

Organizational Development Towards Excellent Management

Noor Azam Mahmad*

Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan, Malaysia

Norasmah Othman

Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan, Malaysia

Mohammad Yusof Mohd Nor

Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan, Malaysia

Abstract

This study will use the Kirkpatrick Assessment Model to assess the School Excellence program through Organization Development (PrOD). This model involves evaluation of reactions, learning (knowledge, skills and attitude), behavior and outcomes, but this study only assesses knowledge and behavior. This study uses survey method by involving 120 respondents of the study chosen by group sampling. The instrument is a questionnaire that has Cronbach Alpha value between 0.930-0.984. The data were analyzed using mean score, percentage, standard deviation and regression. Analysis findings show that there is a significant difference between the level of knowledge and behavior before and after the PrOD. Overall, this study recommends PrOD to be continued, but it is necessary to improve in the formulation of PrOD syllabus so that school leaders can improve the behavior change in meaningful and meaningful implementation of the PrOD.

Keywords: knowledge; Behavior; Kirkpatrick model; Relationship.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

School is an organization at the forefront in meeting the challenges of globalization. Schools need to be an educational change agency and rethink the status quo, beyond professional and management aspects by focusing on organizational development. Organization Development (OD) is a new approach that challenges traditional approaches in building school leadership and management capacity. It is an integrated perspective that recognizes the changing of an important resource to respond to the need for capacity building of the system in order to accelerate the educational excellence of the institute (Yap *et al.*, 2008). OD is not new because schools in developed countries like the United Kingdom deal with this problem through the School Remodeling Program (School Remodeling Program). In New Zealand EHSAS (Extending High Standards Across School Project) program is used for OD programs, these efforts are aimed at promoting the School Development Plan (SIP) to enhance student excellence (Fullan, 2000).

The OD concept in Malaysia coincides with the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025 (Pre-School to Middle School Education) (PPPM, 2013-2025) which emphasizes on the development of schools. This concept is set out in the fifth and sixth shifts to ensure that high-performing leaders are placed in schools and seek State Education Departments, District and School Education Offices to provide specialized solutions in developing schools based on internal expertise.

The PrOD has been implemented since 2008 aimed at improving the development of school organization. However, based on the participants' experience, though the content of PrOD can improve the self-imperative moral of participants, it is difficult for them to apply to teachers involved with PrOD (Yap *et al.*, 2008). Institut Aminuddin Baki (2014a), study revealed that leaders who followed the PrOD, the respondents faced difficulties in integrating the implementation of the management and guiding their teachers only 57.8 per cent of the National Secondary School (SMK) and 63.8 per cent of the National Schools (SK) only succeeded in integrating them into administration. This situation will lead to PrOD's objective that all the knowledge gained can be applied by leaders and teachers not achieved well.

Training is a process of planned learning that aims to improve the ability of employees to solve current problems, solve problems that may exist in the future, develop staff efficiency and develop organizational competitiveness in the future. However, while training practices can improve current job performance, they are not able to attract, retain and encourage employees to enhance the global competitiveness of the organization (Azman and Nurul Inani, 2010). Hairani (2006), stated that in-service trainings had a positive impact on school leaders but training weaknesses were inadequate time and their non-ongoing implementation. Thus, the question is: Does the PrOD have a positive impact to knowledge and skill school leaders?

2. Methodology

The design of this study uses the survey design through questionnaire as a research instrument. The survey method was conducted in Terengganu, Negeri Sembilan, Johor, Kedah, Malacca and Selangor state schools. The selection of the state is based on the state that conducted the PrOD course in 2016. This study uses the Kirkpatrick 1959 model which uses four levels of assessment: reactions, learning (knowledge, skills and attitudes), behaviour and outcomes. However, this study only uses two levels of assessment. [Creswell \(2012\)](#), states that the instrument of study is an important component of collecting data and obtaining the necessary information to answer the questions of the proposed study.

The population of the study was 180 school leaders who followed Prod in three zones throughout the country in 2016. The minimum number required for this study was 118 respondents based on National Education Association's research as reported by [Krejcie and Morgan \(1970\)](#). Sample selection was made by cluster sampling because the respondents were in three zones. The first step of the investigator is to use group sampling to ensure that the population in each zone is selected as a sample. According to [Sabitha Marican \(2009\)](#), group sampling needs to be done so samples can represent each category or place. Then the distribution of the sample is based on the proportion according to the zone. Next step is the leader selection as a sample using a simple random sampling (lottery draw). A total of 38 individual leaders will be elected from the North Zone while 40 leaders will be on the South and Central Zone. This method allows researchers to control the number of samples involved in each group is sufficient and ensure that each selected sample is more representative of each population fraction representing each zone.

In this study, researchers used a questionnaire developed based on the Guidebook for Programs to Boost School Excellence through Organization Development (PrOD) [Institut Aminuddin Baki \(2013a\)](#), [Kamaruzaman et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Azmi Mat Yusoff \(2016\)](#). Questionnaires were formed based on objectives and constructs. The questionnaire used the Likert scale of five ratings.

The mean score, percentage and standard deviation will be generated for descriptive data analysis. In order to determine the level of knowledge and behavioral differences, the paired t test has been used, the double regression (stepwise) is used to determine the relationship that exists between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

3. Research Findings and Discussions

Table-1. Respondent Demography

Back Ground	Respondent	n	Persent
Post	Head Master/Prinsipal	44	36.7
	Senior Assistant	70	58.3
	Other	6	5.0
Gander	Male	60	50.0
	Female	60	50.0
Service Duration	< 6 years	7	5.8
	6-10 years	3	2.5
	11-20 years	20	16.7
	20 years and above	90	75.0
Service Group	Graduates	82	68.3
	Non Graduates	38	31.7

Based on Table 1, 44 persons (36.7%) are headed by principals while 70 persons (58.3%) are senior assistants. The rest are other positions of 6 (5%). There were 60 (50%) men and 60 (50%) female school leaders who responded. For the duration of the service, a majority of the total 20 years (90.0%), followed by eleven to twenty years (20) (16.7%). There were 82 (68.3%) school leaders with a degree compared to none with 38 (31.7%).

3.1. Difference of Knowledge Leaders Level Before and After Attending PrOD Course For Leadership, Team Work, Tool For School And Coaching Improvement

T-test analysis is used to determine and identify the level of knowledge of school leaders before and after attending the PrOD course for leadership constructs, teamwork, tools for school improvement and coaching. The results of this analysis will answer the hypothesis that: There is no difference in the level of knowledge of the school leaders before and after attending PrOD courses for leadership constructs, teamwork, tools for school improvement and coaching.

Table-2. The Difference Mean Knowledge Level of School Leaders Before and After Following PrOD

Knowledge Level Constructs	N	Min Score	Standard deviation	df	t	sig. (2-tailed)
Leadership Pre Leadership Post	120	3.77 4.90	0.56 0.15	119	22.40	0.00
Team Work Pre Team Work Post	120	3.83 4.95	0.74 0.19	119	17.02	0.00
Tool for School Improvement Pre Tool for School Improvement Post	120	3.81 4.95	0.66 0.17	119 119	19.35	0.00
Coaching Pre Coaching Post	120	3.69 4.95	0.67 0.17	119 119	20.21	0.00

*p<0.01

Based on table 2, the mean of pre leadership (min = 3.77 SP = 0.56) and post leadership (min = 4.90 SP = 0.15) and the t value obtained is 22.40 while the value of sig is 0.00. This value is smaller than 0.01. Thus there is a significant difference between the two mins. It can therefore be concluded that post leadership constructs are higher than pre-leadership. The mean of team work construct min (min = 3.83 SP = 0.74) and post team work (min = 4.95 SP = 0.19) and t value is 17.02 while sig 0.00. This value is smaller than 0.01, therefore there is a significant difference between the two mins. The conclusion can be made that a post-team work structure is higher than pre-leadership. For the construct of school improvement tools and the coaching of t value is 19.35 while 20.21 for coaching constructs. Both constructs also have a value of sig 0.00. The conclusions that can be made are all constructs showing a significant difference between the two mins. From this finding, the null hypothesis rejects that there is no difference between the level of knowledge of school leaders before and after the PrOD.

3.2. Difference in Level of Behaviour of School Leaders Before and After Attending PrOD Course for Leadership, Team Work, Tool For School And Coaching Improvement

T-test analysis is used to determine and identify the differences in the behavior changes of school leaders before and after attending PrOD courses for leadership constructs, teamwork, tools for school improvement and coaching. The results of this analysis will answer the null hypothesis: There is no difference in the level of change of behavior of school leaders before and after attending the PrOD course for leadership constructs, teamwork, tools for school improvement and coaching.

Table-3. The Difference Mean Level of School Leadership Behaviour Before and After Following PrOD

Knowledge Level Constructs	N	Skor Min	Sisihan Piawai	df	t	sig. (2-tailed)
Leadership Pre Leadership Post	120	3.90 4.78	0.53 0.13	119	17.79	0.00
Team Work Pre Team Work Post	120	3.97 4.76	0.55 0.21	119	14.26	0.00
Tool for School Improvement Pre Tool for School Improvement Post	120	3.89 4.70	0.50 0.21	119 119	15.74	0.00
Coaching Pre Coaching Post	120	3.86 4.73	0.52 0.18	119 119	16.88	0.00

*p<0.01

Based on table 3, the mean of pre leadership (min = 3.90 SP = 0.53) and post leadership (min = 4.78 SP = 0.13) and the t value obtained is 17.79 while the value of sig is 0.00. This value is smaller than 0.01. Thus there is a significant difference between the two mins. It can therefore be concluded that post leadership constructs are higher than pre-leadership. The mean of team work construct min (min = 3.97 SP = 0.55) and post team work (min = 4.76 SP = 0.21) and t value is 14.26 while sig 0.00. This value is smaller than 0.01. Thus there is a significant difference between the two mins. The conclusion can be made that a post-team work structure is higher than pre-leadership. For the construct of school improvement tool and coaching of t value is 15.74 while 16.88 for coaching construct. Both constructs also have a value of sig 0.00. The conclusions that can be made are all constructs showing a significant difference between the two mins. From these findings the Null Hypothesis rejects: There is no difference in the level of behavior of school leaders before and after attending PrOD courses for leadership constructs, teamwork, tools for school improvement and coaching.

4. Conclusion

The conclusion can be made that a post-team work structure is higher than pre-leadership. The conclusions that can be made are all constructs showing a significant difference between the two mins. The conclusion can be made

that a post-team work structure is higher than pre-leadership. It mean PrOD courses need to be implemented to improve knowledge and skill school leaders.

References

- Azman, I. and Nurul Inani, I. (2010). Training motivation as a connecting variable Between training programs and training effectiveness. *Journal of Humanity*, 16: 83-98.
- Azmi Mat Yusoff (2016). Assessment of training programs in assessment services School-based (pbs), (Thesis PhD. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia).
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. 4 edn: Pearson: Boston.
- Fullan, M. (2000). *The meaning of educational change*. 3rd ed edn: Routledge Falmer: London.
- Hairani, A. M. (2006). The effect of training in service on the quality of teaching and technical and vocational learning, (Master Thesis. Tun Hussein on University College).
- Institut Aminuddin Baki (2013a). *The program handbook moves excellence school through organization development (PROD)*. Institut Aminuddin Baki: Genting Highland.
- Institut Aminuddin Baki (2014a). *The program guidebook moves excellence school through organization development (PROD)*. Institut Aminuddin Baki: Genting Highland.
- Kamaruzaman, M., Norasmah, O. and Siti, R. A. (2009). *Program national qualifying professional qualification (npqh): How far the effectiveness? Workshop on management and leadership seminar on education for the 16th of 2009*. Institut Aminuddin Baki: Genting Highland.
- Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3): 607-10.
- Sabitha Marican (2009). *Penyelidikan sains sosial pendekatan pragmatik*. Percetakan Naz Sdn. Bhd: Kuala Lumpur.
- Yap, M., Kain Ching, Khuzaimah Sulaiman, Wan Karimah Wan Yaacob, Tee Pak Leong and Mahamud Omar (2008). *program melonjakkan kecemerlangan sekolah melalui pembangunan organisasi (PrOD)*. Institut Aminuddin Baki: Genting Highlands.