf of the head, with the head’s signature. The head may give this responsibility to his deputy because this job has no risk, but when it comes to report to the Ministry of Education the head teacher may feel the risk and do it himself as we see in the last question of this part, “who writes reports to ministry of education”. The data, as shown in table 5.23, revealed that the overwhelming majority of the respondents (94.5%) claimed that the head teacher is the person responsible to write reports to the Ministry of Education, while only 5.5% of the sample said the deputy. Indeed the head’s responsibility is to be in touch with parents, not only for parents’ evening or special occasions, but also for many other reasons, especially with those who have abnormal children and annual reports and so on (Alexander, 1998).
Figure 5.22: Bar Graph Showing the Distribution of the One who Writes Reports to Parents

Table 5.23: Frequency Distribution of the One who Writes Reports to the Ministry of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher and deputy head teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table and the supportive diagram, we can conclude that the head teacher’s responsibility is only for the very important issues which need a person with the ability to make decisions, or to deal with formal organisations such as the Ministry of Education.
5.2.6 General Information

This part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain data about the size of the school components; deputies, pupils, teachers’ experience period and the head teacher’s role in terms of like and dislike.

The first question was about the approximate number of pupils in the sample schools. The data as shown in table 5.24 revealed that 91 out of 200 schools had an average of between 251-350 pupils, 41 schools had an average of 351-450. Only nine schools had an average of between 650-850. The mean score of the schools of the sample was 338.
Table 5.24: Frequency Distribution of Approximate Number of Pupils in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate no. of teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-150</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-250</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-350</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-450</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451-550</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551-650</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651-750</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751-850</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table information and the supportive diagram reveals that only a few schools had a small number of pupils (50-150), and few schools had a large number of pupils (651-850). The rest had in the range of 150-650 and the total mean of the entire sample indicated that the school size in relation to pupil number is quite reasonable and consistent with the national standard of learning which is between 20-30 students in each class.

Figure 5.24: Bar Graph Showing the Approximate Number of Pupils in Schools
The second question was about the approximate number of teachers in school. The data shown in table 5.25 revealed that the highest number of responses was concentrated in the category 11-20. Only few indicated a larger number of teachers; 4 out of 200 claimed the teachers’ number between 40-60, and few reported a small number of teachers; 19 out of 200 said between 1-10 teachers. When we calculated the mean from grouped data, we found the mean was 17.5 teachers.

Table 5.25: Frequency Distribution of Approximate Number of Teachers in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate no. of teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table and the supportive diagram showed that the average teacher number clustered in the category 11-20.
The third question was about the number of deputies in school. The data in table 5.26 revealed that the vast majority of the respondents claimed that they had one deputy in their schools. Only 9 out of 200 said they had “no deputy” and 17 out of 200 said they had two.

**Table 5.26: Frequency Distribution of the Number of Deputy Head Teachers in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of deputy head teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No deputy head teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in the table and in the diagram indicated that the size of the school in general was moderate, so they did not need more than one deputy.

Figure 5.26: Bar Graph Showing the Approximate Number of Head Teachers in Schools

The fourth question was about the “number of years you have been a head teacher”. The data as shown in table 5.27 indicated that the vast majority of the respondents claimed that they had between 1-8 years in charge. A few of them, 14 out of 200, claimed they had less than one year and a few of them, 2 out of 200, claimed they had more than 24 years. The mean was 3.6 years.
Table 5.27: Frequency Distribution of Approximate Number of Years you Have Been a Head Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate number of years as a head teacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table and the supportive diagram indicate that most head teachers had only a few years in position, which may reflect a lack of experience.

Figure 5.27: Bar Graph Showing the Approximate Number of Years you Have Been a Head Teacher
5.3 The Interviews

The interview is one of the most popular instruments used in social science and in education particularly, where researchers can obtain data that would not be obtained using any other instrument. It provides flexible, spontaneous and accurate responses. In this study there were three different types of interviewee: head teacher, deputy head teacher and teacher. These are the main characters in educational process. All were interviewed to discuss the head teacher’s role in Saudi primary school. Although the interview schedule for each group was different, ultimately, all were designed to check the head teacher’s responsibilities. Only one head teacher was intensively interviewed, while four deputies and four teachers from different schools were interviewed as a checklist for the head teacher’s claims. The analysis will therefore start with the head teacher and be treated as a “case study”.

5.3.1 The Head Teacher’s Interview

This head teacher came to ALiz Bin Adulsalam School one year after the researcher left. The first question he was asked was about which tasks he was involved with, and their priority among parents, governors, teaching staff, children, or local education authorities. The head went straight to the children, as he said: “The priority for me is how to deliver best management of children’s learning”.

Although he said he paid careful attention to other tasks in relation to parents, teachers, local education authorities, all these could be used to stimulate the learning climate and we can conclude from his answers that, he as a head and other staff worked hard to fulfil the school’s objective and of creating better opportunities for learning, not only knowledge, but also, manner, discipline and cultural heritage. These comments come in line with Terrell (1999), who indicated that the main task of the head is to manage the teaching-learning process, though maximising the staff contribution in order to improve the quality of education, constructive working relations between pupils and staff, planning, supporting and educating. About the governors, he claimed that in the Saudi system there is no such character; as he said “we only have the parents and teacher committee”. This is a basic difference with the British education system.

In relation to the central education authorities, he claimed that individual schools have no direct link with the central education authorities. “All what we need, all what we
report or suggest go and come through local educational authorities”, he said. The head admitted that he had quite limited options in leading and managing school activities. The Ministry of Education provides schools with regular instruction through the local educational authorities. The curriculum is determined centrally and the teacher only follows the guideline to cover and distribute the topics over the academic year, and the head master has to follow the guideline from A to Z. This claim contradicts Southworth (2005), Bell and Bush (2005), who asserted that the transformation of education from central to autonomy and self-control, including finance and school self-management could have greater effectiveness in terms of flexibility, better use of resources and staff professional development.

The ideal type of leading and managing school is to be fully in line with the guidelines given by the educational authorities. He asserted that the capability to deliver new initiatives, modify and revise the curriculum is not possible and implementation of the curriculum as it is set in textbooks must be done to satisfy the inspector. The authorities gave teachers and heads full freedom to manage free activities in art or athletics, which have to be conducted at certain times of the school year in association with other schools, except that the head teacher is often prevented from going beyond the prescribed activities. In this sense his role is to keep the school activities flowing smoothly, and control everything in school, including who is coming or going, teachers’ performance, illness or absence, pupils and school staff problems, maintain contact with the local education authorities, inform them of the school’s needs and inform the local education authorities, inform them of the school’s needs and inform the local education authorities of progress in the teaching-learning process. In addition he maintains good relations with the staff and decides the appropriate rewards and punishment according to the situation. To maintain a good relationship with school staff and developing a strong sense of shared leadership would have a great impact on school performance as Southworth (1998) pointed out “Effective headship in this sense means increasing the effectiveness of all other school leaders” (p49).

In relation to the school budget, the head teacher admitted that the school has no budget; all teachers and staff are employed by the government and they get their salary according to the government regulation; thus the school has no authority to hire teachers or to buy equipment or deal with urgent needs without prior consent of the local authorities. Even plumbing or electricity problems need authorisation from the local education authorities who have the capability to decide and to pay. Practically, the
finance of the school centrally would undermine the capability of the school management and develop (Foskett 2005, Southworth, 2005).

In a question about how to deal with changes, the head teacher claimed that changes could happen internally or externally. In both cases the school administration had a strategy to deal with any changes. He said;

“If the changes take place as a result of new technology (externally) or changes in social atmosphere, then we should have instructions from central educational authorities and we should adopt the changes immediately. In case of internal changes, such as age group changes, like new students arriving or children growing up and moving to new classes, we have a psychological background to deal with the children’s physical, psychological and mental changes. Our experience to deal with children positively is reflected in dealing with children who have different problems and reactions.”

In each age category, the internal changes, as the head teacher asserted, are the head teacher’s and the teachers’ responsibility. Fullan (1992) said “Educational change is technically simple and socially complex” (p109). Accordingly, the head’s ability to manage change in school would be vital to minimise damage and increase the probability of moving forward.

Finally, the head responded positively to a question about coordinating with teachers and supervisors, as he said;

“The education system gives the head teacher overwhelming authority over the teaching and non-teaching staff, some heads have great personal traits to lead through sensible division of labour...so every member of school knows what he has to do”.

On the other hand, the head said some head teachers exploit their authority to act as dictators and such leadership would be full of problems. However, the head teacher realised that every head could easily be a dictator, and to be wise, tolerant and fair is a hard task, but it is necessary to make the school environment flow smoothly. The head teacher interviewed indicated that since the Saudi education system is centralised, head teachers have not many options to make change, to control change, to improve the
quality of teaching, manage resources or take flexible approaches to reward and training opportunities.

In the next section the deputy head’s views on the head’s responsibility and management capability will be reported.

5.3.2 The Deputies’ Interviews

As mentioned earlier, four deputies from four different schools were interviewed. The interview schedule for the deputies was somewhat different from that of the head in terms of question formulation. For the first question concerning the main tasks of the deputy, all the four deputies claimed that their main tasks were to manage and control most school activities. As one said;

“I work closely to the head teacher. Although I have my own office, but most of the time I spend it within the head teacher’s office discussing curriculum implementation, the progress in the student level, the problems and the school’s needs”.

Although their responses seemed to be quite general, their answers suggested overlap between their roles and the head teacher’s role. However, from their answers one can extract that they do the executive part of the management under the head teacher’s instructions and supervision. One deputy said,

“My responsibility is to set up the school activities timetable, report to the head teacher about teachers’, pupils’ and other staff problems, progress, illness, absence and being late and make communication with local education authorities on behalf of the head teacher”.

When I told the deputies that I was still confused about their role and the limitation of their tasks, the answers clarified the ambiguity, in that all deputies claimed that they had no pre-planned schedule prescribed centrally, but rather in each scholastic year they had a meeting with the head to determine the role of each member of staff, including the deputy. With time and since they practised their role year after year, they realised their role from their accumulated experience. However, their role seems to complement that of the head and both the head and the deputy work in an integrated manner.
However, the main objective of the interview with the deputies was to gain insight into the head teacher’s role in school management and leadership. In this respect all the deputy heads agreed that the head teacher’s role is pivotal and this is in line with what Chapman and Burchfield (1992) believe, as they asserted that the head teacher’s role is essential for the quality and efficiency of the school. They stated:

“In third world countries, head masters are powerful gatekeepers, mediating the impact of central Ministry of Education policies on their schools, shaping the educational and social transitions within the school, and interpreting school priorities and activities to the local community”.

(p6)

When the deputies were asked whether or not they took part in school decision-making, all the interviewed deputies, except one, asserted that the school was managed by a team, not a single individual. Therefore the deputy and teachers had to be consulted before any decision making. One deputy claimed that the head teacher in certain circumstances made decisions without asking the deputy or any other members’ opinion. However, it seems in general that the deputy is a vital player in a school team, but his role seems to be derived from the head teacher’s role and integrated with it. The deputy may perform all the head teacher’s roles but the head teacher still supervises and is still the person in charge before the educational authorities. This result is consistent with the findings of Balanskat and Gerhard (2005) who surveyed 15 European countries’ selected head teachers to investigate head teacher’s profile and roles. They found two main roles for the heads; in some countries they played a balanced role between administrative, pedagogic and strategic aspects (Germany, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Northern Ireland and Lithuania), and in others, including England, Estoni, Switzerland and Belgium, the head’s role was purely administrative. Saudi heads are unlike both groups; their role has elements of both balanced and administrative roles. It may be that the system has not clearly crystallised the head teacher’s role, and accordingly, the deputy works only as a shadow of the head teacher. In a case study conducted by Truman (1996) about the head teacher’s role and school improvement, using sei-structured interview with a head teacher of the middle school (primary and secondary school) in England, the researcher divided the role of the head into three parts; (1) head teacher-staff relations; teachers’ perspectives on curriculum development, (2) the nature of the head’s involvement in and strategies for developing collaborative staff relationships, (3) the head’s reflection on his present role. Truman
found that the former head in the case study led in an authoritarian way, there was no collaboration with staff and the school was in need of urgent improvement, so the new head adopted a strategy of collaboration with the staff or strategy of empowerment of teachers and management (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991). Accordingly he achieved amazing results in terms of improving children’s achievement and staff collaboration. He concluded that leadership plays an essential role in improving school effectiveness.

In their answers to the question about whether or not they had a centrally determined regulation that underlines the role of the head and deputy, all the deputies responded similarly, that the Ministry of Education provides schools with general guidelines, without a clear definition of the deputy’s role. They were referred to in the regulation as heads’ assistants. Thus, as one deputy said, “we are working as executive managers”, and most of them said that they follow the head’s instruction, and they knew their roles from accumulated practice over the years. In this context the deputies, like other staff in school, work under the authority of the head who acts according to his personal traits, experience and knowledge. One of the deputies mentioned role conflict and contradiction but such a situation could take place commonly, as Dipaola (2003) indicated, when differences in goals, perceptions or beliefs arise, so as he stated:

“Thus, it should not be surprising that conflict is common in schools, and that conflict is particularly likely to occur at the boundaries or interfaces between different groups or units within organisations” (p143).

In fact, conflict could occur in school especially between the head and deputy. Deputies often privately complain that they do all the work “while the head plays with his computer or makes phone calls” as one deputy said. Despite all that, the deputies gave an indication that the head is the most effective player in school improvement, especially when he/she creates a collaborative culture in school, or in Southworth’s (1998) words, “develops a stronger sense of shared leadership” (p49).

School principals may or may not share leadership, but when it takes place, it could trigger other capabilities. For this reason the deputies were asked, “How far can you share responsibility to evaluate the school performance”. The deputies emphasised that they were in charge of monitoring alongside with the heads the performance of all school staff; teaching and non-teaching staff, as well as the children’s reactions in terms of learning, behaving and achieving, and report that
to the heads, who discuss with them the general performance of the school. In fact, the head can never succeed without developing a sense of shared arrangement, shared responsibility, and shared success. This result is consistent with Middlewood (2005), who asserted that a good head teacher should realise the changing environment, and this has to be an integral part of the whole process of managing a balanced accountability. Within this context, Coleman (2005) emphasised managing for equal opportunities in education, which implies avoiding discrimination and fairly sharing responsibility, which creates a climate of creativity and sense of responsibility to implement policies on a day-to-day basis.

From the information of the interviewed deputies, it appears that the head teacher’s role in Saudi Arabian primary schools is;

1. Flexible, accountable and understandable
2. Characterized by clear objectives
3. Involving a sharing of responsibility and work with other staff as a team

On the other hand they work;

1. As civil servant clerk, so the margin for initiative and creativity is quite limited
2. Within a highly centralized educational system where there is little opportunity to deal with change and create a self-management climate.
3. Within a heavy bureaucratic and hierarchical system where there is no chance to modify the curriculum or review the central system in school.

5.3.3 Teachers’ Interviews

The teachers’ interview aimed to shed more light on the head teacher’s role in Saudi primary schools. Four teachers were interviewed for this purpose. In response to the first question “Does the head teacher ask you to share responsibility?”, three out of four teachers indicated that the head teacher regularly repeated that everybody in the school
was responsible to fulfil the school’s objectives, but as teachers their responsibility was
confined to teaching children, implementing the curriculum and participating in
problem-solving with other administrative colleagues. Only one teacher claimed that
“no”, the head teacher had not asked him to share responsibility; which indicates that
the teacher felt that the head teacher isolated teachers from responsibility. Thus, this
teacher asserted he was responsible for developing children’s understanding,
implementing the curriculum and discussing children’s problems, but as he said, “I
would not share responsibility for administration tasks. Such tasks should be given to
deputies or the secretary”. In this sense the other three teachers also understood their
responsibility as to do their teaching tasks effectively, not contribute to administrative
activities. As one of them said, “In terms of administrative responsibility I am not
involved in such responsibility and I wouldn’t like to be in that position”. This result is
in contrast with Leithwood et al (2003), Webb and Lyons (1982) who suggested that the
head teacher should trigger the potential of teachers’ leadership to share responsibility.
As Leithwood et al (2003), pointed out;

“What teachers perceive leaders actually to be doing is our meaning of the
term “practices”. The most frequently mentioned of these was the
performance of administrative tasks such as working administrative tasks
such as working administrative periods in the office, being on committees
and organising specific events” (p193).

However, the teacher’s responsibility can also be triggered through support, rewards,
autonomy and collaboration, not only through sharing administrative activities and that
is responsibility of the head teacher to achieve the school objectives (Fullan, 1992;
Campbell, 1998).

The second question in the interview schedule was, “If you have a problem with the
national curriculum, what do you do?” The interviewed teachers unanimously
emphasised that they quite rarely faced any problem of ambiguity or contradiction,
because they worked to implement the central curriculum, not to appraise its
components. One teacher said, “I am not in a position to evaluate or criticise the
national curriculum; there is an expert or experts to do it”. If they found some
ambiguity or something not understandable, they said it was their task to make it clear
and understandable, but if some materials or information was confusing, they said they
would have to report to the head teacher, who in turn should report it through the long
bureaucratic ladder. Accordingly the head teacher’s role in such a case is as a filter between teachers and local education authorities and this is one of the head teacher’s communication tasks (Colgate, 1976; Coulson 1976).

Part of the head’s responsibility in a modern school is to share power and facilitate democratic participation in the workplace (Leithwood et al, 2003). Thus teachers were asked whether or not they had any participation in evaluating school performance. Two teachers responded positively, saying they were often asked to discuss school problems and performance. One teacher said sometimes the head or his deputy asked him to share responsibility in evaluating the school performance, and only one teacher said this was not the teachers’ responsibility, but that of the head and his deputies. Generally speaking, most interviewed teachers agreed that they took part in school performance evaluation. This suggests that Saudi heads’ practice is in line with Campbell and Southworth’s (1992) assertion that when the head works as part of a team or creates organisational culture, staff in the collaborative school will accept the head’s authority and develop a sense of “positive enforcement”.

Within the same context, the teachers were asked if they participated in dealing with problems. All the teachers claimed that they were not asked specifically to deal with a certain problem, but they might be consulted during the regular weekly meeting, where all members of staff express their opinions on all school problems. Accordingly the power-sharing seems to be artificial, not genuine, at least in school problem-solving. The results indicated that some head teachers would not like to undermine their authority. As one teacher said, by asking teachers or members of staff to share responsibility for every single matter in the school, heads would risk criticism that they were weak and unable to run the school in the right way. This result contradicts Spillane et al (2005), Whitaker (1998), and Mulford and Silins, (2005), who asserted that the school leadership should establish trust and a collaborative climate and that leadership can be stretched across the practice or as Whitaker (1998) called “multi-layered leadership” (p146).

The teachers interviewed in general indicated that the head teachers in their schools fairly distributed the responsibility among the members of staff, but still there were some areas that need to be power-shared more often, such as consulting teachers on school problem-solving or appraisal of school performance. Having said that, the heads seemed to show little interest in forming a multi-layer leadership.
5.3.4 Conclusion

The interview schedule was designed to assess the head teacher’s role in Saudi primary schools. It was directed to the head teacher (one case), deputies (four cases) and teachers (four cases). The outcomes revealed that the interviewed individuals had only minor differences in their opinions. The majority unanimously agreed that the head teacher is the main character to run the school, as indicated in the literature. The head teacher has to run the school according to the plan prescribed by the central education authorities, making the children’s learning his first priority, while he is working to achieve the school’s other objectives. The Saudi education system has no governors to be consulted or review the achievement and problems with him. The head has a clear objective, prescribed instructions to follow from the central authorities, flexible response and a narrow view of sharing power or creating multi-layered leadership in school. The deputies interviewed also revealed that the head teachers are flexible, accountable and fair, have a clear vision of the school objectives, and share responsibility. On the other hand, they are civil servants working for the government and that gives them only a small margin of initiative and little scope to make desirable change, especially in the field of the curriculum. The teachers interviewed disclosed that the head teacher rules the school with a vision of the school’s objectives to some degree, is flexible and responsible, but has a narrow vision of sharing power or creating multi-layered leadership. Sharing power in particular does not occur in practice, because heads may think that power-sharing would undermine their authority – thus they made only limited moves in this direction. The head is a clerk working for the government, so he has very limited options in terms of the school finance, external change and the curriculum.

5.4 Summary and Conclusion

This part of chapter 5 was concerned with data analysis of the questionnaire. The questionnaire, as we have seen, comprised six sets of questions. In the first set “managing pupils”, the data revealed that the head teachers were well aware of the significance of power sharing and joint responsibility, as most head teachers claimed they shared responsibility and worked as a team with their deputies, their teachers and
other staff. In the second set of questions, “managing teachers and other staff”, the heads seemed to work closely with their deputies, as we saw in question one, “dealing with teachers’ absence, where the heads and deputies had nearly similar scores, fifty-fifty responsibility, which reflects, that although the heads are responsible for managing school, it is impossible for them to do everything by themselves. However, it appears that in a case like “staff development”, the head teachers take such responsibility on their own or decide who needs improvement, training or development. A similar result appeared in relation to getting specialised teachers for special educational needs. This result was systematically repeated wherever there is an important issue such as contacting the Ministry of Education, planning school work, or holding a meeting with members of the local community, while other responsibilities the head can share with the deputy and other staff. The conclusion from that is that the head teachers in their own eyes are responsible directly or indirectly for all the school activities, they fairly share power with others and work as team leaders as well as administrators. However, heads’ responsibility may be seen in the eyes of their deputies or teachers in a different way, as we shall see in the next part, and as one deputy claimed “We do all the school tasks while the head only plays with his computer or makes phone calls.” This is hidden role conflict which we try to avert in order to concentrate on the head’s responsibilities and school management.
Chapter Six

Summary, Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research

6.1. Summary

This study has explored the role of the head teacher in Saudi primary schools. Apart from chapter one which focused on the problem of the study, its importance, the study questions and the study location, the rest was directly related to the head teacher's role. An overview of the Saudi educational system's development was presented as a background that paved the way to the literature review and the empirical procedures. The Saudi educational system was shown to have developed dramatically in the last few decades. Before the establishment of modern Saudi state in 1934, it was very poor and confined to reading, writing and simple arithmetic. In 1935, the first Education Directorate was established to administer a national educational system and for the first time a modern national curriculum for primary education saw the light. In 1953 the Education Directorate was replaced by the Ministry of Education. Over twenty years, the education system developed and expanded dramatically in terms of quantity. Thousands of new schools opened, new teachers were employed and new facilities provided. The quantitative development after 1970 took steady steps, the main focus being on qualitative improvement in terms of curriculum, teaching methods, pedagogy and in-service training with special focus on Saudization of the system, through qualifying more Saudi teachers. Little attention was paid to girls’ education until 1960 when the Presidency of Girls’ Education was established to supervise girls’ education in the country. The educational system structure consists of four major stages; pre-school education covers age 3-5, primary education covers age group 6-11, secondary education covers age group 12-17 and higher education is for those aged 18 and over. Educational is still not compulsory, but free of charge for all stages, from pre-school to university.

The schools curriculum was setup to be in line with Arabic and Islamic cultural heritage. The curriculum has been subject to regular revision and modified several times. The test and examination system is based on monthly class tests, and examinations in the middle of the scholastic year and at the end of the year. To pass, pupils must attain 50% or over, otherwise they would repeat the year.
The Saudi educational system still encounters serious problems such as truancy, difficulty coping with children’s different abilities, shortage of school buildings and building maintenance, lack of school equipment and facilities, besides some deficiencies of teachers’ performance, a centralized system and weakness of the school-family relationship.

Accordingly, the Saudi educational authorities diagnosed these problems and put forward new regulations for choosing head teachers in order to overcome these problems. According to the Ministry of Education regulations, the head teacher should hold a basic university qualification or over, preferably postgraduate MEd and Phd, should have worked as a deputy head for at least five years and should pass the interview.

This background chapter paved the way to discuss the literature in relation to the head teacher role. The literature discussed the head teacher's role under two headings; as a manager and as a leader. Both strongly emphasized the head teacher’s personality, qualification and experience. Although some pay more attention to the personal traits than others, in the end both have significant impact.

As a manager, the emphasis was that the head's role is a "more or less" managerial responsibility. This view was derived from studies of the managerial experience in business and industry which proved its effectiveness. Many writers have suggested that schools as organizations share common ground with other economic organizations in terms of control communication, departmental autonomy and budget determination. As a manager the head teacher should share power and maintain good relations with his/her staff to run the school with minimum obstacles.

The literature presented good reasons behind the rise of the managerialism approach in school. These were either political or structural reasons or ideological reasons. Such an approach emphasized "more should be done for less" as an indication of fast and radical change that could be done to integrate the school components in order to achieve better outcomes. The new managerial approach tried to replace the old fashioned, traditional professional and collegial solidarity, coordination and integration, by a mechanical system that segmented and personalized responsibilities.

The new approach adopted the business terms such as "input" and "output" to be used in school organization. Scholars in this matter asserted that the school "input" can easily be
measured, but the "output" is very hard to measure, since the school is a non-profit organization. Nevertheless, the management philosophy aimed to encourage ordinary individuals to do extraordinary things without undermining the head's authority and responsibility. Gene and Morgan (1992) developed six tasks that could be used as criteria for any successful management in school organization. These were; assessing performance of the staff, helping teachers to identify their potential and improve their career prospects, identify those who need training and improving school management. However, the managerial role of the head became essential since the 1980s and the head teacher was conceptualized as leading professional and chief executive.

On the other hand, a team of scholars such as Fullan (1992), Hughes (1985) Hargreaves (2005) and Lambert (2005), taking the approach of the head teacher as a leader, emphasized that the head has always been a central figure in leading professional staff and a powerful agent for change.

The literature has strongly linked effective leadership and effective school. According to this perspective, the learning organization become more and more sophisticated, requiring the effective leader not to run the school by himself, but rather to hand over power to deputies and other staff, while focusing on general goals.

The discussion went on to consider specific roles of the head, notably managing changes. The point was made that in an in educational environment, as in all social aspects, change is difficult. School leaders need to assimilate outside changes or create inside changes to adapt to the circumstances that surround schools and affect all the school components. This includes reacting to the human side of changes, not only the changes that are intentionally made as part of educational reform. Human changes may affect the school more than internal factors and could test the moral nature of the school leader. The responsibility of the head could go further to cover the quality of teaching and staff performance and to setup a system of INSET for teachers to keep them up-to-date.

Following the review of literature, consideration was give to the research methods to be used for the field work. Following a short review of the quantitative-qualitative methods of collecting data in descriptive studies and their advantages and disadvantages, a mixed – methods approach was adopted. A questionnaire was used with a closed-ended design. The questionnaire covered three main areas; personal information; the head's main responsibilities, and sharing responsibilities.
The questionnaire was complemented by semi-structured interviews with a head teacher, four deputy heads and four teachers.

The data collection lasted about two months. The raw data was transferred to the computer and the outcomes can be summarized as follows:

The questionnaire: The first group of questions related to "managing pupils". The data revealed that most respondents admitted that managing pupils’ absence was the responsibility of the deputy head, while the head took the lead in the "managing educational progress" and the teachers lead "managing behaviour and discipline" and "managing rewards".

In the second group at questions "management of teachers", the head had the deputy were reported to have the main role in "managing teachers' absence", while the information put the head teacher in the lead for "managing staff development" and "special educational needs" as well as "rewarding teachers".

In the third group at questions, "school building and content maintenance”, the deputy was said to have the main responsibility for "supervising and control repairs and maintenance of the school", and the head for "budget spending decisions" and "order supplies for school".

In the fourth group of questions, "curriculum decisions", teachers took the lead in relation to "introducing new teaching methods", and "introducing new technology", while the head teacher was said to dominate in "exam and test decision making" and "extra curricular education" as well as "planner of weekly time–table" and "school work".

In relation to other activities, such as meetings with teachers, contacting local educational authorities, local community and parents, finalizing the school annual reports and so on, the information revealed that these responsibilities were shared between head teachers and their deputies.

The head teacher may be sharing power with others in the learning organization in order to run the school effectively, but even in those areas where the deputy or the teacher have the first-hand responsibilities, the head teacher still watches, observes and controls behind the scenes (indirectly).
To complete the picture, the outcome of the interviews may shed more light on the head’s responsibilities.

The head teacher interview supported the questionnaire outcomes, in relation to the responsibilities of head teacher, deputies and teacher, suggesting that power sharing seems to be the best way to maintain the school organization effectiveness.

The head's priority was said to be management of children's learning, in line with the guidelines of the educational authorities. For the school budget the head indicated that the school had no budget, because all the staff wages and equipment were provided by the central educational authorities.

In relation to managing changes, the strategy is for heads to deal with changes according to their training and the comprehensive strategy of the central educational authorities. Coordination with teachers and supervisors is another aspect of the head teacher's responsibility, which is maintained in order to avoid problems.

The deputy also supported the outcomes of the questionnaire and the head’s interview, as the deputies expressed their opinion on the head's responsibilities and power–sharing in school, which makes the task of the head easier and manageable. The deputies indicated that the head often plans like a factory manager and as a leader then delegates implementation to the deputies and other teaching and non-teaching staff. Nevertheless, the head is still the main player in school development and management, especially when they create a collaborative culture in school.

Teachers’ interviews were another venue to check the head's responsibility. Outcomes showed that most teachers were rarely if ever asked to do administrative roles, which they claimed were the responsibility of the head teacher and his deputies. The teachers admitted that any problem with the curriculum should be reported directly to the head teacher who in turn passed it to the local educational authorities. The teachers in this interview claimed that they were able to share opinions with the head and his deputy but not power. Although teachers have the ultimate power in their classrooms, they do not feel they were decision-making participants. The problem of the heads, they said, was that they would not like to undermine their authority by sharing power, as they might be criticised as weak and unable to run the school properly. It is a cultural norm that works against the modern theory of power-sharing.
6.2 Conclusion

As we reach this part of the study, nothing is left, but to highlight certain points to form our conclusion and interpret the outcomes.

First, we have to understand that the whole study was intended to clarify the head teacher's responsibilities and their role in school development in Saudi Arabia. The study as a whole revealed that the head teachers in Saudi primary schools work in a very strict and complicated milieu; very limited scope is given to them. The centralized educational system and bureaucratic lead makes the head's task harder. However, the empirical investigation revealed that head teacher's work under all circumstances as managers and as leaders to maintain the best learning environment. Their experience and their knowledge may help them to go beyond the restrictions and achieve something beyond the plan.

Second, the outcomes of the study showed that the heads have a great deal of "flexibility" which enables them to adapt and adjust themselves to what the school needs in reality and what the local authority requires; in this manner the head could create changes or adapt to new technology, but maintain the curriculum as it was prescribed. The questioned head teacher and the interviewed deputies and teachers all asserted that the head plays a pivotal role, directly or indirectly, to running the school in times of stability and of change.

Third, the heads in this study showed a reasonable level rate of responsibility toward the children learning, the staff professional development and collaboration.

Fourth, the outcomes indicated that the head is understanding professional power sharing. However, some teachers and deputies claimed that the head tried to keep all the power in his/her hands, power-sharing was used only as a slogan, and in real life the heads are dictators. Despite all these claims, the majority admitted that heads were flexible, collaborative, and used division of labour correctly.

Fifth, heads had clear objectives for the present and the future. This clarity makes the task of the head more reliable and consistent with the local authority and central authority’s general objectives.

On the other hand the head teachers faced some setbacks:
1. Because the head is a civil servant clerk working for the government, he has no choice, but to follow the instructions and act in line with the government policy in implementing the curriculum deploying teachers and other staff.

2. The centralized educational system and the bureaucratic hierarchy gave heads less opportunity to setup their own system and restricts their margin of freedom to undertake initiatives and show creativity.

3. The performance of the heads may differ according to individual differences, experience, and training.

4. Despite some role conflicts between some heads and their deputies, the head still has the upper hand, and he is the most powerful figure in the school.

The general conclusion that can be reached is that head teachers in Saudi Primary Schools are flexible, understanding and responsible, with clear objective vision and team leaders with little margin of freedom of initiatives and creativity.

6.3 Suggestions for Further Research

In the light of the above, we can recommend the following:

1. It is necessary to investigate the other aspects of the head teacher’s role, such as the personal traits, professional qualifications, school culture and administrative management.

2. Study should be conducted of the role of conflict in school, especially between the heads and their deputies, which may affect the process of learning and running the school in an effective way.

3. It is necessary to investigate the independent variables that affect the performance of heads, such as wages, the relationship between the head and the central educational authorities, the methods of choosing the heads and so on.

4. Viewing the head teacher from the viewpoint of the pupils, teachers and non-teaching staff is important to shed light on the effectiveness of the heads.

5. Studying the experience of successful and less successful heads would help to pinpoint the weaknesses and the strengths of the management role of the heads.
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## Appendices

### Appendix A: Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task, Suggestions (assignment)</th>
<th>Head Teacher</th>
<th>Deputy Head Teacher</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Managing pupils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education progresses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour, discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Management of teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting specialist teachers for special ed needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 School Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs, maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order supplies, books, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget spending decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Curriculum decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce new teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce new technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams/ tests decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who does weekly timetable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who plans school work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Who holds meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who deals with community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Ministry (if a problem arises)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who writes reports to parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who writes reports to Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General questions:

Approximate number of pupils in your school? .....................

Number of Deputy Heads in your school? .........................

Approximate number of teachers in your school? ..............

Approximate number of years you have been a Head Teacher? .........

Looking at all your roles/ task as Head,

which role do you like best?

........................................................................................................

which role do you like least?

........................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation in filling this survey.

........................................................................................................

Would you agree to a short interview about the questions in this survey?

Yes......... No........

If yes, please give your name............................................................

and your school..............................................................

Thank you again. Salah Kurdi

SPACE FOR YOUR COMMENTS
Appendix B: Sample Interview Transcripts

Interview with the First Deputy Head Teacher

The deputy head, Mr. (M) is fairly old with glasses, and grey hair. He looked firm with wise judgement and a clear vision of the school’s activities. He welcomed me in his small office and started to talk his long experience with different generations of teachers and students. He said, ‘I understand you are doing postgraduate study abroad. I will be more than happy to help you, because we need profound and systematic studies for developing the educational sector in Saudi Arabia. I thanked him, and we started.

Q. Can you describe your main tasks, as a deputy head?

A. My main tasks as a deputy are to manage and control most of the school’s activities, including, teachers, pupils and other staff. Specifically, I have to set out the school’s time-table, report to the head teacher about the teachers, pupils and other staff/problems, absence, illness and being late, and do some communication with local educational authorities on behalf of the head teacher. Besides all that, I have to pinpoint the problems between teachers and pupils, between pupils themselves, such as bullying, truancy, smoking and so on; and try to find adequate solutions; if not then the head should get involved.

Q. How do you know the limitation of your tasks?

A. We have a clear schedule that determines each member of school’s tasks all over he scholastic year. Dealing with pupils’ problems, for instance, is my field, but teachers’ problems are the job of the head teacher; managing non-classroom activities is the teacher’s job, so by time and accumulated experience everybody in school knows what to do.

Q. Do you take part in school decision-making?

A. Although any decision has to be discussed within the school weekly meeting, and the head often asks teachers and deputies and deputies to give their opinion before taking action, sometimes when the local education authorities, or the Ministry of Education
need rapid answers involving decisions about a wide range of subjects, such as curriculum, school’s needs, financial assessment, the head may take the decision without consultation, but he should inform the school committee. The deputy may take such a decision without consultation in case the head teacher is not available.

**Q.** Do you have a guideline to follow as a deputy?

**A.** The Ministry of Education provides us through the local educational authorities with formal instructions to disclose the general role of each figure in school, but these instructions do not define the deputy’s role. The details will be determined between the head and his deputies. It is the job of the head teacher, who should make a division of labour and outline the task of each figure in school, so we should work as an integrated team.

**Q.** How far can you share responsibilities to evaluate the school’s performance?

**A.** I am working alongside the head teacher. My task is to watch and manage the pupils’ performance, their progress and their weaknesses, as well as their problems and report all that to the head teacher. Teachers should report their progress in implementing the prescribed curriculum and the pupils’ progress. All the reports should be discussed firstly between the head and his deputies, before being discussed in the weekly meeting. Thus, the deputy head is an active player in the evaluation process.

---

**Interview with the Second Deputy Head Teacher**

Mr. (S) is an administrator deputy head. He is still young – in his late twenties or early thirties. He looked firm, confident and serious, pleasant, polite and smiled all the time. After welcoming me in his office, he said, “I have only one hour free, which we can use”. I said, “We don’t need more than that”. So we started immediately to exploit the opportunity.

**Q.** Can you tell me what your main task is as a deputy head?

**A.** My job is to fulfil the school’s commitment towards the children, the community and the local educational authorities. I am working as executive head, working with him, side by side for all aspects of school activities and management.

**Q.** Is there any specific task?
A. As you may be aware, we in the school have to work as a team. Everybody in the school should know his role. The teacher should go to the classroom, prepare lessons and do the test, and the head keeps in touch with the authorities, looking for school’s needs and manages and controls staff activities. The deputy can do both jobs, that of a teacher when another teacher is ill or late or absent, he can do the job of the head when the head is away, and works in between, reports to the head about everything in school.

Q. Do you take part in school’s decision-making?

A. A School as a learning organisation should follow the organisational rules. I mean schools should be managed by teams not individuals. Everybody has a certain role, and we know that from the early beginning, the head teacher holds meetings at the beginning of each scholastic year and makes his policy clear to every member of staff. In case of decisions, most decisions are taken by the head in consultation with the deputy heads. So we pave the road for all decisions that should be taken by the head.

Q. Do you have a guideline to follow as a deputy, or could that be decided between you and the head teacher?

A. Practically, we have a regulation determined by the central educational authorities. These regulations are general, such as, the school should work as a team, integrated, cooperative and coordinate their efforts in order to create good climate for learning. This regulation does not specify the role of any member; thus the head and his deputies would set a framework for the tasks of every member of the school, including the head, his deputies, the teachers and support staff.

Q. How far do you take part in sharing responsibility concerning the evaluation of the school’s performance?

A. We have a regular consulting meeting with the head. I mean me and the other deputy and senior teacher to discuss the school policy in general, where we have succeeded, where we have failed, where we need improvement. Such a meeting would pinpoint the strength and weakness of our performance and underline the areas that need to be modified. So I am at the heart of the school’s evaluation responsibility. In most cases the school committee which consists of the head, his deputies and senior teachers often ask the deputy to watch and report the improvement in certain aspects of the teaching-learning process.
Interview with the Third Deputy Head Teacher

The deputy in this school was Mr. (N), a young man in his early thirties - very smart, very polite and talkative. He invited me to his office and with a cup of tea, we started the interview.

Q. Would you please tell me about your main role in the school?

A. I work side by side with the head teacher, with teachers, social workers and other staff of the school. Although the deputy’s task should complement the head teacher’s task, sometimes I go beyond that to cover teachers in the classroom, or the social worker if the problem is not serious. I could be a receptionist as well, so the deputy seems to be the most important figure in the school.

Q. How do you know the limitations of your tasks?

A. In my job there is no limit. I do everything and anything to maintain the school’s progress. I could replace the head teacher. Indeed, the head teacher does nothing – he only plays on his computer or makes calls. The deputy is the executive head. However, the Ministry of Education defines the head teacher’s roles, the teachers’ roles, but the deputy has no clear definitional roles. That is why the deputy head teacher may go beyond the teachers’ and the head teacher’s role.

Q. Do you take part in school decision-making?

A. The head teacher is responsible for the school’s success or failure before the Ministry of Education. If anything goes wrong, not only will the head be blamed, but his deputies as well. So the head cannot make a decision without profound discussion with his deputies, because they are both in the same boat and both in charge of running the school. Because the deputy is the executive manager, the head should be very keen to consider the deputy’s opinion, and he takes decisions accordingly. Also, most decisions have to be discussed in a meeting that is held on a regular weekly basis, involving teachers, deputies and social workers. If any decision faces objections, then we have to vote, and the head often goes with the majority.
Q. Do you have a guideline to follow as a deputy, or is that decided between you and the head teacher?

A. According to the Ministry of Education’s regulation, the deputy is a head assistant, who could do the job of the head and assist the head to fulfil his objectives. In that case the deputy understands his role without written guideline. We often sit together with the head to determine the task of each member of the school, and the head as an ultimate power of the school may ask the deputy or any other member to help him to do certain job out of the regulation, and everybody would respond positively in order to create integrated organisational behaviour in favour of the children and the school’s objectives.

Q. How far can you share responsibility to evaluate the school’s performance?

A. As you are aware the deputy is the executive manager who deals directly with the schools activities and report to the head teacher about teachers’ performance, curriculum implementation, problems, children’s problems and other staff performance. According to these reports and the deputy’s observation, we discuss the school performance regularly with the head to pinpoint the weakness and try to find fast and adequate solutions. The head teacher can do nothing without his deputies. Thus, the deputy is at the heart of the responsibility. However, the scale of success in school depends on the effective management and effective management depends on how far the other part of the learning organisation is cooperating and coordinating their activities, and that depends on the head’s capability to sort that out practically.

**Interview with the First Teacher**

Q. Does the head teacher ask you to share responsibility?

A. No, but if he does ask, then I will share responsibility in certain areas of the teaching-learning process. I will not, for instance, share responsibility for administrative tasks, such tasks should be given to deputies or the secretary. The teacher shares responsibility in curriculum development, improving the school children’s performance, and discussing the children’s problems.

Q. In case you have a problem with the national curriculum, what do you do?
A. I am a teacher committed to implement the national curriculum, not to discuss its contents. The curriculum is designed centrally by experts, so I don’t think I am entitled to have any objection.

Q. But if you find something, which is not easy to understand by the children?

A. My job is to make it easy to be understood by the children. But if I come with you, and find something ambiguous, I have to report to the head teacher, who is entitled to discuss it with the local educational authority, who can pass it to the central authorities.

Q. Do you have any role in evaluating the school’s performance?

A. No. That is the responsibility of the head teacher and his deputies.

Q. Does the head teacher or his deputies ask you to share responsibility to solve the school’s problems?

A. Through the regular meetings, we discuss all the school’s problems, and we can say our opinion, but I think the head teacher does not want to ask for sharing responsibility in order to maintain his authority and respect.

Interview with the Second Teacher

Q. Do you share responsibility with the head teacher?

A. School is a small society, every single person should be responsible according to the positions they hold. My position as a teacher is as a responsible individual to teach children knowledge, cultural aspects and manner. The head teacher cannot teach and lead, he is in a position of cooperation, coordination and integrated climate through a division of labour in order to achieve the school’s objectives.

Q. In case you have a problem with the national curriculum, what do you do?

A. Very rarely do we face problems with the national curriculum. Firstly, because a committee of experts in education set the curriculum and we trust their ability to design and set a typical curriculum. Secondly, we are not in a position to object, revise or modify the prescribed curriculum. If anything goes wrong, we have to report to the head teacher, and he in turn reports to the local educational authorities, who should report to the Ministry of Education. It is a long bureaucratic way, and eventually they might
consider it, or ignore it. I think they reconsider any problem when it is reported from many schools, and not just one or two.

Q. If you find something ambiguous and not understandable by children?

A. My task is to explain the ambiguity and make it easy, clear and understandable. But in case some subjects or information look confused, we have to report through the long hierarchical ladder.

Q. Do you have any role in evaluating school performance?

A. The head teacher and his deputies are responsible for school’s performance evaluation. They derive their information from observation, the test results and from the problems that may require intervention of the head teacher or his deputies.

Q. Do the head teacher or his deputies ask you to share responsibility in solving school problems?

A. No, they do not. But through the regular weekly meeting we discuss most school problems and we may give our opinions and suggestions. The head teacher may or may not take them into consideration. He is the person in charge of finding the best solution.

**Interview with the Third Teacher**

Q. Does the head teacher ask you to share responsibility?

A. In a learning organisation we should work as a team to achieve the organisation’s objectives. Although the head teacher has not asked me directly to share responsibility, but I am in a position to be a responsible person. I teach children, listen to their problems, teach them to behave in line with our cultural values and help them to overcome their difficulties in school and outside. In practice, we understand our roles in school and act accordingly. So we, teachers, administrators, head teacher and others, work in an integrated team. Do I need to be asked to share responsibility when I am at the heart of the responsibility?

Q. In case you have a problem with the national curriculum, what do you do?

A. In fact I had some problems with the prescribed curriculum, where some ideas contradicted and some ideas were confusing. I reported them to the head teacher, who in
turn reported to the curriculum directorate in the Ministry of Education. They took a while before they revised and modified the problems, but I am sure there were other teachers who reported as well. However, whenever we have similar problems, we usually report them immediately to the head teacher.

Q. Do you have any role to evaluate school’s performance?

A. This is a collective responsibility, and we always have a meeting with the head and his deputies to discuss the school’s performance. There we forward our opinions about the weaknesses of the school’s performance, and put forward the possible solutions.

Q. Does the head teacher or his deputies ask you to share responsibility in solving the school’s problems?

A. No. This is particularly the responsibility of the head and his deputies. They might sometimes find it better to deal with the problems without involving teachers, who have different tasks and responsibilities. But sometimes we find ourselves at the heart of the school’s problems, and we have to take part in solving them. But often, the head and his deputies are in charge of dealing with school’s problems.

**Interview with the Fourth Teacher**

Q. Does the head teacher ask you to share responsibility?

A. In the regular weekly meeting, the head teacher keeps saying to everybody in this school has his responsibility to help achieve our school’s objectives. This speech is general and obvious, so every member of the school understands his role and act accordingly. I am a teacher and I know what to do to keep my job and to maintain my profession, but in terms of administrative responsibility I am not involved in such responsibility and I wouldn’t like to be in this position.

Q. In case you have a problem with the national prescribed curriculum, what would you do?

A: First, as you said, it is prescribed, imposed from the top so we are never being asked to discuss the curriculum, its effectiveness or weakness, we only are only allowed to implement it.
**Q:** What if you find something ambiguous?

**A:** If something is difficult to understand by children I have to explain it, but if there is something I can’t understand or it is contradictory, then I have to report it to the head teacher, who is supposed to report it directly or through the local education authorities to the Ministry of Education. But such a thing has never happened in my career lifetime.

**Q:** Do you have any participation to evaluate the school’s performance?

**A:** I do not, because it is the job of the head teacher and the deputy heads. They often report a positive learning environment and give a bright picture about the school’s performance even when the school’s performance is below standard. It is, as one head teacher said a ‘self-defence mechanism’.

**Q:** Do the head teacher or deputies as you to share responsibility to solve problems of the school?

**A:** Sometimes they ask me or my colleagues about our opinions on certain problems, especially when there is a problem between teachers and pupils, teachers and members of support staff, a teacher with another teacher. But they ask my opinion not to consider it, but like collecting information and use it to solve the problem. Also, in the regular weekly meeting we discuss all the school’s problems and we give our opinions, which may or may not be taken into consideration.