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ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study is to analyze the performance in context of student learning of principals in public sector and private sector schools. For this purpose five main domains were used as variables are: 1) teaching, learning and professional growth, 2) Inter-personal and inter-professional relationship and collaboration, 3) Parent and faculty involvement in decision making, 4) Vision and values, 5) Innovation and change. The population for this study was selected randomly. The target sample was belonged to post-primary and secondary schools. Thus the results summarized different findings. Principals perform more effectively in private sector schools as compare to public schools.
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In early 1900s a principal was perceived as a colleague of teachers whose responsibilities were just around a class house and nothing else. As the time passed the nature of role of principal varied and become stronger, after the unions of 1970s the role has shifted from classroom personnel to a representative of administration. Principal is responsible for the whole administrative system of school. Being an administrator he always seems so busy with his responsibilities. He does not have time to practice the change, innovations in systems and leadership practices. Often he works out on all techniques and strategies without training and practice. So it is necessary to evaluate principal leadership and principal performance as well because at present we find today’s principals suffering from very challenging and hectic situations regarding their position. He has very limited time to do the whole tasks. He has to do everything like “goal setting, vision establishment, creation of an effective learning environment for students and teachers, staff management, support system arrangement for student learning, assembly of community, classroom instructional system, professional development of teachers for learning improvements, parent involvement, external links for advocacy of resources, innovation and commitment”. According to a report of the “Institute of Educational Leadership” sharing leadership is workable term too. Sharing leadership involves parents, teachers, and other community leaders in decision making by principal. This study moves around five domains are following: a) teaching, learning and professional development, b) inter-personal and inter-professional relationships between teachers and principals c) decision making with parents and teachers, d) vision and values, e) innovation and change. These all factors are important to make a perfect educational system in schools.

Research Problem

We are moving in the world of globalization. Competition is increasing minutely. This time is much innovative. Global world is working on strategies, new learning policies, leading styles in educational system sharply. In this 21st century we are still facing a lack of improvements and level in our schooling system. This problem is directly related with principal-ship. Our principal recruitment system is just as it was in early 80s and 90s. We look a “White Male” who is 50 plus as a principal and not pay attention that either he is compatible for the new leadership styles or not and if he can play leadership roles successfully. Often the principals meet with rigid duty timing and not play their part for student learning and staff development or face failure to create a balance. This situation might be due to lack of proper practice or training of up to date changes. In this study we will check out that either today’s principals play the representative role as leaders or not and in which sector the results are more pleasing. We will find out the difference of principal-ship between public sector and private sector schools that where the gap exist?

Objective of Study

To evaluate the principal’s performance of public and private sector schools in terms of leadership styles necessary to achieve significant improvements in student learning.

Research Questions

i. In which principals promote teaching, learning, and professional development for student achievements?

ii. In which sector principals build inter personal and inter professional relationships with teachers?

iii. In which sector principals share their decisions with teachers, parents, and others?

Literature Review

The person charged with management and leadership for a high school to include principals and assistant principals and/or administrators assigned to a secondary school. Teachers teach in schools that are administered by managers known as principals. School administration is one of the large administration units. Teacher’s performance is influenced by the leadership provided by the principals. School leadership influences the effectiveness of teachers and student’s achievement outcomes, Hallinger and Murphy, (1986); OECD, (2001); Pont, Nusche and Moorman, (2008). Sach (1995) stated that favorable environment affects the teacher’s work performance. A report of Tirozzi, (2001), Volante, Cherubini, & Drake, (2008) stated that some principals find their job very stressing and challenging and have lack of time to do their work. The evidence of CBR (2007) suggests that the attitudes of teachers towards principals are changing regarding their responsibilities.

Principal is backend leader in schools. Obi (2002) noted that being an instructional leader the principal must pay attention to the programs of teaching, learning, and professional development staff improvement, class visitation, observations, conferences, seminars, workshops, professional associations, inter-personal and inter-professional relationships, and educational programs. Implementation of instructional leadership can move forward the knowledge of teachers and could
make possible teaching and learning by getting student achievement outcomes. The main role of the school administrator is to facilitate teaching and learning and they found a close relationship between principal’s instructional leadership and teachers work performance... Sergiovanni (1996) revealed that transfer of knowledge about teaching and learning and ability to share with teachers and students is a key role of principal-ship. Hargreaves, (2009) & Volante, (2008) revealed according leadership theories that some principals deal with little professional development support. Ogbodo and Ekpo (2005), citing California Commission on Teachers’ Credentialing noted that education is the major foundation for the future strength of this country. Principals have the ability to change the perceptions of teachers. When the teachers begin to feel that they are a part of school’s mission and vision they work collaboratively and that resulted in the form of strong interactions with principals.

Principal is responsible for building and sustaining of inter-personal relationship with teachers and to promote trust and communicative behavior, (Gimbel, 2003). In a survey of 2010 it is viewed that some post-primary principals do not visit class rooms. Daily inter-personal relations increase trust and support from teacher’s side ahead. Inter-personal and inter-professional relationships should build among teachers and principals. Miller (2001) defines inter-professional education (IPE) as different professions learning about topics of mutual interest, rather than about each others’ roles. Inter-professional education in the workplace can sometimes involve participants from the same team or unit. This can be difficult to arrange, when services must be maintained, but does enable them to share objectives and to work together to effect immediate change or improvement that can readily be observed by all. Each of these types of inter-professional education may cultivate collaboration in different ways. According to a survey weak inter-personal and inter-professional relationships prevent teachers and principals to work together.

Parental participation is highly matter in school administrative system and student learning no matter the child is in early schooling or a graduate from college, (Epstein, 1991; Henderson, & Berla. 1994; Liontos, 1992; Reynolds, et al., 1991; Zellman, G.L., & Waterman, J.M., 1998). Parental involvement finally resulted in case of a) higher grades and test scores, b) better attendance c) more positive attitude and behavior d) greater enrollment in post- secondary schools, (Clark, R., 1993; Griffith, J., 1996; Dauber, S.L. & Epstein J.L., 1993). Parental issues are another area of great concern, especially during these times when parents demand schools adequately prepare their children (Cotton & Wikeland, 2001). Thus, it is important for principals and various faculty groups, i.e. teachers, to work together for mutual support. In addition, the manner in which faculty members worked together as a group significantly influenced student outcomes in schools (Wheelan & Kesselring, 2005). Research exists which concludes that some aspects of school social environment clearly make a difference in the academic achievement of schools (Brookover et. al., 1978).

Students experience more academics and success when their parents participate in their schooling. Parents who are well informed and involved in their children’s schooling they experience a positive attitude and outcomes in their study, Epstein (2001). Parental involvement is ignored at high school levels today. Research has shown that as the student grow older the parent involvement decline and at a time just few parents remain in contact with student performance and academics at secondary schools, (Stouffer, as cited in Lebahn, 1995). A research by (Connors & Epstein, as cited in Phelps, 1999; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Simon, 2001) demonstrated that continuous participation of parents remains the best interest for student. Starratt (1995) stated that vision is a key and an active source of leadership. Fullan, (2002) articulated that effective school leaders (principals) are key to enlarge and sustain education. Being a visionary leader a principal inspires, challenges, guides and empowers. He establishes goals and objectives and must actively work to realize them. In visionary leadership he defines not what we are but what we seek to be and do. In this process the principals are forced to look inward and outward simultaneously. They also understand their schools, nature, needs, strengths, limitations of their staff members and desired achievable goals.

Principals are expected to create and cultivate a vision for the purpose of instructional leadership (inter-personal and inter-professional relationships, teaching and learning outcomes) and community leadership (vision, values, parental involvement, decision making) and to communicate the vision to teachers, students, and the community. Discussing this vision Bredeson (1985) wrote: Broadly conceived, vision is the principal’s ability to holistically view the present, to reinterpret the mission of the school to all its constituents, and to use imagination and perceptual skills to think beyond accepted notions of what is practical and what is of immediate application in present situations to speculative ideas and to, preferably, possible futures (pp. 43–44). The teachers and principals must engage other leaders and faculty to develop a vision about school that what the school must do. Empowered principals become directly responsible for engaging faculty and parental...
involvement in improvement plans of school and student learning outcomes.

Innovation is a key factor that principals often avoid. A survey in 2009 showed that some principals feel they cannot move with innovation. As per evidence from teachers, they feel happy to involve themselves in change and for well being of student’s achievement goals by understanding innovation needs. Today’s principal is perceived to provide effective instructional leadership to assist the staff to participate in provision of quality education by accepting the change and innovation.

Hypothesis Development

Instructions are key factor for teaching, learning, and professional development as well. Either the concerned person is teacher or student. Learning and understanding is necessary for both, a principal being a good instructor can convey the knowledge to teachers and successfully build inter-personal and inter-professional relationship. As a result of research in Ireland’s primary and post-primary schools the scenario was seen that there was a lack of inter-personal and inter-professional relationship among school administrator and community. Principal is responsible to do these tasks.

Hypothesis 1: a) People believe teaching, learning and professional development is higher in private sector schools.

b) People believe teaching, learning and professional development is higher in public sector schools.

Hypothesis 2: a) People believe inter-personal and inter-professional relationships are more strong in private sector schools.

b) People believe inter-personal and inter-professional relationships are more strong in private sector schools.

Hypothesis 3: a) Sharing decision making with teachers, parents and others is implementing in manner by principals of private sector schools.

b) Sharing decision making with teachers, parents and others is implementing by principals of public sector schools.

Hypothesis 4: a) Vision and values are more frequently applying in private sector schools.

b) Vision and values are more frequently applying in public sector schools.

Hypothesis 5: a) Innovation and change is sharply adopted by private sector school principals.

b) Innovation and change is sharply adopted by public sector school principals.

Research Findings

Gender demographics

Results of table exemplified that the principals of public and private schools are in general of male’s category (n=50 or 100 %), marital status was same (n=50 or 100...
50%, were belonged from private schools and 50% from public. All were the principals of one school, (n=50 or 100%). The age limit was in between of 45-55 which clears that age factor matters for implementation of strategic revolutions. Respondents have post graduate degree (n=25 or 49.9%), have experience in their field more than 5 years and less than 10 (n=25 or 49.9%).

Table 1: Gender demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Study Sample</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having responsibilities of more than one school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant experience</td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private School Analysis

The results of female entrepreneurs in table indicated that teaching, learning and professional development is a significant element to evaluate principal where \( \beta = .780 \), \( \text{Sig} = .000 \) and it is positively and directly influence performance evaluation. Innovation where \( \beta = .187 \), \( \text{sig} = .437 \) and it is also directly affect performance of principal. Likewise inter-personal and inter-professional relationship is also important for principals and it is positively and directly influences principal-ship. According to the results of IPR & IPR (\( \beta = .247 \), \( \text{sig} = .301 \)). Two other elements are excluded from this research because of a causal relationship with an error term.

Public School Analysis

The table shows that teaching, learning and professional development is neglected in public schools. For this domain \( \beta = -0.147 \) and significance level is 0.539 and hypothesis is rejected. The results for inter-personal and inter-professional relationship shows direct and positive image of performance (\( \beta = -.518 \), \( \text{sig} = .087 \)). Parent involvement and Innovation is another end where the performance lagged behind and results shows significance level as .695 and .971. In case of creating vision and values the results are positive (\( \beta = .567 \), \( \text{sig} = .074 \)).

Hypothesis 1:

a) People believe teaching, learning and professional development is higher in private sector schools.

b) People believe teaching, learning and professional development is higher in public sector schools.

ANOVA

The research findings for first hypothesis shows that the level of principal performance in context of “informative learning styles, teacher’s professional development, student achievement outcomes, facilitation to staff, freedom for instructional leadership style and skills of teachers “ rated at high extent in private schools as compare to public schools. The ANOVA test
explained the level of significance (private = .000 highly effective) and (public = .853 need much attention in this factor).

**Hypothesis 2:**

a) People believe inter personal and inter professional relationships are more strong in private sector schools.

b) People believe inter personal and inter professional relationships are more strong in private sector schools.

Results of second hypothesis express that, inter-personal and inter-professional relationship building is almost same in both sectors. Principals are not supportive for teacher’s discussions, face-to-face teacher’s meetings, parents and teacher’s meetings, independent experimentation, classroom visitations and mutual collaboration system. Level of significance in results is (private= .556 rejected) and (public= .516, rejected).

**Hypothesis 3:**

a) Sharing decision making with teachers, parents and others is implementing in manner by principals of private sector schools.

b) Sharing decision making with teachers, parents and others is implementing by principals of public sector schools.

This table measures that; principals in private sector schools are not efficient in case of parental participation, decision making at administrative level with staff involvement, provision of new ideas to parents and to inform parents with student’s curriculum activities. So the level of significance at (private= .556 rejected) and (public= .467 rejected).

**Hypothesis 4:**

a) Vision and values are more frequently applying in private sector schools.

b) Vision and values are more frequently applying in public sector schools.

In this hypothesis we see a high significance in both sectors. Principals perform well in creation of vision, problem solving at elementary level, psychological needs assessment of staff and make possible team learning. Significance shows (private= .156 high performance) and (public= .289 high extent of performance).

**Hypothesis 5:**

a) Innovation and change is sharply adopted by private sector school principals.

b) Innovation and change is sharply adopted by public sector school principals.

This test supports to private sector as the level of significance is .249 and the principals of public fail in practice of new techniques for change, focus for opportunities, proven innovative strategy implementations and communication to outside community

**Conclusion**

From the evidence of this research one thing which is observed according standard is that our public sector of schooling is still suffering. Demographics of this study resulted that age and education two main factors contribute to make a principal effective. Principals who fall in age group below 55 and up to 25 years are comparatively ore decisive, visionary, and innovative
find in private schools in higher ratio. Majority of respondents regarding this study holding post graduate degree which shows that higher education have relationship with effective performance.

The results analyzed by this research explained that in all domains of principal performance evaluation, the principal of public sector schools is less efficient, less innovative, not rely on learning, teaching, and professional development strategies. Not just it is, some failures have seen in private sector too. For instance, inter-personal and inter-professional relationships are weaker in both sectors (private and public). These failures directly affect student learning. Our basic purpose of this study was to check out the level of significance in performance and the extent of student learning. An administrator who successfully meets with these efforts can create openness in school culture. Such climate attracts the visitors and community stackers which leads school administration beyond the limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal performance dimensions</th>
<th>Mean private</th>
<th>Std dev private</th>
<th>Mean public</th>
<th>Std dev public</th>
<th>Interpretation private</th>
<th>Interpretation public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching, learning and professional growth</td>
<td>4.5±1.3</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-personal and inter-professional relations</td>
<td>4.5±1.5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing decision making with teachers and parents</td>
<td>4.5±1.5</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>4.5±1.5</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and values innovation and change</td>
<td>4.5±1.5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.5±1.5</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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