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Abstract

This study examines the effect of instructional supervisory role of the Head of Departments on teachers’ job performance. More specifically, the study was conducted to obtain an understanding on how the Head of Department supervisory role is perceived, and how it affects the instructional development and job performance of private secondary school teachers in private secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Data for this quantitative research was collected via the distribution of a questionnaire among 100 teachers from private secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur. The 5-Likert-scale questionnaire was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings of this study indicate that there is a significant relationship between teacher’s perception on the instructional supervision role of the Head of Department and improving teachers’ job performance from various aspects including teaching practices, professional competencies and motivation. All the findings have signify positive relationship on how the good qualities and roles of the Head of Department will instill difference towards better changes in achieving better job performance among teachers in the schools. In short, this study reveals that it is important for the Head of Departments in schools to play the role of instructional leader as it possesses good characteristics in enhancing better teaching and learning for both leaders and the subordinates. In this regard, both the Head of Departments and the teachers are able to develop and create a platform for teaching and learning, and this will also indirectly develop the teachers’ teaching practices, competency and motivation. As a result, good leaders influence their subordinates and encourage them towards better job performance.
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Contribution/Originality

Finally, this study contributes in the existing literature by providing a detailed account on instructional leadership and supervisory as well as schools’ Head of Departments role regarding teachers’ job performance. This is an original study that was conducted to obtain a clearer understanding about teachers’ perceptions on Head of Departments’ supervisory role.
1. Introduction

Instructional supervision includes various roles and responsibilities that entail technical, professional and interpersonal aspects (Weller and Weller, 2002). It also includes strategies and actions to improve conditions for the teaching and learning process (Daresh et al., 2000).

For schools to be effective, they need to look for opportunities to increase the professional development and job performance of teachers for the betterment in managing the teaching and learning process, and this can be done through supervision (Aron and Ogbadu, 2010). Hence, when taking on the responsibilities of a supervisor, the Head of Departments play an important role in promoting and developing the learning and professional growth of teachers. Head of Departments can be a major source of reliance and support for teachers when it comes to addressing issues and problems related to the teaching and learning process and instructional development. As such, it would be fitting to look into how the role of the Head of Departments as an instructional leader related to instructional supervision, will help teachers perform their jobs better.

With the technological boom of the 21st Century, school environments have become increasingly complex and diverse. Children are expected to learn and acquire knowledge and skills that will help them obtain success in school and life. High learning standards are set for them to achieve educational success. This in turn has placed high demand on educational leaders. Not only do they need to have knowledge on school management and finance, it is now imperative for them to develop instructional leadership skills to promote effective teaching and high level learning which comes with their ability to not only to be able to recognize and assume shared responsibility for students’ intellectual and educational development, but also their personal, social, emotional and physical development (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Chan Yuen and Gurnam Kaur, 2009).

The issue of leadership at school level will always be brought up whenever there are issues related to the success or failure of an educational system, especially when it comes to instructional practices in schools and how they reflect educational policies (Yukl, 2010). Hussein Mahmood (1993) said that leadership is of great interest to parents, administrators and policy makers and supporting this is when Krug (1992) said that for schools to be effective, the quality of leadership plays an important role in it.

School leadership is important as not only are they accountable for the school's academic performance, they play an important role towards realising the country’s educational vision. If school leaders are unable to carry out their roles effectively, they will not be able to motivate the teachers or take advantage of their knowledge and experience, and this may affect their ability to motivate students to excel in their education (Chan Yuen and Gurnam Kaur, 2009). Ponnusamy (2010) believes that school leadership greatly influences the teachers, who in turn have a direct influence on students’ achievement. Leaders who can provide the necessary leadership when managing the teachers’ performance can have a large impact on their school’s work environment and if the impact is positive, it may lead to teachers practicing and displaying desired behaviors in the workplace, especially in their commitment towards the school organizations (Hallinger and Heck, 1996a; Ponnusamy, 2010). Weber (1996) proved this in a study when he explained to increase teachers’ commitment towards the schools; leaders need set high expectation on teachers’ performance. Hence, for teachers to become more committed to the school, school leaders need to practice effective leadership behavior. When discussing the concept of supervision in Malaysia, many teachers still perceive it as a form of inspection. Many teachers have yet to distinguish between the concept of inspection and instructional supervision. The first is a form of controlled assessment and evaluation method to ensure the improvement on the standards of schools, whilst the latter focuses more on providing continuous guidance, support and feedback for teachers to develop professionally and to also improve on the teaching and learning process in school (Kruskamp, 2003; Tyagi, 2010). This is because teachers still view supervision as a form of “inspection” tool where an external party will enter their classroom and play the role of observing, examining and assessing teachers on their teaching practices (Mpofu, 2003). They see the supervisor’s role as an inspectorate, examiner and evaluator, rather than a source of guidance and support. This has been teachers’ perception towards supervision. This study is intended to investigate whether teachers perceive the instructional supervisor’s role as a source for improving job performance or an encumbrance for growth.

In Malaysia, the role of the instructional leader is much stressed upon especially with the implementation of the Integrated Curriculum for Secondary Schools (KBSM) where school leadership were required to provide curriculum leadership, which essentially refers to instructional leadership (Hussein Mahmood, 1993). Moreover, most principals and head teachers of private schools hold multiple roles and are responsible for the schools’ management and...
administration, finance, marketing, operation and academic matters. However, most private schools would also have heads of department to help them with academic matters and are responsible for the smooth running of their respective departments. Lim Hui (2010) observed that the capabilities of a Head of Department as an instructional leader are most vital in determining the success of the department. To what extent does the Head of Department play the role of instructional leadership? Does this role include instructional supervision?

Educational supervision is not something new in Malaysia but has been in practice since the British colonial days (Mohd Salleh, 2000). In the Malaysian educational system, the concept of supervision varies for different educational organisations. Supervision on teaching colleges and university conduct supervision to evaluate trainee teachers for their practical teaching. The Ministry of Education has a school inspectorate that conducts supervision for assessing teaching activities, organising function, allocation of resources and overall management of the school, and consequently, offer recommendations for school improvement. At school level, supervision is usually done by the school’s senior team management and their duties are usually to give support and guidance for teachers to upgrade their teaching performance, provide motivation and boost teachers’ morals (Yunus et al., 2012).

This study seeks to investigate the perceptions of teachers on the instructional supervisory role and responsibilities of the Head of Departments from the aspect of developing teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. Looking into these three aspects will give a better understanding on how teachers view the Head of Departments as instructional supervisors and leaders, and if their perceptions on the role and responsibilities of the Head of Department as a supervisor encourage professional growth and improved job performance in school. Instructional supervision plays an important role to the development of education and thus, it is pertinent to establish how teachers perceive supervision and the role of supervisors in schools.

1.1. Instructional Supervisory and Teacher’s Performance

Lashway (2002) refers to the leader who provides feedback and monitors as a ‘facilitative leader’, as same as the Head of Departments when facilitating and monitoring the teacher’s teaching performance. This is because; he believes that the outcome of continuous monitoring can be seen in the teachers’ performance and the students’ performance. This is the reason why monitoring and providing feedback in the teaching and learning process is one of the variables that characterises instructional leadership.

Similarly, Gamage et al. (2009) indicate that the practice of providing feedback and monitoring have significant impact on the teachers’ and students’ performance. This is due to the Head of Departments who conduct their duty effectively by discussing instructional issues; observation of classroom teaching and providing feedback; giving support to the teacher autonomy and protection of instructional time; monitoring progress by providing and supporting improvement; and using learner progress data for program improvement. Furthermore, (Chang, 2001) suggested that instructional leaders should spend more time in the observation process to help the teachers’ improve their performance. He believes that this will help the teachers’ to focus and enable them to work together in planning curriculum and instruction.

Blase (2004) added that Head of Departments as an instructional leader should encourage communication among the teachers to discuss on their work in an attempt to prevent isolation. He also suggested that instructional leaders should support the teachers by making suggestions, giving feedback; solicit opinions, provide professional development opportunities; and also give praise for effective teaching.

Accordingly, Al-ghanabousi and Idris (2010) stated that teacher appraisal is another form of formal base for the leader to communicate with the subordinates. Therefore, monitoring and providing feedback act as an important element as well in determining the role of the instructional leaders.

2. Statement of Problem

Generally, classroom observations or supervision is viewed as a method to gather information for appraisal purposes. Supervision should be seen as a way to improve the quality of the teaching and learning process and ultimately improve the quality of children’s education by improving on teachers’ effectiveness and job performance (Mpofu, 2007). Mpofu (2007) also stated that supervision in schools work best when it is designed in a cyclical method of preparation, observation and feedback. For this to achieve its desired objectives, it is vital that the supervisor and the supervisee develop continuous communication and work closely before and also after the observation process. It is imperative to understand that teachers’ attitudes and perceptions towards supervision play a major role for the improvement of the teacher leaning process and development of job performance (Fraser, 1980). If teachers do not understand supervision as a process towards promoting professional growth and students’ learning, the notion of supervision will not achieve its purposes. Teachers need to realise that the role of the supervisor is to provide them with guidance and support towards becoming more effective teachers (Wiles and Lovell, 1975). Teachers need to believe that the supervisor is there to help them and not burden them with constraints. Teachers tend to have mixed feelings about supervision as they are mistrustful of “direct supervisory intervention in the classroom” (Cogan, 1973).

However, over the years, the concept of instructional supervision has evolved (Marks, 1985) and teachers have gradually come to understand the modern concept of supervision to be more democratic and fair (Cogan, 1973).

With that view, the current condition of instructional supervision of private schools in Malaysia is as yet relatively unknown subject. Despite needing to adhere to the Ministry of Education’s regulations and procedures for registration and the establishment of a private school, their management is not strictly bound to the Ministry’s as with public schools. Due to the nature of how the management in private schools are not completely bound to the Ministry, very little information can be found or gathered on the practices of instructional supervision in private schools. For that matter, conducting a study related to instructional supervision in private schools in Malaysia would be fresh topic to explore on. It would be worthwhile to investigate how teachers of private schools in Malaysia
perceive the role of instructional leadership and how instructional supervision can contribute to the improvement of teachers’ job performance in school.

3. Theories and the Conceptual Framework

For a supervision system to become successful, it is important to understand how teachers perceive supervision. Previously, supervision has been seen as a process of inspection and evaluation. Kapundu (1990) stated that teachers usually associate instructional supervision with appraisal, rating, and controlling them. Only in recent years has supervision been understood to be a system created to provide support and guidance to teachers for the instructional process. Tyagi (2010) described inspection as a top-down approach concentrating on the assessment and evaluation of school improvement based on standards that have been set, while supervision involves providing guidance, support and continuous assessment to teachers for their professional growth and improving job performance. Alemayehu (2008) described that the major responsibilities of instructional supervisors are: examining and reporting programs, organizing and managing of teaching-learning activities; developing and presenting different methods that can be used to improve instructional programs; guiding and monitoring schools and teachers; preparing and organizing professional development programs such as trainings, workshops and seminars; monitoring and supporting mentoring programs for teachers who have just entered the profession; providing direct assistance and performing instructional and administrative activities in schools with teachers and school management through organizing and carrying out clinical, collegial, peer coaching and cognitive coaching methods of supervision.

Fraser (1980) stated that there is a relationship between supervision and teacher satisfaction where improvement in the teaching learning process relies on the teachers’ attitudes towards supervision. Fraser (1980) noted that teachers need to perceive supervision as a process of promoting professional growth; otherwise the process of supervision will not be effective and bring out the results it wants to achieve. Acheson and Gall (1997) noted that if supervision focuses on teacher appraisal and efficiency, teachers will not perceive supervision as a helpful method for teaching and professional growth. Tshabalala (2013) stated that the hierarchy and burdensome nature of certain supervisory approaches can cause resistance of teachers towards supervision. Acheson and Gall (1997) concluded that teachers are not resistant to supervision but rather to the supervision styles and approaches used. It is important to know how to select and apply models of supervision that can develop trust, autonomy and professional learning culture to achieve improvement in teachers’ job performance and professional growth (Hargreaves and Fullan, 2000).

The main outcome of supervision of to help teachers improve which includes improving on what the teachers already know, their teaching skills and their ability to make informed professional decisions (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2006). Zepeda (2007) stated that it is important to clearly understand the connection between supervision and professional growth and teacher evaluation. Zepeda (2007) also noted that there is a bridge between the various models of supervision and professional development.

If supervision focuses on collegiality and professional development, it can be used as an effective tool for teacher’s professional growth and improved job performance. Nolan and Hoover (2008) noted that instructional supervision that focuses on teacher growth can cause improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning. Continuous improvement in methods and skills is necessary for every professional, and so the professional development of teachers has become highly important (Alfonso and Firth, 1990; Zepeda, 2007; Alemayehu, 2008). From the supervisor’s view point, professional development should focus on “providing teachers with the opportunity and resources they need to reflect on their practice and to share their practice with others” (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2006).

There are many models of supervision. To enhance and improve teacher’s job performance, supervisory practices cannot depend on only one model. This is because each teacher is a different individual and approaches to supervision need to consider and combine the best characteristics of different models so as to assist teachers’ growth and development in their job performance.

Differentiated supervision (Glathorne, 2000) is an approach to supervision where teachers are given options on the kinds of supervisory methods they would like to adopt. This model assumes that all teachers should involve themselves in teacher evaluation, staff development and informal observations to improve instruction, regardless of their experience and competence. This model involves clinical supervision, cooperative development and self-directed development in working towards teacher’s growth (Glathorne, 2000).

Developmental supervision Glickman et al. (1998) is another model that involves three approaches to supervision, which are directive, collaborative and non-directive. This model concentrates on the professional development of the teachers to enhance their job performance (Tyagi, 2010).

The planning and administration of effective staff development programs should result in staff development that promotes school improvement, a school climate and culture supportive of change, and individual and institutional professional learning (Wood and Thompson, 1993). Instructional supervision of teachers should be an important component of an effective, comprehensive teacher professional development program towards improving teachers’ job performance.

Kutsuruha (2003) explained a conceptual framework of instructional supervision where supervisors and teachers need to work as a team of professionals to reach the desired outcomes of supervision in improving learning and classroom instruction. Kutsuruha (2003) further explained that supervision has to be the “glue”, that holds the school together, that is a joint, collaborative effort between the teachers and supervisors.

The role of the supervisors is to enhance the purpose of supervision through using various approaches and strategies on different teachers. It is important to understand that teachers as adult learners have different backgrounds and experiences, different abilities in abstract thinking, and different levels of concern for others (Wiles and Bondi, 1996; Glickman et al., 1998; Beach and Reinhartz, 2000). For supervisors to be effective in their role, they must try to practice a framework that is suitable for the individual needs and characteristics of the teacher. Being able to select and match suitable approaches for individual needs can help towards increasing the motivation and
commitment of teachers at work. Making the right choices in supervisory approaches to suit individual needs and preferences can be difficult but decisions can be made by considering different styles in supervision (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2006).

The conceptual framework model (see Figure 1), shows that the teachers’ perception of the role of the Head of Department as a supervisor can contribute towards effective teaching and ultimately, improving job performance. The role of the Head of Department as a supervisor in the development of teaching practices, professional competency and motivation can assist teachers to become effective and to constantly improve.

Figure-1. Conceptual Framework of the Study

4. Research Objectives

The purpose of this study is to:
I. Determine the perception of private secondary school teachers from private secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur on how the Head of Departments’ role as an instructional supervisor:
   (a) on contributing towards the development of teachers’ teaching practices
   (b) in enhancing teachers’ professional competencies
   (c) on contributing towards teachers’ motivation in their job performance

II. Find out if there is a significant relationship between how private secondary school teachers from private secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur perceive the role of Head of Departments’ as an instructional leader and its influence in improving teachers’ job performance from the aspect of developing teaching practice, professional competency and motivation.

5. Methodology

5.1. Research Design

A quantitative survey using a questionnaire was used to carry out the research in private secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur. Using a questionnaire was appropriate for this study because they can reach a significant number of people in a relatively quick amount of time and with minimal expenditure (Ary et al., 2006). The survey was aimed to provide on the perceptions of private secondary school teachers in Kuala Lumpur regarding the instructional supervisory role of the Head of Department in improving teachers’ job performance, focusing on three key elements: development of teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. The study was conducted to obtain an understanding on how the Head of Department supervisory role is perceived, and how it affects the instructional development and job performance of private secondary school teachers in Kuala Lumpur.

5.2. Sample and Sampling Procedure

Kuala Lumpur has eleven private secondary schools officially registered under the Ministry of Education and the sample was drawn from three of them. The three schools are founded and registered according to the Ministry of Education regulations and were selected using simple random sampling because they are presumed to have a professional code of conduct for teachers that includes a monitoring system in practice for teachers’ job performance. An even distribution was made between the three schools and the respondents involved included 100 teachers who are teaching in those schools. Selection of the sample was made using the simple random sampling method. The three schools were selected from eleven private secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur officially registered under the Ministry of Education. They
are believed to be bound by a professional code of conduct for teachers that include a monitoring system in practice for teachers’ job performance. The respondents selected were made based using the simple random sampling method, where each respondent is chosen entirely by chance and each member of the population has an equal chance of being included in the sample.

A questionnaire was personally handed to each respondent. Respondents were then given time to complete the questionnaire, whereby once they were done, it was immediately collected from them.

5.3. Instrument

The instrument was a questionnaire compiled from various past researches on instructional supervision. The items selected for the questionnaire were edited to customise the objectives of the survey which focused on three main elements related to instructional supervision in terms of the development of teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. Cronbach’s Alpha was used to test the reliability of the items. The Cronbach’s Alpha value must be above 0.7 to show that the items are reliable to the study and to ensure precise value for the result.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections with the first section containing items regarding the respondent’s profile, the second section on the development of teaching practices, the third section on professional competency and the fourth section on motivation. Section one consists of six items asking for the respondent’s background, while sections two, three and four consist of ten items each using a Likert type scale of five choices and they are: strongly disagree, disagree, not sure, agree and strongly agree.

5.4. Data Collection Procedure

An instrument was designed to collect the data from respondents. One hundred questionnaires were distributed to one hundred respondents from three private schools randomly selected from eleven private secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur. An equal distribution of the questionnaire was made between the three schools. Permission was first obtained from the school’s administration before the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents. Once approval was given, respondents were selected using the simple random sampling method. Each respondent was personally handed the questionnaire and given time to complete it. The questionnaires were immediately collected once the respondents were done. The administration of the questionnaire was found to be straightforward and uncomplicated. The respondents were observed to have completed the questionnaire in a relative short amount of time, making it less time consuming to gather them back. However, there were some initial challenges in distributing the questionnaire to respondents as there were only eleven private secondary schools located in Kuala Lumpur and as it was nearing the end of the school year, many schools were occupied with end-of-the-year activities, events and tasks. Some teachers found it laborious to complete the questionnaire when their time was much needed elsewhere to undertake their school’s end-of-year tasks and responsibilities.

5.5. Data Analysis Method

The data was processed and analysed using SPSS Package Program (Version 20) and the results are presented using descriptive and inferential statistics. Analysis of the data was divided into three sections. Descriptive statistics was used for measure of central tendency using mode, median and mean, and measure of dispersion using range, variance and standard deviation. Pearson Correlation was used for inferential statistics, while Cronbach’s Alpha was used for reliability test.

6. Findings

This chapter reveals the findings for the study on the role of the Head of Departments in improving teachers’ job performance, focusing on three main elements: development of teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. One hundred set of questionnaire were distributed to obtain the data for this study as mentioned in Chapter 3: Research Methodology. The data was processed and analysed using SPSS Package Program (Version 20) and the results are presented using descriptive and inferential statistics. This data is analysed in three sections. The first section consists of the background of the respondents, the second section deals with the reliability of the variables and the third section deals with the correlation analysis with regards to the relationship of the independent variables in influencing the dependent variable.

6.1. Background of the Respondents

| Table 1. Frequency and percentage of the participants’ gender, age, qualification, and teaching experience |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Gender                                           | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Male                                             | 41        | 41.0     | 41.0           | 41.0               |
| Female                                           | 59        | 59.0     | 59.0           | 100.0              |
| Age                                              |           |          |                |                    |
| 23-29 years old                                  | 49        | 49.0     | 49.0           | 49.0               |
| 30-39 years old                                  | 41        | 41.0     | 41.0           | 90.0               |
| 40-49 years old                                  | 9         | 9.0      | 9.0            | 99.0               |
| > 50 years old                                   | 1         | 1.0      | 1.0            | 100.0              |
| Valid                                            |           |          |                |                    |
| Diploma                                          | 1         | 1.0      | 1.0            | 1.0                |
| Bachelor's degree                                | 74        | 74.0     | 74.0           | 75.0               |
| Master's degree                                  | 25        | 25.0     | 25.0           | 100.0              |
Table 1 shows the frequency distribution for background information of the participants including gender, age, qualification, and teaching experience. As mentioned earlier, the total number of respondents for this study was 100. From the total number of respondents, 41 (41%) were male while 59 (59%) were female. These amounts are not the same as the data collected randomly from various private schools in Kuala Lumpur.

Moreover, the table shows that the majority of the respondents were aged between 23 to 29 years old (49%), followed by those aged 30 to 39 years old (41%), the third highest percentage were at the age of more than 50 years with only 1%. This data shows that the majority of the teachers were young and may have different perceptions on their supervisor as compared to senior teachers.

As stated above in Table 1, there were 62 teachers with teaching experience of less than 5 years (62%), followed by 28 teachers with teaching experience between 5 to 9 years (28%). Lastly, there were only 10 teachers with teaching experience of 10 to 14 years (10%). From here, it can be concluded that the teachers have less teaching experience due to their young age as the majority of the teachers are between 23 to 29 years old.

6.2. Reliability of the Variables

In this study, the inferential statistic was used to measure the role of the Head of Departments in improving teachers’ job performance based on three factors: teaching practice, professional competency and motivation. This part deals with the findings of the descriptive analysis of all variables involved in this study. The variables are measured using the mean and standard deviation or the average score of all variables. The data analysis is shown in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>&lt; 5 years</th>
<th>5-9 years</th>
<th>10-14 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2, Distribution of standard deviations & mean on teaching practice, professional competency and motivation

As stated in Table 2, the item of performance (development of teaching practice) according to the respondents’ view is high at mean=3.882 and std=0.453. Respondents also display high preferential on the role of the Head of Departments in determining their motivation with a mean=3.831 and std=0.446. The third and last element which influences teachers’ job performance related to the instructional role of the Head of Departments is competency with the mean=3.763 and std=0.446. Based on the mean stated above, it is apparent that the Head of Departments’ role of instructional leadership mainly influences the teachers’ teaching practices as the Head of Departments help and encourage teachers to perform well in their job.

Table 3 shows the case processing summary for the items tested in this study. As stated in the table above, N refers to the number of respondents in this study. The number of respondents in this study is 100.

Table 4, Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Statistics

Cronbach’s Alpha 0.916
N of Items 30

Table 4 above, shows the reliability score for this study which is also known as Cronbach’s Alpha. The Cronbach’s Alpha value must be above than 0.7 to show that the items are reliable whereas if the value is below 0.7, it means that the items are not reliable to the study. Thus, it is important for researchers to check their items and also the coding for the data to obtain the precise value for the result. As stated in Table 4, the Cronbach’s Alpha for this study is 0.916 which means the items are reliable to the study.
Table 5 shows the mean and standard deviation for all the items tested in this study. The highest mean for the items is from Question 13 (4.09) while the highest standard deviation score for the items is from Question 20 which is 1.063.

Table 6. Scale Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114.86</td>
<td>135.612</td>
<td>11.645</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, Table 6 shows the scale statistics for the items. It shows the mean, variance and standard deviation for the study. As indicated in this table the mean is 114.86, variance is 135.612 and standard deviation is 11.645. The data shows that the items used in the questionnaire are reliable to the study and help to obtain the correct data as well.

6.3. Correlation Analysis

6.3.1. Relationship between Teaching Practice, Professional Competency and Motivation in Improving Teachers’ Job Performance

In order to determine the relationship between teaching practice, professional competency and motivation in improving teachers’ job performance, Pearson Correlation is used. Pearson Correlation coefficients (r) can only take on values from -1 to 1. The size of the total value provides a sign of strength for the connection. It is a good idea to create a scatter plot before performing a correlation analysis. This enables verification for the damage of the assumptions of linearity and homogeneity of variance (homoscedasticity). Scrutiny of the scatter plots also gives greater idea of the nature of the relationship between the two variables. To be precise, a correlation of 0 indicates
that there is no relationship between the two variables. The hypotheses used to investigate this relationship are stated as below.

**The Hypotheses are stated as the Following:**

H0: p = 0 (There is no significant relationship between teaching practice, professional competency and motivation in improving teachers’ job performance.)

H1: p ≠ 0 (There is a significant relationship between teaching practice, professional competency and motivation in improving teachers’ job performance.)

### Table 7. Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.439*</td>
<td>.644*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.469*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.644*</td>
<td>.469*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In Table 7, N shows the information about the sample of the study. As the total respondents are 100, thus the value of N is also 100. The correlation coefficient value will determine the direction and strength of the relationship. Here, the value for motivation is .439. According to the Guilford Rule of Thumb, it has a strong and positive relationship which means that there is a strong relationship between motivation and teachers’ job performance. Next, the value for competence is .644 and conferring to Guilford Rule of Thumb, it has a strong and positive relationship too. Thus, there is also a connection between competence and teachers’ job performance. The last key element which is teachers’ teaching practice (performance) has the value of 1 for the correlation coefficient which means that there is also positive and strong relationship between teachers’ teaching practice and teachers’ job performance. The Sig (2-Tailed) value in the correlation box shows the value is .000. It means Sig-t(.000) < α (.01), and therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. As the three key elements (teaching practice, competency and motivation) depending on each other, it is to be concluded that there is a significant relationship between teaching practice, professional competency and motivation in improving teachers’ job performance. In other words, the instructional role of the Head of Departments in improving teachers’ job performance through developing their teaching practices, enhancing the professional competency and providing motivation is reliable and significant to the study. These factors influence the teachers’ job performance in schools.

### 6.3.2. Teachers’ Perception on How the Head of Departments’ Role as a Supervisor Contribute Towards the Development of Teachers’ Teaching Practices

#### Table 8. Teachers’ responses towards the supervisor’s contribution on teachers’ teaching practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 above shows the teachers’ responses towards the supervisor’s contribution on teachers’ teaching practices. As stated in the table, there are basically ten items related to teaching practices and the total respondents were 100. The respondents had to answer ten questions to evaluate their perception on the instructional leadership role of the Head of Departments in improving their teaching practices. As can be observed from Question 1 to Question 10 (Q1 – Q10), most of the teachers answered “agree” to these questions, which ranged from 49 to 79 teachers. This means that they agreed that the role of instructional leadership of the Head of Departments helped them to improve their teaching practices in school. The highest responses were for Question 2 which indicated 79 teachers agreed to this statement. The statement was that the Head of Departments helped teachers in developing and selecting instructional material for their teaching practices. In other words, by doing this, the Head of Departments have directly and indirectly helped to improve the teachers’ teaching practices in school. There were only two teachers who answered “strongly disagree” for Question 1 and Question 4. They may have a different concept and perspective on how the Head of Departments can help them to increase their teaching practices in school. The responses for “not sure” and “strongly agree” are almost similar where they ranged from 0 to 31 teachers. In conclusion, the Head of Departments need to make greater contribution to the teachers in helping them improve their teaching practices such as providing guidance in lesson planning, curricula, giving advice in teaching and so forth.
6.3.3. Teachers’ Perceptions on How the Head of Departments’ Role as a Supervisor Enhances Teachers’ Professional Competencies

Table 9. Teachers’ Responses on How the Head of Departments’ Role as a Supervisor Enhances Teachers’ Professional Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data above shows the teachers’ responses on how the Head of Departments’ role as a supervisor enhances teachers’ professional competencies. For this section, there are also ten items that are tested to measure the teachers’ responses related to professional competencies. The items for professional competencies ranged from Question 11 to Question 20 (Q11 – Q20). The total number of respondents was 100, so 100 teachers gave their responses for these items. However, due to some missing data, only 99 teachers responded for Question 11. As stated in Table 9, it can be found that the majority of the teachers answered “agree” for Question 11 to Question 20, which ranged from 36 to 70 teachers. The lowest responses for Question 11 to Question 20 were “strongly agree”. About 1 to 17 teachers answered “disagree”, 8 to 41 teachers answered “not sure” and 10 to 21 teachers answered “strongly agree”. Based on the data, the highest responses were from Question 12, where about 70 teachers agreed to the statement. The statement was about the teachers’ access to professional resources in improving teachers’ professional competencies. Most of the teachers claimed that their Head of Departments helped to facilitate their access to professional resources, which in turn may help to develop their knowledge in target areas and thus develop their professional competencies as well (Question 12). Furthermore, in order to improve teachers’ professional competencies, the Head of Departments also need to evaluate the performance of teachers in class or school. This statement is supported by 69 teachers as they answered “agree” for Question 13. By referring to all this data, it can be concluded that there is a link between the Head of Departments’ instructional leadership role in improving teachers’ professional competencies.

6.3.4. Teachers’ Perceptions on the Head of Departments’ Role as a Supervisor and How It Contributes Towards Teachers’ Motivation in Their Job Performance

Table 10. Teachers’ responses on the head of departments’ role as a supervisor and how it contributes towards teachers’ motivation in their job performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>Q22</th>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>Q25</th>
<th>Q26</th>
<th>Q27</th>
<th>Q28</th>
<th>Q29</th>
<th>Q30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 above shows the data for Question 21 to Question 30, which captured the teachers’ responses on the Head of Departments’ role as a supervisor in contributing towards teachers’ motivation in their job performance. Motivation is one of the factors tested in this study to determine the Head of Departments’ role in improving teachers’ job performance. Thus, Question 21 to Question 30 (Q21 – Q30) is based on the theme of motivation for the teachers. Based on the data, the responses are categorised into five main scales which are “strongly disagree, disagree, not sure, agree, and strongly agree”. The teachers were to give their responses based on these scales. As stated above, the highest responses given by the respondents for Question 21 to Question 30 were “agree” which ranged from 36 to 82 teachers respectively. There were 82 teachers who answered “agree” for Question 21, which also contributed to the highest value for this data. The lowest responses were for the scales “strongly disagree and disagree”, which involved 0 to 6 teachers only. Question 21 dealt with the statement that stated “HOD is an example of good work and behaviour for the teachers to follow”. This implies that this particular quality in their Head of Departments helps to improve their motivation to perform well in their work. While Question 21 shows the highest value for the data, the second highest value was from Question 22 which indicated 72 teachers answered “agree” for the question. According to the data received, the teachers considered their Head of Departments as a symbol and sign of success and accomplishment for the teaching profession (Question 22). This contributes to the increase of motivation among teachers and improves their job performance as well. Thus, in conclusion, the Head of Departments’ role as an instructional supervisor does influences the teachers’ motivation in cultivating their job performance.

7. Discussion
Looking into the findings and data analysed, the result indicated that there is a significant relationship among teachers’ teaching practices, professional competency and motivation in improving their job performance. It also
concluded that the Head of Departments’ roles and responsibilities as the leader influence the teachers’ teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. In other words, the role of the instructional Head of Department in improving teachers’ job performance by developing their teaching practices, enhancing professional competency and providing motivation is reliable and significant to the study. These factors influence the teachers’ job performance in school.

Furthermore, there are three main elements analysed in detail. Firstly, teachers’ responses towards supervisors’ contribution to the teachers’ teaching practices was analysed. From the survey conducted, it has been identified that Head of Departments have played a vital role in contributing to the teachers’ teaching practices. Most teachers tend to agree that the Head of Departments help them in their teaching practices. As said by Phillips (2009), Head of Departments as the instructional leader must be a practicing teacher. Acting as a practicing teacher, Head of Departments are capable of providing good teaching practices for the teachers to perform better.

The second element analysed was on teachers’ responses on how the Head of Departments enhance teachers’ professional competencies. From the results, most of the teachers claimed that their Head of Departments helped in facilitating their access to professional resources which in turn helps to develop their knowledge in the target area and thus developing their professional competencies as well. As mentioned by Pitsoe (2005), an instructional leader must be capable of transferring knowledge, skills, attitudes, techniques and proficiencies. This means that as a Head of Department, one must be capable of transferring knowledge and skills that he or she has to the teachers in order to gain success in teachers’ performance and students’ achievement as well. Head of Departments capability in transferring their knowledge to the teachers’ will enhance the teachers’ competency.

The final element is on the teachers’ responses on the Head of Departments’ role as a supervisor in contributing towards teachers’ motivation in their job performance. According to the data received, the teachers considered their Head of Departments as a symbol and sign of success and accomplishment of the teaching profession. This contributes to the increase of motivation among teachers and improves their job performance as well. Thus, in conclusion, the Head of Departments’ role as an instructional supervisor does influence the teachers’ motivation in cultivating their job performance. Similarly, referring to Yukl (2010), he said that an instructional leader must have the competency and ability to encourage and motivate subordinates to work together to achieve and perform better. Therefore, Head of Departments who can motivate their teachers will develop the sense of motivation in them and encourage them for better performance.

8. Conclusion

In this research, it has been attempted to investigate the roles and responsibilities of Head of Departments in influencing teachers’ teaching practices, professional competencies and motivation. The results presented showed a positive relationship between the Head of Departments’ roles and responsibilities and its influence on teaching performance. The findings indicated that there is a significant relationship between the Head of Departments’ role in enhancing teachers’ performance from the aspect of teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. All findings signify a positive relationship on how the good qualities and role of the Head of Departments will instil difference towards better changes in order to achieve good job performance among teachers in school.

In short, this study revealed that it is important for the Head of Departments of the school to play the role of the instructional leader as it possesses good characteristics in enhancing better teaching and learning for both leaders and the subordinates. In this case, both Head of Departments and the teachers are able to develop and create a platform for teaching and learning, and this will also indirectly develop the teachers’ teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. As a whole, good leaders influence their subordinates and encourage them towards better job performance. Finally, this study contributes in the existing literature by providing a detailed account on instructional leadership and supervisory as well as schools’ Head of Departments role regarding teachers’ job performance. This is a original study that was conducted to obtain a clearer understanding about teachers’ perceptions on Head of Department’s supervisory role.

9. Recommendations

Looking into the data analysis results, it clearly shows that Head of Departments as instructional leaders give a huge impact on the teachers in the sense of performance of teaching practices, professional competency and motivation. Therefore, the Head of Departments should look for possible improvements in the instructional leadership role to develop the performance of the school as whole. Thus, there are a few recommendations in order to develop the quality of instructional leadership among the teachers. Firstly, the Ministry of Education should start taking the professional development programs for private schools seriously. As we know, in Malaysia there are already various kinds of staff development programs being implemented in order to improve the teachers’ performance. However, there is very little focus given on the training for the leaders themselves, especially for leaders of private schools. In the attempt to enhance the teachers’ performance, it is vital to pay attention to the leader’s quality and roles first. More practical workshops and training courses must be provided. These workshops must at least be conducted twice a year. These workshops are necessary since Head of Departments seldom receive training in instructional leadership. The second recommendation is in relation to the first recommendation given. Since it has been suggested to the Ministry of Education to take professional development programs for private schools seriously, they must also play their role to ensure that the Head of Departments attend workshops that are conducted. Head of Departments as instructional leaders must avail themselves to the opportunity as it would not be effective if they do not give proper commitment to these programs. The Ministry may spend a huge amount of sum in order to conduct the professional development programs, but it will only be effective and meet its purpose if the Head of Departments take up the initiative to take part and participate in the programs prepared for them.

The third recommendation is that the Head of Departments in private secondary schools be given compulsory training in communication skills. Good communication is a basic requirement to bridge and develop the road
between teachers and leaders. In order for Head of Departments to deliver their knowledge, ideas and visions to the teachers, communication is the only way. Therefore, instructional leaders must have very good communication skills. This will enable the Head of Departments to communicate with the teachers’ to bring about healthy communication within the school and also enhance good relationship between them. In conclusion, these recommendations are believed to enhance the role of instructional leaderships among Head of Departments in private secondary schools and also influence teachers’ to give better teaching and learning performance.
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