Examining Teachers' Perceptions of School Effectiveness in Public Primary and Secondary Schools

American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities
Vol. 7, No. 2, 178-192, 2022
e-ISSN: 2520-5382

Andre Anthony Martin

University of the West Indies, Bridgetown, Barbados.
Email: andre.martin@open.uwi.edu

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions of School Effectiveness based on school level, sex and role in management in public schools in Grenada. Using a quantitative descriptive correlational research design, a survey was administered to a sample of 729 primary and secondary schools' teachers using a 58-item Likert scale questionnaire. Principal Component Analysis identified 5 components of School Effectiveness and this result was analysed using descriptive statistics, the independent samples t-test, and the Pearson Moment Corelation. The findings indicated that the teachers' perceptions of School Effectiveness were highly positive and moderately positive in primary and secondary schools respectively. The t-test revealed significant differences between primary and secondary school teachers, however, none were detected based on sex and role in management. The findings also revealed that there were significant substantial direct relationships among the components of School Effectiveness. This study establishes a discourse on the perceptions of School Effectiveness, adding to the School Effectiveness literature in a Caribbean context. It further suggests that schools should focus on key elements of School Effectiveness to lead school to development, however, the initiative is for practitioners to decide what key components of school effectiveness should be the highlighted in their school development plan.

Keywords: *Grenada, Leadership, School effectiveness, Shared vison, Teachers' characteristics, Teachers' perceptions.*

DOI: 10.55284/ajssh.v7i2.818
Citation | Andre Anthony Martin (2022). Examining Teachers' Perceptions of School Effectiveness in Public Primary and Secondary Schools. American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 7(2): 178-192.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.
Competing Interests: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.
History: Received: 24 October 2022/ Revised: 28 November 2022/ Accepted: 15 December 2022/ Published: 30 December 2022
Publisher: Online Science Publishing

Highlights of this paper

- Using a quantitative descriptive correlational research design, this paper examined the teachers' perceptions of School Effectiveness based on key demographic variables in public schools in Grenada.
- The tecahers' perceptions were found to be positive with significant differences between primary and secondary school teachers and significant substantial direct relarionships among the componets of School Effectiveness.
- This study suggests areas of School Effectiveness that practicioners can target to develop their schools.

1. INTRODUCTION

Schools are expected to achieve their desired educational outcomes and the implication of failing to achieve these outcomes can have detrimental socio-economic impact on small developing states such as those in the Caribbean region. Watson (2017) reiterates that education enables economic stability and social integration for the population. Throughout the Caribbean, there have been deliberations surrounding school effectiveness and the relevance of schooling. The issue becomes more complex, in the Caribbean, as schools are judged on examination scores rather than on the qualities that exhibit school effectiveness. Interestingly, there will always be non-school variables that can influence student performance and the input of schools, particularly those that collect low performing or challenged students, may be ignored.

The initial view of an effective school was based on the school's academic performance at public examination as stated by Jacobson (2011) and Sammons, Gu, Day, and Ko (2011). Likewise, currently in Grenada, the perception by many including school officials, parents, teachers and students is that effective schools are those that perform highly at the external regional examinations. Furthermore, schools are asked to be more accountable, which lead to the utilization of distinct measurable objectives such as high academic scores, while the consideration of other inputs of school effectiveness are non-existent. As a consequence, the focus on accountability factors (test scores) has dictated how the school achieve success, rather than other measures that play a major role in school improvement. However, boundaries of assessments, economic emphasis or forfeiture of humanism are opinions detrimental to standardized assessments (Parra, 2018). In addition, Botha (2010) contended that although academic measures have been widely used to measure school effectiveness, there is a need for further measures of a broader range of outcomes. Botha noted that a long-standing problem of using students' outcomes to measure school effectiveness has been to investigate conditions that serve to increase learning or achievement that are aligned to the school factors, rather than on other conditions such as those associated with the learner, e.g., socio-economic status, motivation, and learner competencies.

Educational organizations must provide the assurance of school effectiveness, as there can be compensations that go beyond training in basic skills (OECD, 2017). The Governor of the Eastern Caribbean Central Bank (ECCB) explained that the Caribbean needs to make significant enhancements in education to improve the quality of students produced from their schools. The Governor questioned whether an education system moulded by the historical British Colonial system is preparing students to meet the current skills, aptitude and knowledge of the labour force and the future markets (Now Grenada, 2021). The educational literature on school effectiveness is sparse in the Caribbean and it is not as established as in other jurisdictions. It is not known how teachers, the central constituents of schools, perceive the effectiveness of the operations of schools, whether differences in perceptions exist among constituents and how the features of school effectiveness interrelate to create better results for schools. For this reason, it is important that feedback on school effectiveness is gathered from teachers, as they are best positioned to form a judgement as a result of their constant interaction with the measures of school effectiveness. This study sought to determine primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness as measured by Shannon and Bylsma (2007) characteristics of high performing schools. The aim of the study also encompassed any variations in

perceptions based on school level, teacher sex, and the teachers' role in management (member/non-member of management team) and examined the relationship among the components of school effectiveness.

School effectiveness can be defined as the influence that the school has on the academic performance and social development of the students (Fuller & Hollingworth, 2014). Botha (2010) noted that school effectiveness means the institution achieves its desired outcomes, which is regarded as an outstanding feature of an effective school. However, Botha conceded that the meaning, creation and depth of school effectiveness conceptualization are intricate matters.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In this paper, School Effectiveness was operationalized as the extent to which the school has the characteristics of high performing schools as identified by Shannon and Bylsma (2007). These nine characteristics are briefly defined as:

i) A clear and shared focus- measures the school's focus on achieving a shared vision where everyone understands his/her role in this achievement.

ii) High standards and expectations for all students- clarify the belief of staff and teachers that all students can learn and meet high standards.

iii) Effective school leadership-the use of effective instructional and administrative leadership in the implementation of change processes.

iv) High levels of collaboration and communication- measures the ability of the school to utilize team work among teachers, across grades or forms, with other staff and with parents and members of the community.

v) Curriculum, instruction and assessments aligned with national standards- measures the alignment of the curriculum taught and measured, to the nation's standards and the teachers' understanding of the role of instruction and assessment in the learning process.

vi) Frequent monitoring of learning and teaching- defined as the use of a balance sequence of varying assessment to identify students who need help.

vii) Focused professional development-refers to the emphasis placed on improving staff in fundamental disciplines.

viii) A supportive learning environment- relates to the school's ability to provide a harmless, public, vigorous, academically inspiring environment.

ix) High levels of family and community involvement- determines the sense of responsibility that all have in educating students (Shannon & Bylsma, 2007).

The international literature is sate with studies on school effectiveness, differentiating among schools that fail and those that succeed, and how schools can change in order to improve their effectiveness. During the 1960s a movement emerged to study school effectiveness in the United States of America and the United Kingdom. This ignition was triggered by Campbell et al. (1966) asserting that student achievement was not determined by the schools the students attend. Many sought to investigate this case but it led to adding weight to the idea that learning institutions did influence students' achievement (Brimer, Madaus, Chapman, Kellaghan, & Woodrof, 1978; Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979; Madaus, Kellaghan, Rakow, & King, 1979; Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis, & Ecob, 1988; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979). These studies supported the claim that all children regardless of their background can learn and that schools can control the factors that enable the students to master the core curriculum. Reynolds et al. (2014) noted that school effectiveness studies have evolved from the practical research of Edmonds (1979); Rutter et al. (1979) and Mortimore et al. (1988) to focus on educational effectiveness as an essentially changing set of assumptions which diverted from the thinking that teaching and

learning are a fundamentally fixed set of interactions, towards one that appreciates that the variables within education constantly interrelate and attain different school outcomes (Kyriakides & Creemers, 2008).

Eventually the focus of school effectiveness evolved to equity studies to view effective schools during the 1970s particularly in the USA. Hence early definitions of school effectiveness surrounded the concept of equity. One of these by Scheerens (2000) is still relevant for the examination of the concept for this study. In this concept, the manner in which schools attain their set targets, as compared to other schools that are similar, and the management of the school's environment are pertinent considerations in school effectiveness.

The literature points to varying features of school effectiveness, in which many empirical studies are based. García Jiménez, Torres Gordillo, and Rodríguez Santero (2020) review of articles on school effectiveness concluded that within content, although circumstantial factors impact school effectiveness, school level variables also have an effect. Sangsurin, Chusorn, and Agsonsua (2020) found in Thailand that the most indirect influential factors affecting school effectiveness in primary schools are 1) shared vision, 2) climate and environment of the schools, 3) teachers' teaching quality, and 4) academic leadership. According to Shannon and Bylsma (2007) the emphasis in effective schools is the attainment of a clearly defined and adopted vision, and on ensuring all the constituents understand their responsibilities in fulfilling the mission. The writers also believe that both the mission and the goals ought to be created from the school constituents' core expectations and values, thereby following a dependable framework. Lezotte (2011) identified that principals were able to communicate artfully the strategies needed to achieve the vision in effective schools. Likewise Ertesvåg and Roland (2015) indicated that strong school leadership provides clear directions for school improvement and creates structures for efficient collegial work.

A review of the literature revealed that most of the related studies were focused on the relationship between school effectiveness and other school variables such as school performance and leadership. Most studies also used the measures of Lezotte (2001) correlates of school effectiveness and very few used the Shannon and Bylsma (2007) model of high performing schools as a measure of school effectiveness. Much of the studies measuring perceptions of school effectiveness, focused on primary and secondary schools, came mainly from Africa and Asia.

In a mixed methods study done by Magulod Jr (2017) to investigate school effectiveness in public and private primary schools found that the level of school effectiveness to be high in both types of schools. Factorial analysis revealed that the components of school effectiveness that influence school performance were identified as school leadership competency and professional collaboration. Magulod Jr (2017) included principals in the study, it did not consider other levels of schooling such as secondary. In another study, Pihie, Dahiru, Basri, and Hassan (2018) found school effectiveness to have a strong direct relationship with entrepreneurial leadership in secondary schools. In Pihie et al. (2018) study and Umar, Kenayathulla, and Hoque (2021) school effectiveness was observed to be high in secondary schools. Arivayagan and Pihie (2017) also found that the level of school effectiveness in secondary school to be high overall and that a moderate correlation exists between school principals' creative leadership practice and school effectiveness.

Very few studies investiagted the differences in the perceptions of school effectiveness based on the demogrpahic variables of the participants. Özgenel and Mert (2019) in their research findings found teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness to indicate significant differences based on their educational background and school level but not according to their gender and seniority. They also found that school effectiveness perceptions of undergraduate teachers were higher than those of graduate teachers.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study is quantitative research which adopts a descriptive correlational research design to examine primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions of School Effectiveness. To this end, the research was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extend do teachers perceive their school to exhibit the characteristics of School Effectiveness?
2. Are there any significant differences in teachers' perceptions based on a) school level, and b) gender and role in management as moderated by school level?
3. Are there significant relationships among the components of School Effectiveness?

The sample comprised teachers from 52 public primary schools and secondary schools in Grenada who were in a favourable position to judge the effectiveness of their school over a continuous period. A total of 901 teachers who served at the school for a period longer than two years were targeted for the study. From this population, 729 teachers from primary and secondary schools volunteered to participate in the study. The Demographical Data of the Participants in the Study or Table 1 provides a breakdown of the demographical data of the teachers who participated in the study. Of the 52 schools assessed by the study, there were 478 primary school teachers distinguished by 96 males and 348 females or 153 management team members and 252 non-management team members. There were 251 secondary school teachers, distinguished by 81 males and 161 females or 71 management team members and 157 non-management team members. Some of the participants did not provide the data for their gender and their role in management.

Table 1. Demographical data of the participants in the study.

Demographic variables	Demographic variables	Primary school	Secondary school	Total
School level	Primary school	478	-	478
	Secondary school	-	251	251
	Total	478	251	729
Gender	Male	96	81	177
	Female	348	161	509
	Missing data	34	9	43
	Total	478	251	729
Role	Management team member	153	71	224
	Non-management team member	252	157	409
	Missing data	47	14	61
	Total	478	251	729

The research utilized a survey to collect data from the participants regarding their demographics and the extent to which their schools exhibit the characteristics school effectiveness. Information was gathered from the Ministry of Education to indicate the schools where the principals were serving for a period of at least two years. Permission was sought from the Chief Education Officer and principals to conduct the investigation in the schools. Meetings were held with the teachers who qualified to participate in the study to gain their permission and to explain the nature and purpose of the study. This was followed by the distribution of copies of the questionnaires to the teachers, which were completed and returned in sealed envelopes to the researcher within a period of two weeks.

The questionnaire used in the study comprised of three questions on demographic details of the participants and fifty-five (55) questions measuring school effectiveness. These measures were adopted from Shannon and Bylsma (2007) nine characteristics of high performing schools. The participants were required to indicate an answer that best corresponds to their views, as to the extent to which the school exhibit the characteristics of school effectiveness. Scoring was based on a Likert-type scale procedure where 0 represents no basis to judge, 1 represents do not agree

at all, 2 represents agree slightly, 3 represents agree moderately, 4 represents agree mostly, and 5 represents agree completely. The scores for the participants can range from 0 to 330.

The data collected from the teachers were analysed, using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to determine the suitability of identifying dimensions on the 55-item scale. Using the Varimax method, initial analysis indicated that the School Effectiveness Scale (SES) has eleven components with eigenvalues greater than unity, explaining 64.41% of the variance. Based on a sufficient number of primary loadings, the ease of interpreting the components, and the supporting work of Shannon and Bylsma (2007) a decision was made to extract five components.

In the final analysis, using the Varimax method, the five components selected explained 49.71 % of the variance. After an examination of the literature for similarities, the components were named Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis, Team Work and Alignment Emphasis, Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis, Learning Milieu Emphasis, and Family and Community Participation Emphasis. It is noted that this five-factor solution attained accounting for 35.6, 4.16, 3.82, 3.37, and 2.76 % of the variance, respectively.

Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis - refers to the school's focus on achieving a shared vision where everyone understands their role in this achievement, the belief of staff and teachers that all students can learn and meet high standards, and the use of effective instructional and administrative leadership in the implementation of change processes. This scale comprised fourteen (14) items. The sum scores obtained can range from 0 to 70, consequently mean scores from 0.00 – 23.29, 23.30 – 46.63 and 46.64 – 70.00 were considered low, moderate and high ratings respectively of the Vision, Standards and Leadership Scale.

Team Work and Alignment Emphasis - refers to the school's focus on utilizing collaboration among teachers, across grades or forms, with other staff and with parents and members of the community and the alignment of the curriculum taught and measured, to the nation's standards and the teachers' understanding of the role of instruction and assessment in the learning process. Twelve (12) items were used to measure this component. The sum scores obtained on this sub-scale range from 0 to 60, thus mean scores from 0.00 – 20.00, 20.01 – 40.00, and 40.01 – 60.00 were measured as low, moderate and high ratings respectively of the Team Work and Alignment Emphasis Scale.

Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis- refers to the school's focus on the use of a balance sequence of varying assessment to identify students who need help, and on improving staff in fundamental disciplines. This scale uses eight (8) items, with scores ranging from 0 to 40. A low rating was represented for means scores from 0.00 – 13.33, a moderate rating represented mean scores from 13.34 – 26.66 and a high rating represented mean scores from 26.67 – 40.00.

Learning Milieu Emphasis Family – refers to the school's focus on the provision of a harmless, public, vigorous, academically inspiring environment. This scale comprised 6 items, with scores ranging from 0 to 30. A low rating, moderate rating and high rating will be obtained for mean scores ranging from 0.00 – 9.99, 10.00 – 19.99, and 20.00 – 30.00 respectively.

Family and Community Participation Emphasis – refers to the school's focus on the sense of responsibility that all have in educating students. Seven (7) items were used to measure this scale, with sum scores ranging from 0 to 35. A low rating, moderate rating and high rating were measured using means scores ranging from 0.00 – 11.67, 11.68 – 23.34, and 23.35 – 35.00 respectively.

Table 2. The reliability statistics for the school effectiveness scale.

Name of scale	No. of cases (Participants) used (643)	No. of items used	Items # on questionnaire	Cronbach alpha
School effectiveness	521	47	1-9, 11-13, 15-16, 20-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-38, 40-43, 44-49, 51-57	0.950
Vision, standards and leadership emphasis	603	14	1 – 9,11-13,15-16	0.892
Team work and alignment emphasis	598	12	20-25, 27-29,31-33	0.804
Monitoring and professional development emphasis	607	8	35-38,40-43	0.807
Learning milieu emphasis	620	6	44-49	0.825
Family and community participation emphasis	636	7	51-57	0.845

These subscales formed the School Effectiveness Scale (47 items). In this study, School effectiveness was defined as the ability of the school to achieve its formally defined goals, measured by indicators of high performing schools as identified by Shannon and Bylsma (2007). The sum scores obtained on this scale ranges from 0 to 235; consequently, mean scores from 0.00 – 78.33, 78.34 – 156.66 and 156.67 – 235.00 were considered low, moderate and high ratings respectively. A team of experts checked the instruments used for content validity. *The Reliability Statistics for the School Effectiveness Scale or* Table 2 illustrates that the Cronbach Alpha test conducted for internal reliability. Table 2 revealed that the school effectiveness scales had excellent internal consistency.

The data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (version 19). In addition to Principal Component Analysis, the study utilized the t-Test for Independent samples, t-Test for Paired samples and the Pearson Moment Correlation.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Primary and Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions of School Effectiveness

Primary and Secondary School Teachers' Rating of School Effectiveness and the Independent Samples t-Test Results Table 3 provided a description of the means, standard deviation and t-test results for primary and secondary school teachers' ratings of School Effectiveness and its components.

Table 3. Primary and secondary school teachers' rating of school effectiveness and the independent samples t-test results.

Component	School level	N	Mean	SD	t	df	P
School effectiveness	Primary	425	161.89	36.89	2.992	654	0.003
	Secondary	231	152.98	35.54			
Vision, standards and leadership emphasis	Primary	425	48.55	11.81	4.186	654	< 0.0005
	Secondary	231	44.56	11.37			
Team work and alignment emphasis	Primary	420	41.65	9.34	2.186	648	0.029
	Secondary	230	39.95	9.70			
Monitoring and professional development emphasis	Primary	418	26.26	7.10	1.592	647	0.112
	Secondary	231	25.30	7.84			
Learning milieu emphasis	Primary	417	23.03	6.14	4.472	646	<0.0005
	Secondary	231	20.88	5.34			
Family and community participation emphasis	Primary	417	24.21	6.10	3.454	646	0.001
	Secondary	231	22.46	6.27			

Table 4. Male and female teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and the independent samples t-test results.

Component	Gender	Primary schools						Secondary schools					
		N	Mean	SD	t	df	p	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
School effectiveness	Male	91	163.67	35.666				77	160.21	35.09			
	Female	333	161.38	37.312	0.523	422	0.601	154	149.37	35.32	2.203	229	0.029
Vision, standards and leadership emphasis	Male	91	48.89	12.382				77	47.40	10.428			
	Female	333	48.44	11.675	0.323	422	0.747	154	43.14	11.581	2.722	229	0.007
Team work and alignment emphasis	Male	90	41.67	9.471				77	41.16	8.919			
	Female	329	41.64	9.332	0.020	417	0.984	153	39.35	10.040	1.338	228	0.182
Monitoring and professional development emphasis	Male	90	26.20	6.922				77	26.88	8.164			
	Female	327	26.29	7.164	0.107	415	0.915	154	24.51	7.573	2.190	229	0.030
Learning milieu emphasis	Male	90	23.14	4.469				77	21.53	5.435			
	Female	326	22.99	6.538	0.210	414	0.834	154	20.55	5.285	1.317	229	0.189
Family and community participation emphasis.	Male	90	25.04	6.069				77	23.23	6.209			
	Female	326	23.98	6.112	1.467	414	0.143	154	22.08	6.309	1.320	229	0.188

Table 5. Teachers' ratings of school effectiveness based on role in school management and the independent samples t-test results.

Component	Role in management	Primary schools						Secondary schools					
		N	Mean	SD	t	df	p	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
School effectiveness	Management team member	157	166.49	35.242				71	153.69	30.568			
	Non-management team member	268	159.20	37.632	1.973	423	0.049	160	152.67	37.615	0.201	229	0.841
Vision, standards and leadership emphasis	Management team member	157	49.97	11.313				71	44.63	10.113			
	Non-management team member	268	47.72	12.030	1.909	423	0.057	160	44.53	11.911	0.063	229	0.950
Team work and alignment emphasis	Management team member	156	42.56	8.781				71	39.44	8.155			
	Non-management team member	264	41.11	9.630	1.544	418	0.123	159	40.18	10.327	0.538	228	0.591
Monitoring and professional development emphasis	Management team member	156	27.10	6.424				71	25.90	7.514			
	Non-management team member	262	25.76	7.439	1.862	416	0.063	160	25.03	7.986	0.778	229	0.437
Learning milieu emphasis	Management team member	156	23.02	5.053				71	20.94	4.623			
	Non-management team member	261	23.04	6.715	-0.031	415	0.976	160	20.85	5.648	0.123	229	0.902
Family and community participation emphasis	Management team member	157	24.43	6.545				71	22.77	5.522			
	Non-management team member	260	24.08	5.831	0.560	415	0.576	160	22.33	6.608	0.501	229	0.617

The findings indicate that the primary school teachers expressed high ratings for School Effectiveness and its components: Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis, Team Work and Alignment Emphasis, Learning Milieu Emphasis and Family and Community Participation Emphasis, except for Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis where the rating was moderate. The secondary school teachers expressed moderate ratings for School Effectiveness and its components: Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis, Team Work and Alignment Emphasis, Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis and Family and Community Participation Emphasis, except for Learning Milieu Emphasis where the rating was high. This suggests that the teachers held positive views of their schools' effectiveness.

In addition, the preliminary analysis indicated that the primary school teachers reported higher mean scores of School Effectiveness than their secondary school counterparts. As a consequence, the t-test revealed that there were significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups on School Effectiveness (t=2.992; df=654; p=0.003) and its components: Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis (t=4.186; df=654; p<0.0005), Team Work and Alignment Emphasis (t=2.186; df=648; p=0.029), Learning Milieu Emphasis (t=4.472; df=646; p<0.0005) and Family and Community Participation Emphasis (t=3.454; df=646; p=0.001). However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores for the Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis. This implies that generally the primary school teachers perceived their schools to be more effective than their secondary school counterparts.

4.2. Male and Female Teachers' Perceptions of School Effectiveness

When the primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions were moderated by sex, Male and Female Teachers' Ratings of School Effectiveness and the Independent Samples t-Test Results or Table 4 indicated that the male teachers rated their schools higher on all the components of School Effectiveness except in the case of Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis component at the primary school level. However, the t-Test for Independent samples revealed that there were no significant differences in the ratings between those two groups at the primary school level. At the secondary school level, significant differences were found for School Effectiveness (t=2.203; df=229; p=0.029), and the components: Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis (t=2.722; df=229; p=0.007) and Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis (t=2.19; df=229; p=0.03). No significant differences were found for Team Work and Alignment Emphasis, Learning Milieu Emphasis and Family and Community Participation Emphasis.

4.3. Teachers' Perceptions of School Effectiveness Based on Role in Management.

When teachers' perceptions were moderated by role in management, the *Teachers' Ratings of School Effectiveness Based on Role in School Management and the Independent Samples t-Test Results* or Table 5 indicated that at the primary school level, the teachers who were management team members rated their schools higher on the components of School Effectiveness (except in the Leaning Milieu Emphasis component) than the teachers who were non-management team members. At the secondary school level, non-management team members rated their school higher on all the components of School Effectiveness. However, the t-Test for Independent samples revealed that there were no significant differences in the ratings between those two groups at the primary and secondary school levels.

4.4. Relationship Among the Components of School Effectiveness at the Primary and Secondary School Level

To determine whether significant correlations exist among the variables of School Effectiveness, the Pearson Product Moment statistical technique was used. *The Correlation Matrix for Interrelationship Among School Effectiveness Components*, Table 6, provides the results of the correlation analysis.

Table 6. Correlation matrix for interrelationship among school effectiveness components (N=1155). (Primary schools' results are displayed below the diagonal while secondary schools' results are displayed above the diagonal).

	Components of school effectiveness				
Components	**Vision, standards and leadership emphasis**	**Team work and alignment emphasis**	**Monitoring and professional development emphasis**	**Learning milieu emphasis**	**Family and community participation emphasis**
Vision, standards and leadership emphasis	1	0.727**	0.701**	0.683**	0.699**
Team work and alignment emphasis	0.679**	1	0.707**	0.647**	0.699**
Monitoring and professional development emphasis	0.687**	0.751**	1	0.667**	0.693**
Learning milieu emphasis	0.464**	0.471**	0.441**	1	0.711**
Family and community participation emphasis	0.649**	0.653**	0.659**	0.661**	1

Note: **Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (Two-tailed).

Using the two sampled sets of teachers, when the Pearson r was run, it was determined through the correlation matrix that at the secondary school level:

a) Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis shared a significant high direct correlation with Team Work and Alignment Emphasis (r = 0.727 p< 0.0005) and Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis (r = 0.701, p< 0.0005) and a significant moderate direct correlation with Learning Milieu Emphasis (r =0.683, p< 0.0005) and Family and Community Participation Emphasis (r = 0.699, p< 0.0005).

b) Team Work and Alignment Emphasis shared a significant high direct correlation with Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis (r = 0.707 p< 0.0005) and a significant moderate direct correlation with /8/92Learning Milieu Emphasis (r = 0.647, p< 0.0005) and Family and Community Participation Emphasis (r = 0.699, p< 0.0005).

c) Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis shared a significant moderate direct correlation with Learning Milieu Emphasis (r = 0.667, p< 0.0005) and Family and Community Participation Emphasis (r = 0.693, p< 0.0005).

d) Learning Milieu Emphasis shared a significant high direct correlation with Family and Community Participation Emphasis (r = 0.711, p< 0.0005).

The *Correlation Matrix for Interrelationship Among School Effectiveness Components* or Table 6 further indicates that at the primary school level:

a) Vision, Standards and Leadership Emphasis shared a significant moderate direct correlation with Team Work and Alignment Emphasis (r = 0.679 p< 0.0005), Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis (r = 0.687, p< 0.0005), Learning Milieu Emphasis (r = 0.464 p< 0.0005) and Family and Community Participation Emphasis (r = 0.649 p< 0.0005).

b) Team Work and Alignment Emphasis shared a significant high direct correlation with Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis (r = 0.751 p< 0.0005) and a significant moderate direct correlation with Learning Milieu Emphasis (r = 0.471, p< 0.0005) and Family and Community Participation Emphasis (r = 0.653, p< 0.0005).

c) Monitoring and Professional Development Emphasis shared a significant moderate direct correlation with Learning Milieu Emphasis (r = 0.441, p< 0.0005) and Family and Community Participation Emphasis (r = 0.659, p< 0.0005).

d) Learning Milieu Emphasis shared a significant moderate direct correlation with Family and Community Participation Emphasis ($r = 0.661$, $p < 0.0005$).

5. DISCUSSION

In essence, primary schools were seen to be better able to focus on achieving a shared vision, where everyone understands their role in this accomplishment. Primary schools were perceived to focus more on staff and teachers' belief that all students can learn and meet high standards, and on the use of effective instructional and administrative leadership in the implementation of change processes. Primary schools were also perceived to be more focused on utilizing collaboration among teachers, parents and members of the community; on the alignment of the curriculum taught and measured to the nation's standards; and on the teachers' understanding of the role of instruction and assessment in the learning process. Furthermore, primary schools were assessed to be more focused on the provision of a harmless, public, vigorous, academically inspiring environment, and on the sense of responsibility that all have in educating students. Moreover, primary and secondary schools were perceived to be similarly focused on the use of a balance sequence of varying assessment to identify students who need help, and on improving staff in fundamental disciplines.

The discoveries of teachers having positive ratings of their schools is similar to the phenomenon of individuals having positive self-perceptions. Any negative ratings of the school are in fact an indictment on the teachers' effectiveness. Positive ratings of school effectiveness have been reported in previous studies compiled in the Caribbean and in the international arena. Arivayagan and Pihie (2017) and Umar et al. (2021) found that secondary school teachers perceived their schools to be practicing an overall high level of school effectiveness. Magulod Jr (2017) findings revealed that the level of school effectiveness of public primary schools was high. Arivayagan and Pihie (2017) also found that teachers in Malaysia gave high ratings on school effectiveness on the dimensions of vision, standard and expectation, leadership, collaboration and communication, alignment with standards, monitoring teaching and learning, and learning environment but they expressed moderate ratings for professional development and family and community involvement. The results Gebhardt, Schwab, Krammer, and Gegenfurtner (2015) study suggest that all teachers were satisfied with their teamwork and primary school teachers had more positive perceptions than the secondary school teachers.

The t-test results accord with a previous study done by Özgenel and Mert (2019) and Cerit and Yildirim (2017). These studies determined that primary school teachers believed their schools practiced a higher level of school effectiveness than their secondary school counterparts.

Several reasons can be given for the differences in perceptions by the teachers. Three plausible reasons are school size, teacher experience and training, and job specialization. In Grenada, primary schools are much smaller than secondary schools and have more experienced and trained teachers than secondary school teachers. Approximately 78.4% of primary schools' teachers are trained compared to 63.9% for secondary schools. Primary school teachers having more than twenty years-experience in teaching represents 51.5% of the primary school teachers in the study compared to 24.5% for secondary school teachers. Furthermore, in primary schools' teachers teach the entire curriculum by grade level in many instances whereas there is subject specialization at the secondary school level.

School size and teacher experience allow for easier ways of getting individuals to commit towards a goal, to communicate a vison, and to build consensus. The more experienced and trained teachers are supposed to be better placed, in knowing the school's mission, vision and goals, and are better able to facilitate learning easier with more effective strategies. The more experienced and trained teachers are better placed to raise standards of student

performance as well as being more involved in aligning the curriculum, instruction and assessment to national standards.

The more qualified and experienced teachers are better positioned to judge the characteristics of effectiveness as they have a better sense of understanding the rubrics of the school over a period of time. Effectiveness has to be sustained which can lead to the less experienced and untrained teachers having a less positive assessment of the school's progress, as the results of the policies undertaken may take time to materialize. Specialization does not give teachers additional time to learn more about the child as opposed to having to teach the child all areas in the curriculum. Primary school teachers can be better placed with added knowledge of the child, to influence improvement in aspects of students' outcomes.

In the secondary schools, more teachers are charged with testing accountability than in the primary schools. This summons for greater transparency in secondary schools and for those teachers to be more accountable in their practice. Differences in perceptions of the teachers by level, may be a result of the secondary teachers' perceptions being influenced by the students' external test scores. These scores tend to measure teachers' performance at the secondary level more than at the primary level in Grenada. This occurs as the regional examination results at the primary level indicate success as mostly all students "pass" whereas at the secondary level they have to earn their "pass". The examination results create an avenue for lower assessment of school effectiveness for secondary schools.

Smaller schools allow for building healthier relationships among staff and students, thereby creating an improved learning environment. It is much easier to know every student and their family associates in small schools, hence a greater chance to get everybody involved, as each child will be perceived to matter. In the larger schools, some students can go unnoticed whether for strong performances or good behavior. As such since the secondary schools tend to be larger than the primary schools, it may be that areas of school effectiveness may not be entirely visible or transparent to all teachers in the secondary schools. The views of the primary school teachers may differ as the principals of the secondary schools are more obligated to spend more time and resources on administrative and managerial responsibilities, shifting from leadership activities that can boost school effectiveness, such as sharing a focused vision (Goff, Goldring, & Bickman, 2014). Furthermore, fragmentation and polarization can often occur in the larger schools, and as such the secondary schools may have more variation within schools on perceptions of school effectiveness.

Interestingly, the degree of hierarchy is the same for both school levels (teachers, heads of department, principal) and the background characteristics (education, experience, and training) of the leaders in the schools are similar, hence the homogenous views by both groups of teachers with regards to Monitoring and Leadership. Schools also exist within a district organization, hence, the teachers from secondary and primary schools' views were similar for Monitoring and Collaboration, as schools may share similar practices propelled by the Ministry of Education through the district teams.

Özgenel and Mert (2019) in their research findings found teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness to not show significant differences according to their gender. In similar studies, as cited by Özgenel and Mert (2019), Toprak (2011) found that male and female teachers expressed similar views of their school effectiveness. However, Kanmaz and Uyar (2016) found that male teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness were higher than female teachers. The findings of this study indicated- that sex is not a factor impacting perceptions of school effectiveness.

Very few studies, if any, were done on the differences observed in school effectiveness based on teacher role in management at the school. Most studies used other demographic variables such as sex, age, level, and qualification. Umar et al. (2021) study in Niger revealed that management team members gave high ratings to secondary school effectiveness. Özgenel and Mert (2019) found no differences in teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness based on

seniority. In Grenada, senior teachers are considered those on the management team. It was detected that teachers' perceptions about school effectiveness increased with seniority and there are some research findings that observed teachers' seniority is a variable that positively affects school effectiveness (Ontai-Machado, 2016).

Two plausible reasons can explain this study findings on school effectiveness perceptions based on the teacher role in management. Most categories can be seen as self-reporting especially to the management team members, hence the higher ratings by the management team members as people tend to be more positive when reporting about themselves. Likewise, reporting on other areas showed that both groups' perceptions were similar. In addition, the degree of hierarchy is the same in each school (teachers, heads of department, principal) and the background characteristics (education, experience, and training) of the teachers are similar, hence the homogenous views by both groups of teachers.

In general, the correlations among the School Effectiveness variables at both school levels assessed to be a significant substantial direct relationship. This suggests that there is a link among the variables indicating that when applied, the school should focus on the use of a combination of variables to generate greater school effectiveness. There seems to be an interrelation among the variables of school effectiveness, as for example Monitoring involves Assessment and so too are Alignment and Expectations. Hence the teachers may have similar perceptions on these variables.

6. CONCLUSION

This study examined teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness measured by the characteristics of high performing schools. Teachers are key constituents of the school, who are ever-present, who can be good judges of how the school is organized, and their views can help guide future leadership actions that could lead schools to success.

The study indicated that primary schools were seen in a more positive light than secondary schools. The implementation of policies and plans within the Grenadian education system needs careful consideration as the reality in schools is vastly different for primary and secondary schools' teachers. Policies in the Ministry of Education should be directed at the management of school enrollment as the trend has been for the increase in secondary schools' enrollment whilst primary schools are getting smaller. Additionally, secondary schools need to pay attention to some of the best school improvement practices of the primary schools and adopt these practices in their settings, where applicable. Furthermore, perception can influence practice. Principals can direct teachers' perceptions by organizing and explaining the key components of school effectiveness that the staff need to focus on in the school. As a result, the practices of teachers are influenced by the principal and maximum teacher commitment to all relevant areas of school effectiveness can be earned. The fact that the secondary school teachers' ratings on teamwork was moderate, suggests that there is a need to reduce teacher isolation, and to increase team building in these schools. Grenadian secondary schools, as perceived by teachers, need to provide a more favorable environment where the constituents of the school can work together aggressively and use more effective means of communication.

Although the study focused on all available schools within a targeted population, it was evident that some schools were perceived to be more effective than others. Hence, a thorough study of these effective schools can be done to capture their typical practices that can result in improved school effectiveness within a Grenadian context. In addition, the study indicated that some components assessed require further exploration to provide a clearer understanding of the related issues. Additional research can be done to investigate the relationship that other variables such as leadership styles may have on the components of school effectiveness. Likewise, additional research on the perceptions and or expectations of school effectiveness by other stakeholders such as parents, students, education

officers, and school managers, can add to the limited knowledge of school effectiveness in Grenada. This new knowledge can inform the practices of principals to lead their schools to success.

The study incorporated many aspects of the literature and suggests the need for school development; hence, the Grenadian education system must devise a means of adequately preparing persons for a position that is salient to the management of the variables of school effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Arivayagan, K., & Pihie, Z. A. L. (2017). Teacher's perceptions related to principals' creative leadership practices towards school effectiveness. *The Pertanika Journal of Scholarly Research Reviews, 3*(3), 70-82.

Botha, R. J. (2010). School effectiveness: Conceptualizing divergent assessment approaches. *South African Journal of Education, 30*(4), 605-620. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v30n4a391

Brimer, A., Madaus, G. F., Chapman, B., Kellaghan, T., & Woodrof, R. (1978). *Differences in school achievement.* Slough England: NFER-Nelson.

Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *Schools social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference.* New York: Praeger.

Campbell, E. Q., Coleman, J. S., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cerit, Y., & Yildirim, B. (2017). The relationship between primary school principals' effective leadership behaviours and school effectiveness. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education, 6*(3), 902-914.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*(1), 15-24.

Ertesvåg, S. K., & Roland, E. (2015). Professional cultures and rates of bullying. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 26*(2), 195-214. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2014.944547

Fuller, E. J., & Hollingworth, L. (2014). A bridge too far? Challenges in evaluating principal effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 50*(3), 466-499. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x13506595

García Jiménez, J., Torres Gordillo, J. J., & Rodríguez Santero, J. (2020). What is published in impact journals on school effectiveness? A systematic review of research results and methods. *Pedagogika, 138*(2), 5-24. https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2020.138.1

Gebhardt, M., Schwab, S., Krammer, M., & Gegenfurtner, A. (2015). General and special education teachers' perceptions of teamwork in inclusive classrooms at elementary and secondary schools. *Journal for Educational Research Online, 7*(2), 129-146.

Goff, P. T., Goldring, E., & Bickman, L. (2014). Predicting the gap: Perceptual congruence between American principals and their teachers' ratings of leadership effectiveness. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 26*(4), 333-359. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-014-9202-5

Jacobson, S. (2011). Leadership effects on student achievement and sustained school success. *Management, 25*(1), 33-44. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541111100107

Kanmaz, A., & Uyar, L. (2016). The effect of school efficiency on student achievemen. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education, 3*(2), 123-136. https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.239551

Kyriakides, L., & Creemers, B. P. (2008). Using a multidimensional approach to measure the impact of classroom-level factors upon student achievement: A study testing the validity of the dynamic model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 19*(2), 183-205. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450802047873

Lezotte, L. W. (2011). Effective schools: Past, present, and future. *Journal for Effective Schools, 10*(1), 3-22.

Lezotte., L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective school's movement.* Okemos: MI: Effective Schools Products.

Madaus, G., Kellaghan, T., Rakow, E., & King, D. (1979). The sensitivity of measures of school effectiveness. *Harvard Educational Review*, *49*(2), 207-230. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.49.2.1533110q23j83566

Magulod Jr, G. C. (2017). Factors of school effectiveness and performance of selected public and private elementary schools: implications on educational planning in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *5*(1), 73-83.

Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D., & Ecob, R. (1988). *School matters*. Great Britain: The University of California Press.

Now Grenada. (2021). Individualized skill focus. Retrieved from: https://www.nowgrenada.com/2021/11/individualised-skill-focus.

OECD. (2017). *Education at a glance 2017: OECD indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Ontai-Machado, D. O. M. (2016). *Teachers' perceptions of elementary school principals' leadership attributes and their relationship to school effectiveness*. Doctorate Dissertion Walden University.

Özgenel, M., & Mert, P. (2019). The role of teacher performance in school effectiveness. *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, *4*(10), 417-434. https://doi.org/10.35826/ijetsar.42

Parra, J. D. (2018). Critical realism and school effectiveness research in Colombia: The difference it should make. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *39*(1), 107-125. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2017.1330681

Pihie, Z. A. L., Dahiru, A. S., Basri, R., & Hassan, S. (2018). Relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and school effectiveness among secondary schools. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *8*(12), 258-274. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i12/5011

Reynolds, D., Sammons, P., De Fraine, B., Van Damme, J., Townsend, T., Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (2014). Educational effectiveness research: A state-of-the-art review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *25*(2), 197-230. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2014.885450

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. London England: Open Books.

Sammons, P., Gu, Q., Day, C., & Ko, J. (2011). Exploring the impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes: Results from a study of academically improved and effective schools in England. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *25*(1), 83-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513541111100134

Sangsurin, K., Chusorn, P., & Agsonsua, P. (2020). A model of causal relationships affecting the effectiveness of primary schools under Khon Kaen primary education service area. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *9*(1), 230-236. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p230

Scheerens, J. (2000). *Improving school effectiveness*. Paris, France: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

Shannon, G. S., & Bylsma, P. (2007). Nine characteristics of high-performing schools: A research based resource for schools and districts to assist with improving student learning. OSPI. In (pp. 1-146). Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Toprak, M. (2011). School effectiveness of teachers working in primary schools opinions on: Adıyaman ili örneği/Primary school teachers' views on school effectiveness: Case of adıyaman province.

Umar, O. S., Kenayathulla, H. B., & Hoque, K. E. (2021). Principal leadership practices and school effectiveness in Niger State, Nigeria. *South African Journal of Education*, *41*(3), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v41n3a1859

Watson, T. N. (2017). Effective school leadership and New York city's immigrant and migrant children: A study. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *31*(5), 622-632. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-11-2016-0244