

A Review of School Effectiveness Theory for School Improvement

Noor Azizah Zamir

Faculty of Management and Economics, Sultan Idris Education University, 35900 Tanjong
Malim, Perak, Malaysia
Email: azahzamir88@gmail.com

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i3/7028> DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i3/7028

Published Date: 25 March 2020

Abstract

Based on District Education Office indicate that the highest number of non-effective schools compared to effective schools. The purpose of this article to review the school effectiveness studied by local or international researchers. This article was written based on the history of school effectiveness, school effectiveness models and previous studies that have been done locally and internationally. There are several models of school effectiveness that have been highlighted in this discussion and this paper also discusses the elements of school effectiveness models. For further studies are needed to examine school effectiveness practice in the school. The paper shows that policymakers, administrators, managers and headteachers at secondary school level may improve the schools by adopting effective strategies.

Keywords: School Effectiveness, School Effectiveness Model, Elements, School Improvement

Introduction

Recently, there is more research about school effectiveness by previous researchers. School effectiveness often linked with educational leadership. Usually, educational leadership is referring to a teacher's role and responsibility to facilitate students toward school effectiveness. Sparks (2003) states that the teacher is an individual who is important in leading changes to create an effective school. According to Leithwood & Riehl (2003) study, most of the teacher leadership is a major contributor to the school's success. Although many studies indicate that effective school often linked with the school principal, but student achievement also contributing to the effective school.

School effectiveness often used as a measurement for evaluating the success of the teacher in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, personality, student's value and academic achievement as well. To improve the quality of education, many measures implemented by the MOE such as an effective school program. This program aims to improve the best quality of schools, disclose the education system in the world and allows schools to implement innovation in their management. By this program, so many types of schools develop such as

vision school, smart schools, Boarding Schools, Cluster school and High Prestige schools. Although this program is implemented, the daily primary and secondary schools are not negligible because the main role of this program is to develop the success school. Become school success depends on the teacher's leadership but not the type of school.

According to Shukor (1998), the school does not become effective if the leader no capability to lead an excellent culture in the organization. Gray (1990) in Nor (2004) also stated that there is no evidence show that excellent schools lead by poor leadership. In Zahid (1993), Shukor (1998) and Hassan (2000) indicate that a non-effective school can be turned into successful If there are have quality leadership. The daily primary and secondary school can also be a High Prestige School if there are have strong and quality leadership in schools.

Problem Statement

The schools get recognition of High Prestige School (effective school) show the smallest number compared to schools that are not accredited (Non-effective school). Creemers (2010) describes the element of academic achievement in school effectiveness model. This element included in High Prestige Schools election which show that the gap between effective school and non-effective schools. Previous study indicates that the significant different between school's recognition with school are not accredited. This show that the weaknesses of school community such as leaders, teacher, administration to make school effectiveness and lake of knowledge to improve school.

Literature Review

The school effectiveness was first introduced since early 1950, the effective school often liked with school's effort in leading a change to improve student achievement. However, it is too complicated to define school effectiveness because too many factors influence the effectiveness of the school. There is a study about school effectiveness in the early 1970s indicate that effective school received less attention in the education field because of schools believes that there are factors in this school do not effect on the student achievement. Whereas in the early 1980s, the study found all activities at school can influence the effectiveness of the school. It is also supported by Cohn and Rossmil (2001) have suggested some reasons the effectiveness of a school should be evaluated.

First, there are theories to prove that school effectiveness is influenced by individual, teaching and learning method. Second, school effectiveness is influenced by communication in decision-making which is capable to change internal and external schools. In the latest study on school effectiveness focus more on research sample, each school has different factors in terms of environment, processes, and structures. All these factors will contribute to school effectiveness (Cohn & Rossmil, 2001). Some studies state that school effectiveness refers to school improvement efforts and measurement of student achievement. However, other researchers argued this statement and explain that the school's effectiveness was more focused on the behavior in the classroom, student participation and value of learning (Rutter, 1983; Abdullah et. al, 2016).

Hopkin and West (1994) said that school effectiveness is a place to develop the cognitive, affective, psychomotor, social and aesthetic and optimal learning environment as well.

According to Scheerens (2004) School effectiveness refers to aspects of teaching, learning, motivation and community involvement. Many of the factors which refer to the study of school effectiveness. Refer to the Bakirci, Turkdogan & Guler (2012) study found that the involvement of the leader giving an impact on the classroom teaching activities. Also, the involvement of teachers in decision-making, high-level communication between principals and teachers will affect school effectiveness. More researchers agree that effective school exists when there is have a relationship between principals, teachers, students, curriculum and teaching process, climate and school culture, between school and parents, social, relationship with the environment (Bakirci et. al, 2012).

Based on the definition of Scheerens, Glas, and Thomas (2003) describes effective schools that occur when a desired level of success has been achieved. Scheerens et. al (2003) explains that a school can control the situation and the internal environment of the school to make it an effective school. While Harris (2003) and Stoll and Fink (1992, 1996) supports this fact and agree that each school will get different result due to the needs, problems and different abilities. The concept of school effectiveness is an effort to change the strength, knowledge and research skills to create a new culture.

Common Elements of Success

The theory of school effectiveness is not only giving a significant impact on these factors such as student achievement, well-being but also in a relationship of the student's negative behaviours such as bullying and risky behaviour (Rutter & Maughan, 2002; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000). More than 40 years ago, school effectiveness has been studied in several successful schools in improving student results and generate something positive which considered the socio-demographic composition of the school. There are some of the theories and models developed by previous researchers

Theory of School effectiveness 1970s – 1990s

The different approaches to the school effectiveness because researchers are always thinking new dimension. Such as Edmonds (1979) has developed five factors of school effectiveness i) high expectations for student achievement, b) continuous assessment of student progress, c) strength of leadership education, d) a safe climate and organizes and e) emphasizing basic skills. While Mortimore, Sammons. Stoll, Lewis, & Cob (1988) discusses some of the characteristics of school effectiveness namely a) positive climate, b) the involvement of parents, c) leadership, d) the work environment centred, e) leader involvement n, f) teachers consistent, g) the involvement of teachers, h) maximizes communication between teachers and students.

According to Aggarwal-Gupta & Vohra (2010); Bredeson (1985); Reynolds & Teddlie (2000) discuss that school effectiveness is closely related to internal factors. Meanwhile, researchers Scheerens and Creemers (1989) describe the effectiveness of school-related inputs and outputs. Other researchers such as Brookover, Schweitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood & Wisenbaker (1979); Edmonds, (1979); Rutter et al., (1979) in Ali (2017) said that the effective school is involved a process other than the input and output. There are various views described by scholars about the effectiveness of the school. But some of them said effective schools are often associated with internal factors, external, input, process, and output.

Theory of School Effectiveness by Rutter et. al (1979) in Grosin (2004)

The study found that an excellent school can fight the negative effect that affects the school an example of a student background that is favourable. A study conducted by Rutter and colleagues in England in the 1970s which Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, (1979) in Grosin (2004) found that the school effectiveness occurs when there is a) efficiency in leadership, b) high expectations by listeners, c) school environment conducive to learning, focusing on basic skills, look up with students regularly (Edmonds, 1979; Scheerens, 2016). In the United Kingdom, research on school effectiveness begins with the study of Rutter. The study found that there are several factors involved in the effectiveness of class size, school size, and age of the building of the school. However, the most important thing in determining the highest level of effectiveness is balance in the reward system, intellectual, the school environment, opportunity for student's role, an academic goal, teacher as a role model, excellent classroom management, strong leadership and democratically in making –decision.

School Effectiveness Model by Marzano (2005)

In the model of school effectiveness by Marzano (2005) emphasize eight (8) dimensions to make the school successful which are a) instructional leadership b) clear mission c) good environment, d) high expectation of successful e) keep review student progress f) learning opportunity, g) perform task on time, h) has a positive relationship between school and home.

Comprehensive Model School Effectiveness by Bert. Creemers (2010)

Creemers (2002) has introduced a comprehensive model school Effectiveness or Effective Educational Research (EER), which has a four-level indicator such as l) student level, b) classroom level c) and d school level) context level. The model generated by the model Carroll (1963), a School Learning Model combined with other effectiveness school models. Then, Creemers (2010) have described the six (6) elements that are needed to bring to the effectiveness of the school is a) high expectations of stakeholders, b) material and non-material sources, c) community involvement, d) academic achievement, e) teacher efficacy and f) quality assurance. Six of these elements have been used by some researchers to review the effectiveness of schools which Ali (2017).

K-12 School Effectiveness Framework (2011)

Some schools in Ontario have used the K-12 School Effectiveness Framework Model (SEF K - 12) to measure school effectiveness. According to reports in Ontario Schools (2010, .28), school effectiveness is a process of evaluation before, on the and after the study because the assessment is a process of collecting accurate information on the student in achieving the curriculum. The main purpose of this evaluation is to improve student learning. For this improvement, evaluation before, on the and after the learning needs more attention. Teachers will provide feedback and guidance to this improvement.

Teachers will be involved in the learning evaluation process which assists by all the students together to develop the ability to be independent, set goals, determine the next step of learning and make reflection. Also, school effectiveness is determined by the school leadership and classroom. According to the report K-12 School Effectiveness Framework (2011, P.55), the result of the effective school based on professional learning communities to determine the level of effectiveness. Each educator involved in the process of a) identifying the current level of achievement, b) level of development goal, c) cooperation in achieving

the goals, d) maintain a professional learning community effectively which is the school staff must focus on teaching and learning as well, work collaboratively for learning improvement and make continuous improvement.

Theory of School Effectiveness by Fullan (2013)

Michael Fullan (2013) describes the school effectiveness must have a curriculum, teaching, and learning. According to him, the practice of innovative teaching includes three elements such as a) students of the pedagogical centre including an increase in learning, self-regulation and evaluation, collaboration, and communication skills. Secondly, b) learning outside the classroom including emphasizes problem solving and real-world innovation. And lastly, use of communication and information technology in achieving a learning goal.

School Effective School by Scheerens (2015)

Scheerens (2015) states that there are one hundred and nine (109) research study discusses in seven different models and theories on the school effectiveness namely Quinn and Rohrbaugh model, Coleman's functional community theory, comprehensive model Creemers, Parson's social systems theory, dynamic model, model Carroll J. B., and microeconomic theory. However, Creemers has argued Carroll's model in 1963 as the best model because it only focuses on the characteristics of the student's background. There are many theories introduced by other scholars about school effectiveness.

However, the combination of effective school models and theories of Coleman's theory, the effectiveness of the comprehensive model Creemers, microeconomic theory, model Quinn and Rohrbaugh, Dynamic model and model Carroll J. B. Thus, the effectiveness of this school have been presented to the three approaches. First, the internal effectiveness which emphasizes process improvement by involving external parties (Ayeni & Adelabu, 2011; Day et al., 2010; Hallinger, 2010; Khan, 2013b; Leithwood, Wahlstrom, et al., 2010; Saleem et al., 2012). Second, the effectiveness of the mediator is closely related to intermediate quality assurance (Khan, 2013; Niqab, 2016; Shahnaz & Burki, 2013). The last approach is the effectiveness of the future was described by Scheerens (Scheerens, 2015).

Summary of School Effectiveness Theories

Based on table 1, there are seven (7) theories and Models about school effectiveness by previous researchers. Each theory and Model have own objective to achieve the same goal. The elements involved in these theories as a guideline for school improvement and lead to the school effectiveness.

Table 1: Summary of School Effectiveness Theories

Theory			Summary
Theory of School effectiveness	1970s – 1990s		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High expectations for student achievement, • Continuous assessment of student progress, • Strength of leadership education • A safe climate and organizes • Emphasizing basic skills • The involvement of parents, • Leadership, • The work environment centered, • Leader involvement • Teachers consistent • Maximizes communication between teachers and students
Theory of School Effectiveness by Rutter et. al (1979) in Grosin (2004)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency in leadership, • High expectations by listeners, • School environment conducive to learning • Focusing on basic skills • Look up with students regularly
School Effectiveness Model by Marzano (2005)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Leadership • Clear Mission • Good Environment • High Expectation of Successful • Keep Review Student Progress • Learning Opportunity • Perform Task On Time • Has A Positive Relationship Between School and Home.
Comprehensive Model School Effectiveness by Bert. Creemers (2010)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High expectations of stakeholders, • Material and non-material sources, • Community involvement, • Academic achievement, • Teacher efficacy • Quality assurance
K-12 School Effectiveness Framework (2011)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on this theory emphasize the aspect of evaluation, guidance, feedback and reflection for teaching and learning process. • Encourage the teachers involved in these aspect mentioned to assist all the student together develop the ability to be independent, achieve the goal, planning for future learning.

Theory of School Effectiveness by Fullan (2013)

- Students of pedagogical centre including increase in learning, self-regulation and evaluation, collaboration, and communication skills.
- The learning outside the classroom including emphasizes problem solving and real-world innovation.

School Effective School by Scheerens (2015)

- i) Combination theories by previous researchers:
 - process improvement by involving external parties
 - the effectiveness mediator is closely related to intermediate quality assurance

Note:Summary of school effectiveness theories by previous researchers

According to Naseer (2011), school improvement should be involved in these five aspects namely i) leadership practice of successful school's head ii) Interpersonal relationship, iii) collaborative iii) shared school vision iv) instructional and mentoring support v) parent and community involvement. Based on the seven theories above the elements stated by previous researchers related to five aspects as mentioned by Naseer (2011). Supported by Dahiru, Basri, Aji & Samiran (2018) stated that to improve the effectiveness of the schools, educators must focus on the leading indicators, which are those elements that influence the trailing indicators of effectiveness.

Conclusion

To enhance and ensure the effectiveness of the school and meet the demands of various parties, the school must have a strategy in management practices. This study is important to policy maker, administrators, managers and headteachers as a reference in order to improve the quality of education in schools. This study also beneficial to the schools to refer in drafting and designing training programs, leadership courses among teachers in the future. Efforts in improving teacher leadership should be updated so that teachers can lead and create the positive behaviour among students, this is certainly improving student success and drive to the effective schools.

For future studies, the researcher propose some suggestions that can be taken. The selection of respondents for this study focuses on two schools as effective school and non-effective school. For future studies, the number selection of school can be expands so that the finding will going depth about differences of effective school and non-effective school. This study focus on two type of school (Regular school and High Prestige School). For further study, the researcher can be focus on comparisan between Regular School and other type of effective school so that the finding obtain more clearly due to different type of school backgrounds.

References

- Shukor, A. (1998). *Focus on Educational Management*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysia Education Ministry.
- Abdullah, A. G. K., Ying-Leih, L., and Ying, M. H. (2016) *Teachers' Morale and School Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Sibu*, Sarawak International Journal of Education, Culture and Society 2016; 1(2): 52-57 <http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/j/ijecs> doi: 10.11648/j.ijecs.20160102.14
- Aggarwal-Gupta & Vohra (2010). *Measuring Effectiveness of Schools in India: A Multiple Stakeholder Framework*. KJ Somaiya Institute of Management Studies and Research Mumbai, India
- Ayeni, A. J., & Adelabu M. A. (2011). Improving learning infrastructure and environment for sustainable quality assurance practice in secondary schools in Ondo State, South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education* 2012 January, Volume 1 Number 1, 61-68. ISSN: 2243-7703 Online ISSN: 2243-7711
- Bredeson, P. V. (1985); Communication as a measure of leadership in school: A portraiture of school principals. Published by: University of North Carolina Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40364902>
- Brookover, W. B., Schweitzer, J. H., Schneider, J. M., Beady, C. H., Flood, P. K., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1979). *Elementary school social climate and school achievement*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15(2), 301–318. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1162468>
- Bakirci, H., Turkdogan, A., & Guler, M. (2012). Is My School an Effective School? Headmaster and Teacher Views. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 46, 3471-3476.
- Carroll, J. B. (1963). *A model of school learning*. *Teachers College Record*, 64, 723-733
- Creemers, B. P. M. (2002). *The comprehensive model of educational effectiveness: background, major assumptions and description*. Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences, University of Groningen. Retrieved on January 22, 2010 from: http://www.rug.nl/staff/b.p.m.creemers/the_comprehensive_model_of_educational_effectiveness.pdf
- Creemers, P. B. (2010). A comprehensive framework for effective school improvement. December 2005 *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 16(4):407-424 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450500235200>
- Cohn, E., & Rossmiller, R. A. (2001). Research on effective schools: implications for less developed countries. *Comparative Education Review*, 31(3), 377-399
- Dahiru, A. S., Basri, R., Aji, A. A., & Asimiran, S. (2018). Modelling Social System for School Effectiveness. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8 (12).178-186.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Leithwood, K., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Gu, Q., & Brown, E. (2010). *Ten strong claims about successful school leadership*. Nottingham, UK: The National College for School Leadership
- Edmonds, R. (1979b). *A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling*. Cambridge, MA: Centre for Urban Studies, Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved March 12, 2004 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED13561.
- Fullan, M. (2013) *Stratosphere: Integrating Technology, Pedagogy and Change Knowledge* Pearson Canada Inc., Toronto
- Gray, J. (1990) The quality of schooling: frameworks for judgements, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 38, (3): 204-233.

- Grosin, L. (2004). Research on successful schools as a basis for school development. In G. Berg, & H.-Å. Scherp (Eds.), *The many faces of school development*] (pp. 137–178). Stockholm, Sweden.
- Hassan, A. (2000). *Interpersonal skill for Teachers*. Kuala Lumpur: PTS Publications and Distributors Sdn. Bhd
- Hopkins, D., & West, M. (1994). Teacher development and school improvement. *Teachers as Leaders. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa*.
- Harris, A. (2003). Distributed Leadership in Schools: Leading or misleading? January 2003 *Management in Education* 16(5):10-13
- Hallinger. (2010) Hallinger, P. (2010). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 0013161X10383412
- Khan, A. (2013b). A case study of instructional contributions of community and government secondary school administrators in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 4(2), 47-59. Retrieved on Sep 5, 2016 from: file:///C:/Users/hp/Downloads/100-100-1-PB.pdf
- K-12 SEF (2011, P.55), *School Effectiveness Framework*. A support for school improvement and student success ISBN 978-1-4606-2495-1 Print ISBN 978-1-4606-2496-8 PDF © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2013
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Available at www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-centre/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.aspx Leithwood K.A., &
- Riehl, C., Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What Works in Schools: Translating research into action?* USA: ASCD.
- Mohd Nor (2004) *Instructional Leadership, Commitment, and Job Satisfaction: A case study of comparison and relationship between effective school and Non-effective school*. LB2831. 926.M2 N822 2004 f 7415. PhD thesis, University Sains Malaysia.
- Naseer Ahmad Salfi, (2011), "Successful leadership practices of head teachers for school improvement", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 49 Iss 4 pp. 414 - 432
- Niaz Ali (2017). *Teachers' Perceptions of the Relationship Between Principals' Instructional Leadership, School Culture and School Effectiveness in Secondary Schools in Pakistan* Institute Of Educational Leadership University Of Malaya Kuala Lumpur
- Niqab, M. (2016). *The relationship among principal leadership skills, organizational citizenship behaviour, and intellectual capital in secondary schools in Pakistan*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, IEL, University Malaya).
- Rutter, M. (1983) Rutter, M. (1983). School effects on pupil progress: Research findings and policy implications. *Child development*, 1-29.
- Rutter, M. & Maughan, B., (2002). School effectiveness finding 1979-2002. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(6), 451 - 475
- Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, (1979) Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., & Ouston, J. (with Smith, A.). (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reynolds & Teddlie (2000) *International handbook of school effectiveness*. London: Falmer.

- Saleem, F., Naseem, Z., Ibrahim, K., Hussain, A., Azeem, M. (2012). Determinants of school effectiveness: a study of Punjab level. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(14), 242-251
- Scheerens, J., & Creemers, B. P. (1989). Conceptualizing school effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(7), 691-706.
- Scheerens, J., Glas, C., & Thomas, S.M. (2003). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring: A systemic approach*. Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers
- Scheerens, J. (2004). Review of school and instructional effectiveness research. *Educational for All Global Monitoring Report 2005*. 1-18.
- Scheerens, J. (2015). Theories on educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 26(1), 10-31.
- Scheerens, J. (2016) *Educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness: A critical review of the knowledge base*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Shahnaz, L., & Burki, A. A. (2013). *Why children go to work and do not attend school? Empirical evidence from Pakistan*. LUMS Economics Working Paper Series, Department of Economics, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore.
- Sparks, D. (2003). Change Agent: An Interview with Michael Fullan. *Journal of Staff Development*, 24(1), 55–58.
- Stoll, L., & Fink, D. (1996). *Changing our schools: Linking school effectiveness and school improvement*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D., (2000). The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research. January 2000. *School Leadership and Management* 20(3):394 – 395
- Zahid, W. M. (1993), *Vision Education Filling Agenda*. Kuala Lumpur. Nurin Enterpr