

**PERSONAL AND SCHOOL ATTRIBUTES AND  
INNOVATIVENESS OF PRINCIPALS IN  
SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

**Lourdes Estrada Barlis**

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education  
(Educational Administration)  
in the  
Division of Educational Leadership and Professional Services  
College of Education  
University of the Philippines  
Diliman, Quezon City  
May 2004

**CARD** 110985d

LG

996

2004

E33

B37

## ABSTRACT

The personal attributes of the principals, school attributes and NSAT Performance for two school years and how they affect the innovativeness of principals in the areas of instructional development, faculty development and resource generation and management were studied through a self-assessment of the principals and perception of their teachers. This study also examined the personal attributes of principals which include their educational qualifications, length of experience, administrative skills, innovative leadership behavior, priorities and school attributes which include quality of faculty and school size. It determined the extent of innovativeness of principals in instructional development, faculty development and resource generation and management areas. It determined which of the personal and school attributes could predict the innovativeness of the principals.

The study was done in 12 top and 12 bottom-ranking public secondary schools in two divisions of the National Capital Region. It involved 24 principals and 120 teachers. The respondents were selected on a two-stage stratified sampling.

A three-part self-administered questionnaire was used to gather data on personal attributes, extent of innovativeness of the principal and school attributes. A one-part self-administered questionnaire for teachers was used to determine their perception of the extent of innovativeness of their principals. For every school visited, the principal, a department head or a master teacher and a student leader were interviewed.

Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics using the t-test, chi square and multiple regression analysis were used to analyze and interpret the data. All the tests used the .05 level of significance.

The findings revealed that principals in top-ranking schools had longer experience as administrator although there is an equal number of PhD and MA graduates. There are more teachers with PhD degree , Outstanding Performance Rating and occupying Master Teacher I position in top-ranking schools but there are more teachers with MA degree and Very Satisfactory Performance Rating in the bottom-ranking schools. Delegating tasks effectively was significantly different as perceived by teachers but not as assessed by the principals in top and bottom-ranking schools. There was no significant difference in mean ratings of top and bottom-ranking schools with regard to instructional development, faculty development and resource generation and management skills. The top-ranking schools had better quality of teachers than the bottom-ranking ones. There is no difference in terms of school size between the top and bottom-ranking ones. The findings also revealed that among the predictors examined, there was a trend for administrative skills although it merely indicated nearing significance.. There are no predictor of innovativeness in the areas of faculty development and resource generation and management.

The first hypothesis that there is a difference in the personal attributes of principals belonging to top and bottom-ranking schools is not supported by the data. The second hypothesis that there is a difference in the personal attributes of principals belonging to top and bottom-ranking schools as assessed by principals and perceived by teachers is not supported by the data. The third hypothesis that

there is a difference in the attributes of top and bottom-ranking schools in terms of quality of faculty and school size is partly supported by the data. The quality of the faculty is associated with the innovativeness of the school administrators, while the data on school size failed to support this. The fourth hypothesis that there is a significant difference between top and bottom-ranking schools in the extent of innovativeness of the principals as assessed by principals and perceived by teachers is not supported by the data. The fifth hypothesis that personal attributes and school attributes best predict the innovativeness of the principal is partly supported by the data.

Based on the findings, this study could serve as a baseline data for further in-depth studies on innovativeness of principals not only in the secondary but also in the tertiary level. It is also recommended that provisions be made for teachers to enrol in graduate school through scholarship programs. In addition, the new Performance Appraisal System of the Department of Education, which has just been implemented, should be given feedbacks so as to improve the instrument to make it effective in measuring the performance of the principals, teachers and non-teaching personnel.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Title page	i
Approval Sheet	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Dedication	v
Abstract	vi
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xi
List of Figures	xiii
List of Appendices	xiv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Significance of the Study	6
Scope and Limitation of the Study	7
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	9
Theoretical Assumptions	9
The School Principals' Personal Attributes	13
Qualifications	15
Length of Service	16
Innovative Behavior	16
Perspectives on Educational Leadership	20
Administrators' Priorities	23
School Attributes	25
Quality of Faculty	25
School Size	29
Innovativeness in Instructional Development	31
Innovativeness in Faculty Development	42
Broadening Participatory Decision Making as a Factor for Faculty Development	44
Innovativeness in Resource Generation and Management	49
Innovation and Innovativeness	53
Innovation and Innovativeness as Part of Total Quality Management (TQM)	58
Conceptual Framework	62
Research Hypotheses	66

Operational Definition of Variables	68
<b>III. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>70</b>
The Research Design	70
The Sample	70
The Research Instruments	72
Data Collection Procedures	74
Data Analysis Procedures	76
<b>IV. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA</b>	<b>78</b>
Personal Attributes of the Principals	
Belonging to the Top and Bottom-Ranking Schools	79
A. Educational Qualifications	79
B. Average Length of Experience	80
C. Administrative Skills	81
D. Innovative Leadership Behavior	87
E. Priorities	93
School Attributes of Top and Bottom-Ranking Schools	101
A. Quality of Faculty	101
B. School Size	104
Extent of Innovativeness of the Principals of Top and Bottom-Ranking Schools	106
A. Instructional Development	106
B. Faculty Development	112
C. Resource Generation and Management	117
Predictors of Innovativeness of Principals	124
<b>V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>132</b>
Summary and Major Findings	132
Conclusions	137
Recommendations	138
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>141</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1	Profile of the Respondents ( Principals)	71
2	Profile of the Respondents ( Teachers )	72
3	Educational Qualifications of the Principals	79
4	Average Length of Experience of Principals	80
5a	Self-Assessment of the Principals on Administrative Skills	82
5b	Perception of Teachers on Administrative Skills of Principals	84
5c	Comparison of Self-assessment of Principals and Perception of Teachers as to Administrative Skills in Top-ranking Schools	85
5d	Comparison of Self-assessment of Principals and Perception of Teachers as to Administrative Skills in Bottom-ranking Schools	86
6a	Self-assessment of the Innovative Leadership Behavior of the Principals	88
6b	Perception of Teachers on Innovative Leadership Behavior of the Principals	89
6c	Comparison of Self-assessment of Principals and Perception of Teachers as to Innovative Leadership Behavior in Top-ranking Schools	92
6d	Comparison of Self-assessment of Principals and Perception of Teachers as to Innovative Leadership Behavior in Bottom-ranking Schools	93
7a	Self-Assessment of the Priorities of the Principals	95
7b	Perception of Teachers on the Priorities of the Principals	98
7c	Comparison of Self-Assessment of Principals and Perception of teachers on Priorities in Top-ranking Schools	99
7d	Comparison of Self-Assessment of Principals and Perception of Teachers in Bottom-ranking Schools	100
8a	Educational Qualification of Teachers by Type of School	101
8b	Performance Rating of Teachers by Type of School	103
8c	Rank Position of Teachers by Type of School	104
9a	School Size for School Year 1999-2000	105
9b	School Size for School Year 2000-2001	105
10a	Self-assessment of Principals on Instructional Development	107
10b	Perception of Teachers on Instructional Development	109
10c	Comparison of Self-assessment of the Principals and Perception of the Teachers on Instructional Development in Top-ranking Schools	110
10d	Comparison of Self-assessment of the Principals and Perception of the Teachers on Instructional Development	111



Table	Title	Page
11a	Self-assessment of the Principals on Faculty Development	113
11b	Perception of Teachers on Faculty Development	114
11c	Comparison of Self-assessment of the Principals and Perception of Teachers on Faculty Development in Top-ranking Schools	116
11d	Comparison of Self-assessment of the Principals and Perception of Teachers on Faculty Development in Bottom-ranking Schools	117
12a	Self-assessment of the Principals on Resource Generation and Management	119
12b	Perception of Teachers on Resource Generation and Management	120
12c	Comparison of Self-assessment of the Principals and Perception of Teachers on Resource Generation and Management in Top-ranking Schools	121
12d	Comparison of Self-assessment of the Principals and Perception of Teachers on Resource Generation and Management in Bottom-ranking Schools	123
13a	Regression Coefficients with Instructional Development as Dependent Variable	125
13b	Regression Coefficients with Faculty Development as Dependent Variable	128
13c	Regression Coefficients with Resource Generation and Management as Dependent Variable	132

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
1	Map of Innovation Process	55
2	Conceptual Framework	65

## LIST OF APPENDICES

A. Letter to Dr. Corazon D. Santiago	151
B. Indorsement letter to the Schools Division Superintendent, Manila and Quezon City	152
C. Indorsement letter to Dr. Corazon D. Santiago	154
D. Approval/ Indorsement letter to researcher through the Schools Division Superintendent	155
E. Cover letters for the school administrator and teacher respondents	158
F. Questionnaires for School Administrator and Teacher	160
G. Structured Interview	165