INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT

OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL

Vol 15, Issue 4, (2026) E-ISSN: 2226-6348

Principals' Practices, Challenges and Strategies in the Implementation of Physical Activity, Sports and Co-Curricular Assessment (PAJSK) in Secondary Schools

Muhammad Atik Bin Norzan Shah, Bity Salwana Binti Alias

Fakulti Pendidikan, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

Corresponding Author Email: bity@ukm.edu.my

DOI Link: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v15-i4/29375

Published Online: 10 November 2026

Abstract

Physical Activity, Sports and Co-Curricular Assessment (PAJSK) is a non-academic component of Malaysia's School-Based Assessment that documents students' fitness, participation, engagement and achievement. Although the Ministry of Education Malaysia provides operational guidelines, implementation quality also depends on principals' ability to coordinate responsibilities, develop teachers' competence and sustain assessment consistency. This conceptual article examines principals' practices, challenges and strategies in implementing PAJSK in secondary schools through a narrative synthesis of policy documents and educational leadership literature. Instructional leadership, distributed leadership and change management are considered alongside the assessment principles of validity, reliability and fairness. The analysis identifies seven interconnected challenges: rubric interpretation, evidence documentation, continuity of activities, data integrity, digital capacity, stakeholder communication and equitable opportunities for participation. It proposes an integrated PAJSK governance framework and a four-phase strategy encompassing alignment, system development, monitoring and institutionalization. The framework constitutes a theoretical proposition rather than an empirically validated model. The article contributes by mapping leadership mechanisms onto observable indicators of implementation quality, providing a basis for school-level improvement and future research. The proposed strategies must be interpreted in accordance with current ministry requirements and differences in secondary schools' capacities.

Keywords: Pajsk, Principals, School Leadership, Change Management, Quality Assurance

Introduction

School-Based Assessment (Pentaksiran Berasaskan Sekolah [PBS]) in Malaysia situates student development within a framework that extends beyond examination performance. According to the Guidelines for the Management of School-Based Assessment, First Edition 2025, PBS comprises Central Assessment, Classroom Assessment, Psychometric Assessment and Physical Activity, Sports and Co-Curricular Assessment (PAJSK) (Ministry of Education Malaysia [MOE], 2025). PAJSK recognises non-academic development through information on

students' fitness and involvement in sports, clubs, societies, uniformed bodies and extracurricular activities. Its role is related to the aspirations for holistic education articulated in the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013–2025 (MOE, 2013). That blueprint provides the historical policy context, whereas current procedures must be guided by the MOE guidelines in force.

Nevertheless, the existence of guidelines does not, in itself, guarantee consistency in implementation. In a secondary school, PAJSK scores and records are compiled through the work of multiple teachers, coordinators and co-curricular units, while opportunities for student participation depend on the school calendar, available resources and environmental support. Differences in the interpretation of rubrics or weaknesses in evidence management may create risks of inconsistent information. These risks should be discussed as plausible administrative concerns; they must not be taken as evidence that all schools experience scoring errors or dishonesty. At the same time, newly proposed administrative arrangements should not supersede the scoring rules prescribed by the MOE.

The school leadership literature offers explanations of the relationships among vision, programme coordination, the distribution of responsibilities and the development of organisational culture (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Spillane, 2006). The change management literature, meanwhile, emphasises capacity building and the institutionalisation of improvement practices so that reforms do not become occasional or short-lived initiatives (Fullan, 2001; Kotter, 1995). However, arguments drawn from these bodies of literature cannot be transferred directly as evidence of PAJSK effectiveness without considering the context of non-academic assessment and the requirements of national policy.

Against this background, the article addresses three questions: How may principals' leadership practices be understood as mechanisms for strengthening PAJSK implementation quality? What operational challenges need to be addressed? How can improvement strategies be aligned with assessment principles and school capacity? Its purpose is to develop a conceptual argument linking these questions rather than to report causal relationships based on field data that have not been collected.

Definition and Concept of Pajsk

The 2025 PBS guidelines describe PAJSK as an assessment that evaluates physical activity and fitness status and measures students' participation, engagement and achievement in sports, co-curricular and extracurricular activities (MOE, 2025). The document groups PAJSK into three components: SEGAK and BMI 5–9T, co-curricular activities and extracurricular activities. Within the scope of this article, the discussion of secondary schools focuses on SEGAK and relevant co-curricular and extracurricular activities; BMI 5–9T is not treated as an assessment applicable to all secondary school students. Details of scoring, categories, eligibility criteria and reporting procedures must always be referred to the MOE's Guidelines for Physical Activity, Sports and Co-Curricular Assessment for Secondary Schools, Forms 1–5 and STAM Candidates (MOE, n.d.).

In this article, 'principals' practices' refers to leadership actions and organisational coordination that support PAJSK operations. 'Challenges' are factors that may affect access to participation, record accuracy, or process consistency. 'Strategies' are improvement

measures that can be organised in phases without altering the official scoring procedures. 'Implementation quality' is conceptualised in terms of compliance with guidelines, consistent application of criteria, traceability of evidence, data accuracy, accessibility of opportunities and the use of information for follow-up action. This definition is an analytical synthesis developed for the present article, not an alternative official definition to that provided by the MOE.

It is also important to distinguish PAJSK scores from the educational value of the activities being assessed. High scores do not necessarily constitute comprehensive evidence of social skills development, just as low scores do not necessarily indicate a lack of student interest. Principals should therefore avoid treating a single score as an absolute indicator of programme effectiveness; attendance patterns, activity choices, student support and learning experiences should be considered alongside scores. The OECD (2024) report on social and emotional skills supports a broad view of student development; however, it is not a direct study of PAJSK and is not used here as evidence of the validity of PAJSK scores.

Underpinning Theories and Models

Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) instructional leadership model identifies three domains: defining the school mission, managing the instructional programmed and promoting a positive school learning climate. In the context of PAJSK, these domains may be interpreted as embedding holistic education in the school mission, organising resources and co-curricular schedules and fostering a safe and inclusive culture of participation. This application is an interpretive extension from academic instruction to the management of non-academic programmes; it does not demonstrate that the original dimensions automatically measure PAJSK quality. The instrument-validation study by Basah and Abdul Razak (2023) and the meta-analysis by Hallinger et al. (2013) provide a foundation for understanding the instructional leadership construct but do not replace an assessment specific to the PAJSK context.

The distributed leadership perspective examines how leadership practice emerges through interactions among leaders, teachers and organizational tools rather than merely through the allocation of tasks (Spillane, 2006). In PAJSK, principals establish lines of accountability, while the Senior Assistant for Co-Curricular Affairs, PAJSK coordinators, teacher advisers, Physical Education teachers and other relevant personnel perform functions within their respective areas of authority. Ghazali and Alias (2024) reported a positive relationship between distributed leadership practices and teacher job satisfaction in secondary schools in Pasir Mas. Ting et al. (2024) examined distributed leadership and middle leaders' organisational commitment in primary schools in Johor. Both studies support the rationale for collaborative organisation, but neither directly measured the effectiveness of PAJSK scoring. Zhang et al. (2025) reviewed relationships between distributed leadership and teacher job satisfaction in public schools, while Zhou et al. (2025) examined related constructs in higher education in China. Thus, studies conducted at different educational levels are used to support proposed organisational mechanisms, not as findings that can be directly generalised to PAJSK.

Kotter's (1995) change model emphasises a sense of urgency, a guiding coalition, a vision, the removal of barriers, short-term wins and the anchoring of change in organisational culture. Fullan (2001) demonstrates that educational change requires capacity building, practitioners'

understanding and attention to contextual complexity. When applied jointly to PAJSK management, these perspectives suggest gradual improvement beginning with a shared understanding, followed by functional work systems and monitoring with clearly defined purposes. Schools need not implement Kotter's eight steps as a mechanical checklist; the underlying principles should be adapted to the school calendar, decision-making authority and available resources.

Finally, the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing emphasise that score use requires consideration of validity, reliability, fairness and the appropriateness of the intended inferences (American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], & National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME], 2014). This does not imply that PAJSK is a psychometric test equivalent to a standardised test; rather, the standards provide an ethical basis for examining record accuracy and decision consistency. This basis is consistent with the PBS quality assurance guidelines, which identify mentoring, moderation, monitoring and detection as management processes (MOE, 2025). Black and Wiliam's (1998) formative assessment framework further highlights the value of assessment information when it is interpreted and used to inform follow-up action. Its use here, however, is a conceptual analogy rather than an assumption that PAJSK score management is equivalent to classroom assessment.

Significance and Conceptual Contribution

The significance of this topic lies in the principal's position as the link between MOE assessment requirements and the daily practices of school personnel. This article makes a conceptual contribution by mapping relationships in which leadership practices shape organisational mechanisms such as training, verification, communication and access to participation; these mechanisms may, in turn, support indicators of PAJSK implementation quality. The mapping distinguishes elements supported by policy documents from assumptions that still require investigation, thereby reducing the risk of overgeneralised claims of effectiveness.

Conceptual Approach

This article employs a focused narrative synthesis of official PBS/PAJSK documents, foundational works on instructional and distributed leadership, organizational change literature and selected studies concerning workload and assessment fairness. The sources are used to develop arguments, assess the contextual suitability of theories and formulate operational proposals. This is not a systematic literature review: no claim is made regarding an exhaustive database search, a PRISMA protocol, or formal risk-of-bias assessment. Accordingly, the proposed framework and indicators should be understood as propositions requiring empirical validation rather than findings from field research.

Practices and Roles Expected of Principals

The first practice is aligning the vision for student development with the mandates of PBS and PAJSK. Principals can position physical and co-curricular activities within school planning as valuable educational experiences rather than merely as mechanisms for generating scores. Such alignment requires consistent communication with teachers, students and parents, accompanied by the establishment of monitorable process targets. For example, reporting accuracy or the proportion of scheduled activities actually conducted is more directly within

organisational responsibility than targets focused solely on increasing scores. This approach is consistent with the school mission and climate dimensions of Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) model; however, its targets must not encourage record manipulation.

The second practice involves coordinating work structures and quality assurance. Principals need to ensure that the functions of the PBS committee, co-curricular management and coordinators designated by policy are operationally connected. Task allocation should specify who records data, who reviews documents, who verifies reports and how ambiguous cases are referred for clarification. Coordination should also address overlapping responsibilities between co-curricular and assessment units so that activity records can be used without creating competing documentation systems. Principals are responsible for ensuring that decisions or disputes concerning scores are referred through authorised channels and documented with the reasons for corrections, thus establishing a clear control structure that does not depend on individual discretion. Such clarity is more substantive than simply creating additional committees because it reduces gaps in accountability. From Spillane's (2006) perspective, templates, schedules, meetings and review records also function as tools that shape shared leadership practice.

The third practice concerns developing the competence of personnel responsible for implementation. Effective training goes beyond general briefings to guide teachers in applying actual scoring criteria, identifying appropriate forms of evidence and managing non-routine cases through official channels. Collective discussion of illustrative cases can reveal differences in interpretation before data are finalised. Principals should also provide follow-up support to newly appointed teachers or those assuming coordination responsibilities. Although Basah and Abdul Razak (2023) support the measurement of instructional leadership in primary schools, the need for PAJSK training is argued here conceptually on operational grounds rather than incorrectly attributed to the findings of that study.

The fourth practice is monitoring based on meaningful process indicators. Monitoring may cover the completeness of records, cases awaiting verification, postponed activities and the distribution of participation opportunities. Follow-up action should focus on guidance and system correction rather than punitive surveillance. The 2025 PBS management guidelines provide the official basis for quality assurance through mentoring, moderation, monitoring and detection (MOE, 2025). Proposed instruments such as dashboards, brief reports, or periodic reviews are supplementary tools that schools may adapt; they should not be treated as MOE-mandated formats or frequencies unless explicitly specified in current directives.

The fifth practice concerns resource management and equity of participation. Schools differ in terms of sports facilities, coaching expertise, transport access and community support. Principals need to balance opportunities for student participation without allowing advantages in resources to become the sole measure of student development. Scheduling, collaboration with external agenciesand shared use of facilities may reduce barriers, subject to relevant safety requirements and approvals. Evaluations of PAJSK quality should consider whether schools provide reasonable opportunities for students, including those who require adaptations to participate.

Finally, principals are responsible for maintaining ethical scoring practices and the confidentiality of student data. Transparency means that criteria and review procedures can be explained; it does not mean that all student records should be accessible without restriction. Digital evidence management requires role-based access controls, the use of authorized storage and controlled correction procedures. Before centralising student records, schools should define authorised user categories, handover procedures and methods for retaining or deleting records in accordance with current administrative instructions. Certificates, photographs and letters containing student identities should not be circulated through open communication groups merely to facilitate review. The MOE's Digital Education Policy (2023) provides a relevant context for digital transformation but does not establish that any particular third-party application is suitable for PAJSK data. Leadership commitment in this area entails creating practical and accountable processes, not introducing additional bureaucracy.

Challenges Faced by Principals

Inconsistent Interpretation Of Guidelines And Rubrics

Implementation involving multiple assessors creates the possibility of different interpretations of participation categories, positions held, or achievement levels. Although the PAJSK guidelines establish scoring principles, ambiguous cases still require reference to official documents and authorised verification channels. If two teachers apply different criteria to equivalent evidence, score comparisons become less meaningful. This illustrates a risk to consistency, not evidence that any particular school has assigned scores incorrectly. The principles of reliability and fairness in the standards developed by AERA, APA and NCME (2014) support the need to minimise variation unrelated to students' actual achievements.

Documentation Burden and Evidence Management

Collecting attendance records, confirmation letters, certificates and achievement information may become repetitive when different units use different formats. Dispersed sources of evidence increase document retrieval time and complicate review. Arba'in and Mohd Noor (2024) found relationships among workload, school resources and teachers' job stress in their study sample, but their research did not specifically measure the PAJSK documentation burden. Its application to PAJSK is therefore supportive rather than direct: principals should evaluate existing workflows before introducing additional documentation requirements.

Consistency in Scheduling and Conducting Activities

Co-curricular activities are vulnerable to timetable changes, conflicting demands for facilities, external competitions and local circumstances. Scheduling changes without replacement arrangements may reduce students' participation opportunities and compromise the completeness of records. However, any effects on scores depend on the PAJSK rules in force and the circumstances of individual students. The administrative responsibility is to document changes, provide appropriate alternative activities and ensure that scoring decisions are based on official requirements rather than an automatic assumption that every cancellation affects marks.

Data Integrity, Accuracy and Traceability

Recording information from multiple sources creates risks of duplicate entries, incomplete documents, or delayed verification. Data integrity encompasses factual accuracy, the clarity

of data sources and the ability to trace corrections. The risk of administrative error must not be equated with allegations of misconduct; every concern should be examined on the basis of evidence. PBS quality assurance, with its emphasis on monitoring and detection, provides a foundation for managing these risks (MOE, 2025). At school level, the central requirement is not a large number of audits but a workable review process that does not compromise teaching time.

Digital Capacity and Dependence on Individual Personnel

Differences in software skills, internet connectivity and equipment mean that digitalisation does not necessarily solve every problem. If all information is known or managed by only one staff member, teacher transfers may disrupt the continuity of operations. The Digital Education Policy (MOE, 2023) provides a broader framework for strengthening digital capability; at school level, more realistic measures include developing concise work instructions, maintaining access according to assigned authority and training replacement personnel. Implementation must comply with student information management requirements established by the relevant education authorities.

Communication between Schools and Stakeholders

Students' achievements in activities outside school sometimes depend on supporting evidence from organisers or relevant agencies. Delays in receiving documents and unclear inquiry channels can make verification more difficult. Principals can clarify the responsibilities of accompanying teachers, timelines for document submission and procedures for responding to parents' inquiries. Procedural transparency also protects students from bearing the consequences of administrative delays beyond their control, subject to PAJSK verification rules.

Inequalities in Participation Opportunities

Facilities, travel costs, time, family support and the availability of coaches may differ across schools or groups of students. Such differences raise questions about equitable opportunities to attain recordable achievements, even when identical scoring rules are applied. This situation calls for attention to students who face barriers to access or have specific participation needs. The OECD (2024) report highlights the importance of inclusive opportunities for social and emotional development, but it does not provide a specific measure of PAJSK disparities in Malaysia. The extent of local challenges must therefore still be established using school data and field research.

It is important to emphasise that these challenges are described through theoretical reasoning, policy documents and supporting literature. No prevalence statistics or inter-school comparisons are presented because this manuscript is not a survey study. The severity of these challenges may vary across urban, suburban and rural schools. Consequently, principals' priorities should be informed by evidence from their own school operations rather than an assumption that every challenge arises simultaneously.

The seven challenges can be organised into three analytical clusters: assessment quality (rubric interpretation and data integrity), organizational capacity (documentation, scheduling and digital capability) and equity of participation (communication and access). This grouping helps principals distinguish problems requiring technical training from those requiring

changes in resources or community relationships. It also discourages the use of a single solution, such as digitalisation, to address all types of challenges.

Strategies for Addressing the Challenges

This article proposes a four-phase improvement strategy derived from a synthesis of Kotter (1995), Fullan (2001), Spillane (2006) and the PBS quality assurance principles (MOE, 2025). The four phases are neither new official directives nor an effectiveness-tested model. Instead, they constitute a practical sequence that can be evaluated and adapted to school readiness without changing MOE scoring criteria.

Phase 1: Aligning Understanding and Priorities

Principals initiate change by clarifying the purpose of PAJSK in student development and the risks of inconsistent processes. An initial review may identify teachers' understanding of current guidelines, existing documentation workflows and activities that are difficult to implement. Technical briefings using authentic case examples are more useful than general instructions to 'improve scores'. At this stage, principals also establish referral channels for ambiguous scoring issues and make clear that MOE rules take precedence over internal standard operating procedures. The success of this initial phase should be interpreted in terms of developing awareness and the ability to apply instructions consistently. Quantitative targets for scores or grades should be avoided if they risk encouraging tokenistic participation or reporting that fails to reflect actual circumstances. Reasonable early indicators include a documented workflow map, clear responsibilities and staff participation in training, rather than short-term changes in student scores.

Phase 2: System Development and Allocation of Responsibilities

The implementation structure is then clarified through a responsibility matrix distinguishing recording, review, verification and corrective action. Schools may standardise evidence checklists to support administrative work, but they should not impose additional evidence requirements that disqualify students where such requirements are not stipulated in policy. For digital management, centralisation of files should be assessed in terms of accessibility, security, data ownership and user capability. Distributed leadership principles support building the capacity of several personnel so that operational continuity does not depend on a single teacher (Spillane, 2006).

Phase 3: Mentoring, Moderation and Risk-Based Monitoring

This phase draws on established quality assurance mechanisms, particularly mentoring, moderation, monitoring and detection as outlined in the PBS guidelines (MOE, 2025). Principals may use sample record reviews, case discussions and checks of data completeness to identify errors requiring correction. If a school opts for monitoring every six to eight weeks, this frequency is merely an internal management recommendation subject to the school calendar; it is not a compulsory MOE standard. Monitoring findings should lead to supportive actions, such as targeted training, improved system access, or activity adjustments, together with documentation of traceable decisions.

Phase 4: Institutionalisation and Data Use For Improvement

The final phase focuses on sustaining practices shown to be appropriate within the local context. Work instructions, systematic handovers and post-reporting reviews can reduce the

loss of organisational knowledge when teachers transfer. PAJSK information may help schools examine student participation, the need for fitness programmers and opportunities for talent development. However, conclusions about students' character or well-being should not be drawn from scores alone. Principals must also assess whether new processes genuinely save teachers' time or merely transfer administrative burdens from physical files to digital systems. Kotter's (1995) principles for consolidating change and Fullan's (2001) emphasis on capacity are relevant at this stage.

Table 1
Mapping the seven challenges to proposed strategies and implementation indicators

Challenge	Phased intervention	Illustrative indicator
Rubric interpretation	Phases 1 and 3: case moderation and scoring guidance	Inter-rater agreement; interpretation issues referred for clarification
Evidence documentation	Phase 2: standardised templates and authorised storage locations	Record retrieval time; completeness of valid supporting evidence
Scheduling instability	Phases 1 and 3: calendar review and replacement activity plans	Proportion of activities delivered; records of replacement activities
Data integrity and errors	Phases 2 and 3: verification and audit trails for corrections	Data-entry errors detected; time taken for corrective action
Digital capacity	Phases 2 and 4: training and handover planning	Number of trained personnel; operational disruptions
Communication of external evidence	Phases 1 and 2: communication channels and submission timelines	Supporting documents obtained and verified
Participation access gaps	Phases 1 and 4: barrier mapping and community partnerships	Access to activities and participation opportunities according to need

Note. The matrix is a conceptual proposal; the indicators are neither official MOE key performance indicators nor mandatory requirements. All practices remain subject to the PAJSK guidelines currently in force.

Integrated Conceptual Framework

Based on the theoretical synthesis, principals' leadership practices can be understood through three complementary functions. Instructional leadership provides direction and a school climate that recognises the value of PAJSK; distributed leadership supports coordination and accountability across units; and change management guides phased adjustments to processes. These functions are expected to influence organisational mechanisms such as training, score review, evidence traceability, scheduling and expanded student access. At the outcome level, the indicators to be evaluated include procedural compliance, scoring consistency, record integrity and equity of opportunity, rather than average scores alone.

PRINCIPALS' LEADERSHIP PRACTICES
Instructional: vision, programmer and climate | Distributed: roles and accountability | Change: capacity building and institutionalisation
↓ Organisational mechanisms ↓
TRAINING AND MODERATION • EVIDENCE CONTROL • SCHEDULING • COMMUNICATION • PARTICIPATION ACCESS
↓ Observable outcome indicators ↓
QUALITY OF PAJSK IMPLEMENTATION
Policy compliance • Scoring consistency • Record accuracy and traceability • Equity of opportunity

Figure 1. Proposed conceptual framework linking leadership and PAJSK implementation quality

Contextual factors to consider: digital capability, workload, school resources and student access. Arrows indicate proposed relationships, not evidence of causality.

The framework generates three analytical propositions for future testing. First, alignment between principals' vision and consistent scoring training is expected to be associated with reduced variation in rubric interpretation. Second, clear responsibilities and user-friendly review tools are expected to support evidence traceability and recording accuracy. Third, the benefits of monitoring for implementation quality may vary according to school digital capacity, workload and participation access. These are hypothesised relationships rather than empirical conclusions. Theoretically, principals' practices serve as antecedent conditions, organisational mechanisms function as explanatory processes and PAJSK quality constitutes the outcome construct. Digital capability, workload and the participation environment are proposed as contextual factors that may influence the strength of these relationships. This framing can help future researchers select designs capable of distinguishing the effectiveness of strategies from variation in school resources.

Recommendations for Future Research

The first priority is to test inter-rater scoring consistency among teachers using equivalent cases and evidence. A design combining record analysis, scoring training and comparisons of decisions across assessors could establish whether greater alignment of understanding actually reduces unwanted variation. Such studies should distinguish disagreements in rubric interpretation from technical data-entry errors and missing supporting documents.

The second priority is to examine the leadership mechanisms proposed in the framework. Multiple-case studies in secondary schools with different capacities could compare the roles of principals, Senior Assistants for Co-Curricular Affairs, PAJSK coordinators and implementing teachers. Meeting observations, analyses of standard operating procedures and interviews could explain how role distribution functions in practice, consistent with Spillane's (2006) perspective. Correlational studies could also examine associations between leadership practices and data management indicators, while explicitly recognising that correlation does not establish causation.

The third priority is to evaluate the phased strategy through interventions that are ethically conducted and suitable for the school context. Comparable indicators may include time spent managing evidence, record completeness, the number of corrections and teachers' work

experiences before and after changes. Such designs need to account for external factors, including changes to official systems, staff transfers and disruptions to the school calendar, so that observed improvements are not automatically attributed to a single intervention.

The fourth priority concerns equity of participation. Research could examine relationships among facilities, distance, family support, activity choices and students' opportunities to gain meaningful co-curricular experiences. Student and parent perspectives are essential for understanding barriers that are not visible in scores. Studies should also test whether digitalisation genuinely reduces teachers' workloads or creates new burdens, particularly in schools with limited access to information and communication technology.

Conclusion

PAJSK is an important component of non-academic assessment, but its implementation quality cannot be judged solely by the completion of score entries. This article argues that the principal's role lies in connecting the vision for student development, organizational coordination, teacher competence and data governance with the principles of assessment validity, reliability and fairness. The seven challenges identified suggest that weaknesses may arise in rubric interpretation, workflow management, the provision of opportunities, or communication, requiring differentiated solutions.

The conceptual contribution of this article is a framework that links instructional leadership, distributed leadership and change management to organisational mechanisms and PAJSK quality indicators. The proposed four-phase strategy offers a plausible sequence for improvement, but it neither replaces official MOE guidelines nor claims empirically tested effectiveness. A key limitation is its reliance on narrative synthesis and supporting evidence from studies that, in some cases, do not directly examine PAJSK. Empirical validation is therefore needed before the framework's proposed relationships can be considered established. With this approach, principals' roles can be assessed not merely through leadership aspirations but through accountable assessment processes and more equitable opportunities for student participation.

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). Standards for educational and psychological testing. American Educational Research Association. https://ncme.org/resources/books/testing-standards/

Arba'in, N., & Mohd Noor, N. H. (2024). School resources, workload and teacher job stress: A moderation model of gender. ATTARBAWIY: Malaysian Online Journal of Education, 8(2), 12–24. https://doi.org/10.53840/attarbawiy.v8i2.222

Basah, A. A., & Abdul Razak, A. Z. (2023). Exploring instructional leadership practises items among headmasters in public primary schools: An exploratory factor analysis. Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 8(9), e002533. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v8i9.2533

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Fullan, M. (2001). The new meaning of educational change (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Ghazali, M. A. M., & Alias, B. S. (2024). The relationship between principal's distributive leadership practices and teacher job satisfaction in secondary schools in Pasir Mas District, Kelantan. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 14(9), 2555–2570. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v14-i9/22900

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217–247. https://doi.org/10.1086/461445

Hallinger, P., Wang, W.-C., & Chen, C.-W. (2013). Assessing the measurement properties of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale: A meta-analysis of reliability studies. Educational Administration Quarterly, 49(2), 272–309. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12468149

Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. Harvard Business Review, 73(2), 59–67.

Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2013). Pelan pembangunan pendidikan Malaysia 2013–2025 (Pendidikan prasekolah hingga lepas menengah) [Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013–2025 (Preschool to post-secondary education)].

Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2023). Dasar pendidikan digital [Digital Education Policy]. https://www.moe.gov.my/dasarmenu/dasar-pendidikan-digital

Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2025). Panduan pengurusan pentaksiran berasaskan sekolah: Edisi 1 tahun 2025 [Guidelines for the management of school-based assessment: First edition 2025]. Examination Syndicate, Ministry of Education Malaysia. https://www.moe.gov.my/pentaksiran-berasaskan-sekolah

Ministry of Education Malaysia. (n.d.). Garis panduan pentaksiran aktiviti jasmani, sukan dan kokurikulum sekolah menengah tingkatan 1–5 & calon STAM (PAJSK–SM) [Guidelines for physical activity, sports and co-curricular assessment for secondary schools, Forms 1–5 and STAM candidates]. https://www.moe.gov.my/pentaksiran-berasaskan-sekolah

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). Social and emotional skills for better lives: Findings from the OECD survey on social and emotional skills 2023. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/35ca7b7c-en

Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.

Ting, L. M., Tahir, L. M., & Hassan, R. (2024). Principals' distributed leadership toward middle leaders' organizational commitment in primary schools in Johor. Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, 22(2), 3060–3083. https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00225

Zhang, C., Alias, B. S., & Nordin, M. N. (2025). Effects of distributive leadership on teachers' job satisfaction in public schools: A systematic review. Education Sciences, 15(4), 412. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040412

Zhou, S. L., Hamid, A. H., & Alias, B. S. (2025). Deconstructing distributed leadership: How self-efficacy and organizational commitment shape teacher satisfaction in Chinese universities. Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management, 13(4), 14–31. https://doi.org/10.22452/mojem.vol13no4.2