



The Correlation Leadership Style and School Productivity

Mukhtar¹, Risnita², Dian Cita Sari³

^{1,2,3}UIN Sultan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi

E-mail: mukhtar@gmail.com¹, diancitasari233@gmail.com²

Article Info

Article History:

Received: March 21, 2020

Revised: April 15, 2020

Published: April 23, 2020

e-ISSN: 2623-2324

p-ISSN: 2654-2528

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3763425

Abstract:

The objectives of this study were to identify the levels of leadership style and to explore the relationship between headmaster's leadership style and their School Productivity in Madrasah Aliyah 1 at Riau Province. Leadership style conceptual Framework was used as the framework to guide the study. The sample consisted of 30 respondent. The result from the mean percentages of leadership style levels obtained that among the leadership style dimensions, Data presentation showed the high level productivity. However, four dimensions such as productivity search skills, productivity retrieval skills, productivity interpretation skills and productivity management skills indicated moderate level among school productivity. Spearman correlation presented that Productivity search skill has significant relationship to the School Productivity. However, data presentation skills, productivity retrieval skills, productivity interpretation skills and productivity management skills were not significant relationship to the School Productivity.

Keyword: *Leadership style, School Productivity*

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the emergence of new technologies, particularly educational technology, is phenomenal. This is a tremendous challenge for educators and teachers (Kaware and Sain, 2015; Spengler, 2015). Leadership style have accelerated the teaching and learning process, but it has also created problems for the educational community. To solve these problems, educators need to master these technologies Productivity first, so that they can teach students to effectively use them for their benefit (Kaware & Sain, 2015; Kelly, 2013; Hung, Lee, & Lim; 2012; Liu & Tee, 2014; Spengler, 2015).

At the theoretical level, leadership style's can be expected to be beneficial for learning. However, although the Productivity technologies are being increasingly used in educational settings, there is little empirical evidence to support their advantage (Wagner et al., 2014), and on educational outcomes (Fairlie et al., 2010; Argentin et al., 2014). This research presents original new data to demonstrate the contribution of leadership style to principal cognitive abilities, as well as their School Productivity

RESEARCH METHOD

Kurtz and Peled (2016) created the conceptual framework for leadership style learning which is needed for 21st-century learners. The result will determine Principals' strengths and weaknesses in leadership style level that must be addressed in order to facilitate learning in the current era.

The research design which is used in this study is quantitative, employing descriptive and co-relational data analysis methods. This research method is used in this study to examine the relationship between students' leadership style level and their School Productivity in Madrasah Aliyah 1 at Riau Province. The data is obtained from a survey questionnaire. This research used a cross-sectional survey to collect data from different sections of the population. A Likert scale was used to measure the leadership style and School Productivity. After completing these steps, these left the study with a sample 30 from three Madrasah in Three city in Riau Province.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The main construct in this study is leadership style and the instruments used to collect data within this study was adapted from Kurtz & Yehuda (2016). The leadership style scale was used to measure the level of leadership style among students. The scale consisted of 23 items. It describes the leadership style level for learning among students (Kurtz, 2016). The leadership style instrument used a 5-point Likert scale, comprising the following options: 1= Not at all, 2= Low, 3= Moderate, 4= High, 5= Very High. The higher score indicated a higher leadership style level. The researcher adapted the original questionnaire by removing the four domains with 30 items which are not related to the current study. There are three sections in this survey questionnaire. The first section is demographic productivity, which contained several relevant data on the participants, which included gender, age, academic year, specialization and the semester they are in, and their CGPA. The next section is the leadership style questionnaire which contains 23 items measuring constructs of leadership style. The constructs leadership style scale include productivity research and retrieval (12 items), productivity management (3 items), processing and presentation of productivity (8 items).

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

Every item in the questionnaire must address the research questions. Kurtz and Peled (2016) have tested the survey instruments used in this study, administrated in a manner that ensures objectivity, and validated each domain with Cronbach's alpha. The social responsibility domain has a Cronbach alpha of 0.853. Team-Based Learning has a Cronbach alpha 0.717. The Cronbach alpha for productivity research and retrieval is 0.930 and the productivity management domain has a Cronbach alpha of 0.807. Digital integrity has a Cronbach alpha of 0.717. Leadership style for productivity validation has a Cronbach alpha of 0.821, and processing and presentation of productivity has a Cronbach alpha 0.890. The Leadership style Scale survey has a Cronbach apha of 0.70 for the constructs of both learner-content interaction and general satisfaction. The instruments which are validated above are employed in this study. However, the researcher needed to remove some domains which are not related to the focus of the study. The researcher did a pilot study to find the validity and reliability measures of the sample in this location. After analyzing the pilot data collected, the researcher found the validity and reliability of the instruments used in this study having a Cronbach alpha of 0.920. Hence, the instruments can be justifiably employed to measure the research questions in this study. In addition, the supervisor of this study has checked and corrected the questionnaire used in the study.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Initially, all items derived from the questionnaire were coded, scored and analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version IBM 22. The data collected were analyzed by employing descriptive statistics, partial correlation and independent t-test. The data was tabulated and summarized by using tables of frequencies and percentages of participants' demographic productivity, including age, gender, the level of degree, CGPA, and computer experience.

Two types of statistical analysis were used to analyze the data collected from the respondent students, using the questionnaire. Specifically, in order to profile the leadership style of productivity level in school at madrasah aliyah, descriptive statistics in the form of frequency counts, percentages and ratios were presented. The primary analysis allowed the researcher to

divide the surveys into five broad groups: 1) Strongly High level; 2) High level; 3) Moderate level; 4) Low level; 5) Not at all. The level counts were conducted on the 5 categories. The researcher identified the range of mean score from each construct, following Hafizan, et al (2015). The high level of interest was (3.67-5.00); moderate (2.34-3.66); and low (1.00-2.33). To identify the relationship between leadership style level and School Productivity, spearman correlations were used to determine the strength and direction of relationship between the variables. This analysis addresses the fourth research question.

Data Screening. Data were collected manually. The data were then processed by using SPSS version 22. Data screening was implemented to ensure that the data were clean, accurate, complete and ready for analysis. Before running the analysis, the data were screened for errors, missing values and outliers. Errors were checked by processing the data in SPSS. An inspection of the minimum and maximum values shows no values outside of the response scale of 1 to 5. Therefore, no errors were found in the dataset. Missing values were checked by running descriptive statistics on the variables. The result showed no missing values in the dataset.

Underlying Structure of Leadership style. This section describes the students’ responses to all items representing each digital category. The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) found 5 different categories of leadership style, namely, Productivity Search, Data Representation Skills, Productivity Retrieval, Productivity Interpretation Skills, and Productivity Management. The responses for “High” and “Very High” were collapsed to represent just one category of high level of leadership style. The same was done with “Not at all” and “Low” where they were collapsed to represent just one category of low level of leadership style. The Tables below show the distribution of responses to the eight items of leadership style

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to answer the relationship between Leadership style and School Productivity, Spearman correlation was employed to find the association between these two variables. In this study, the predictor or the independent variable is leadership style skills and the dependent variable is School Productivity among students. Table 4.10 below presents the comparison between the two variables.

Productivity Search Skills. Eight (8) items regarding productivity search skills were asked in the Productivity Search questionnaire. Table 4.2 shows that students did not report a high level of terms productivity search skills. Respondent reported moderate levels in their ability in productivity search skills (M=3.79, SD= 0.79).

Data Presentation Skills. Four (4) items relating to respondent’s skills on data presentation were included in the questionnaire. The results are tabulated in table 4.3 Compared to students’ ability in productivity research skills, students’ skills on data presentation showed lower percentages of high level of from the respondents, ranging between 41.4% and 63.5%. The overall findings for the statements show that most of respondents have a moderate level in productivity, with a mean value of 3.47 (SD= 0.90).

Productivity Retrieval. The overall findings for the statements show that the majority of respondents have a moderate level of Productivity Retrieval skills, with a mean value of 3.55 (SD= 0.83). Table 3.3 shows a visual presentation of the respondents’ productivity retrieval skills.

Productivity Interpretation Skills. The overall findings for the statements show that most of the students have a high level in productivity interpretation skills, with a mean value of 4.63 (SD= 0.82).

Productivity Management Skills. The overall findings for the statements shows that the majority of the students have a high level in Productivity Management Skills, with a mean value of 3.76 (SD= 0.94).

Table 1. The Relationship between Leadership style and School Productivity (N=30)

Leadership style skills		School Productivity
Productivity search skill	Spearman Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.118* .020 30

	N	
Data presentation	Spearman Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.092 .070 30
Productivity retrieval	Spearman Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.049 .331 30
Productivity interpretation skills	Spearman Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.025 .624 30
Productivity Management Skills	Spearman Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.005 .924 30

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

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

Based on the finding above, the Spearman correlation analysis demonstrates that there is only one leadership style skill (productivity search skill) which has a significant relationship with School Productivity ($r = -.118$, $p = 000 < 0.05$). The finding confirms that the productivity search skill is a significant predictor for the enhancement of students' School Productivity at this university.

Meanwhile, the four skills of leadership style, including data presentation, productivity retrieval, interpretation skill and productivity management skill are not statistically significant in relation to the students' School Productivity. The Spearman correlation test showed that the four skills of leadership style has no statistically significant correlation with School Productivity (data presentation, $r = -.092$, productivity retrieval, $r = -.049$, productivity interpretation skills, $r = -.025$, productivity management skill $r = .005$, $p = 000 > 0.05$).

The above results and findings of this paper have shown that students feel themselves to have moderate levels of leadership style. Leadership style is necessary because these skills will help students easily access and acquire knowledge for learning. They need to know the right way to use the technology in order to acquire the knowledge they seek. According to Norazilah & Fazli (2016), knowledge and productivity are transferred, and through precise application of leadership style in this modern era, to get easily access knowledge fast and easy. In addition, regarding this issue, Principal need to improve their skills in leadership style. They need to acquire skills and become familiar with the system, so that they can benefit and use the resources for School.

The finding revealed that only one skill of leadership style, namely productivity skill, was found to be significant. ($r = -.118$, $p = 000 < 0.05$). This finding indicates that leadership style is not the main factor in students' School Productivity. Kudari (2016) found that there are many factors that affect students' School Productivity, including personal background, learning experience, synergy with parents, teachers, and environments, friend's circles, demographic, etc. Lister (2014) found that there was some evidence gained from school productivity affecting learning outcome, but there was no evidence that people who integrate school productivity for learning enhanced their learning outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer would like to express thankful to the Almighty God for His guidance, and direction during this research. Her thankful as well as to all member Madrasah Aliyah 1 in Riau Province who participated, my lecturers, my colleagues, and my family members who always give support.

CONCLUSION

This paper studied the level of leadership style have relationship to school productivity. Furthermore, this study seeks to find the relationship between leadership style and their School Productivity. The results of this research found that Principal generally have a moderate level of

leadership style skills. In addition, there is no evidence that leadership style influence School Productivity, in this study. Thus, future research could be suggested to study the leadership style area, particularly the concept of individualizing instruction, rather than on the relationship between a leadership style and his educational capabilities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argentin, G. G. M., Pagani, L., & Stanca, L. (2016). The Impact of Leadership style on Educational Outcomes: Evidence from Performance Tests. *Educational Studies*, 42:2, 137-162.
- Calvani, A., Cartelli, A., Fini, A., & Ranieri, M. (2009). Models and instruments for assessing digital competence at school. *Journal of e-Learning and Knowledge Society (English version)*, 4(3), 183-193.
- Greene, J. A., Seung B. Y & Copeland, D. Z. (2014). Measuring critical components of leadership style and their relationships with learning. *Computers & Education* 76 (2014) 55–69
- Gilster, P. (1997). *Leadership style*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Computer.
- Kudari, J. M. (2016). Survey on the Factors Influences the Students' Academic Performance. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Management & Technology*. Vol-5, Issue-6
- Kurtz, G., & Peled, Y. (2016). Digital learning literacies –A validation study. *Issues in Informing Science and Productivity Technology*, 13, 145-158
- Lister, M. (2014). Trends in the Design of E-Learning and Online Learning, *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, Vol. 10, No. 4.
- Norazilah, S. & Fazli, M. B. (2016), Leadership style Awareness among Students, *researchhub.uitm.edu.my*. Volume 2 Issue 1
- Sherman, C. D. (2011). The relationship of Pre-service Education Majors' Multiple Intelligence Learning Styles to their Level of Leadership style, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
- Spengler, S. (2015). Educators' Perceptions of a 21st Century Leadership style Framework. <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>, Instructional Media Design Commons.
- Tang, C. M. and Chaw, L. Y, (2016) "Leadership style: A Prerequisite for Effective Learning in a Blended Learning Environment?" *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning* Volume 14 Issue 1 2016, (pp54-65).