

INDICATORS OF GOOD PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP BASED ON PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, AND ADMINISTRATION STAFF PERSPECTIVES IN THE ERA OF INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

4.0

Aan Juhana Senjaya **

^{a*} Educational Management,
Wiralodra University

Jl. Ir. H. Juanda KM. 03 Indramayu, Indonesia. aanjsenjaya57@gmail.com

Abstract

Research relating to the leadership of principals in Indonesia generally uses indicators from various theories and literatures. In fact, principal, teachers and staff who are directly involved with the activities of school principals, of course, they have their own criteria and indicators relate to good principal leadership. This study aims to explore and find the good principal leadership indicators based on principals, teachers, and administration staff perspectives. An open question about the characteristics of a good principal leadership was asked to 124 respondents (12 principals, 93 teachers, and 19 administrative staff). The answer is directed and written at least 3 characteristics words. Furthermore, 670 statement as answers were analyzed qualitatively to take the similarity of meaning and there are 36 Statements with different meaning. Quantitative analysis is done to sort the indicators based on Response Indeks (RI). The results show there are 29 indicators, namely: Wise, Honest, To be responsible, Role models, Discipline, Assertive, Charismatic, Mastering IT, Fair, Smart, Visionary, Transparent, Democratic, Responsive, Open, Friendly, Protect, Humble, Communicative, Motivator, Souled leader, Able to solve problems, Creative, Loyal, Professional, Social soul, Self-Cofidence, and Trustful.

Keywords: administration staff, good principals leadership, Indicators, teachers.

Received: 20 Oct 2019 – Revised: 19 Nov 2019 – Accepted 19 Dec 2019 – Available online 30 Dec 2019

I. INTRODUCTION

An overview of the evolution of school leadership over the past three decades is presented by Hallinger. The study aim to provide a rationale that the knowledge based on principals' leadership was still incomplete. It provides better guidance for those who occupy the current principal's role more than 40 years ago. At the end he summarizes the findings and brief comments on the application of the principal's leadership knowledge based. Hallinger stated that: (1) The principal is the leader of values/norms; (2) The principal is important, but he can only achieve success through collaboration with others; (3) Leadership aims to build and increase

capacity; (4) take the time to understand the context first, then develop an appropriate leadership strategy; (5) Leaders must try to share leadership and empower others, but they must choose the right time and method (Hallinger, 2011).

The principal as a leader in a school has responsibility to the continue the activities and the entire educational process to achieve the goal. A good headmaster is a thinker at school that creates a school climate and ensures the continuity of the education process in a sustainable manner so it can increase the productivity of teachers and students. The principal is not only the head of the school but

also the instructor and motivator for the teacher, staff, and students. The principal as a good leader will be accepted by teachers and school administration staff as people who can achieve schools improvement. A good headmaster is not called to be just a school leader, but more important is trying to make a difference with other schools. It means that in schools there must be better changes, improve the quality of processes and have better outputs. The role of the principal is increasingly emphasized in policy and implementation in schools. The contribution of the principal's leadership to the educational process and results shows a significant contribution (Nooruddin & Bhamani, 2019).

Mitchell and Tarter examined the influence of the principal's professional leadership orientation on teacher professional behavior, academic optimism, and reading achievement. The results show that the principal's leadership directly influences teacher professional behavior and academic optimism (Mitchell & Tarter, 2016). Bentley examines Principals' Self-Perceived Leadership Styles in the Era of Accountability. The results show that the findings of this study are that principals from elementary, middle, and senior high schools in order to identify various approaches and styles of leadership in the era of accountability. The findings of this study also provide benefits for principals in evaluating alternative leadership methods to motivate teachers and students to improve academic outcomes (Bentley, 2011).

Hallinger, Liuc and Piyamand explored the relationship of headmaster leadership and teacher professional learning in China and Thailand. The results showed that statistically, the 'mediated effect' of principals' leadership on teacher professional learning in both societies is significant. These findings contribute to an understanding of the influence of leadership that policy makers and practitioners should support school leadership, teacher development, and educational change (Hallinger, Liu, & Piyaman, 2019).

Furthermore Hallinger, Lee, and Ko revealed the influence of the principal on the community

of professional teachers in Hong Kong. The results showed that the quality of the principal proved to be a significant determinant of the principal's leadership. The quality of the principal influences the Community of Professional Teachers both directly and indirectly. The quality of the principal also contributes to the positive perception of the principal's leadership and organizational trust (Hallinger, Lee, & Ko, 2014).

Then, Hariri, Monypenny, and Predeaux examined the leadership style and the principal's decision-making style that teachers felt and their similarities with Anglophile and Western literature. The results showed that the school principal exhibits three leadership styles and five decision-making styles. Principals are more likely to exhibit transformational leadership styles, less likely to exhibit transactional leadership styles and almost impossible to show laissez-faire leadership styles Principals are more likely to exhibit rational decision-making styles and less likely to show other decision-making styles (Hariria, Monypenny, & Prideaux, 2016).

The principal is challenged to balance the various goals that must be achieved. What was once seen as a traditional position that exclusively focused on bureaucratic management, the role of the principal has now changed to become focused on developing and maintaining institutional learning goals (Goddard & Miller, 2010).

Research that examined the attributes (indicators) of school principals that were predicted to achieve sustainable leadership was carried out by Chan and Sidhu examining the characteristics of Leadership of a Superior School Principal in Malaysia. This study reveals a complex but interesting picture of leadership in schools. It was revealed that the success of a school principal requires full participation and intelligent partnership from all parties involved. In addition, strong support, clear vision, and proper empowerment are also seen as critical and crucial factors that must go hand in hand with good leadership. This reflects school leaders who practice

collaborative, cooperative, participatory, democratic, and focused forms of leadership by giving others responsibility to lead (Chan & Gurnam Kaur, 2009).

Farah summarizes the characteristics of an effective headmaster from a variety of literature both books and research results. The summary results are outlined in alphabetical order from the word PRINCIPAL as follows.

P-Plans school activities and provides guidelines

R-Respects the wishes of the school population, replies their requirement and listen

I-Indicates and commands school population and never dictates orders

N-Networks to the school population and makes timely contact

C-Consults with school population and conducts constructive changes

I-Instructs school population and accept new idea

P-Participates in school activities and encourages teamwork

A-Attracts school population and motivates them to learn and teach hard

L-Leads school population to the right directions and learns from them. (Abdikadir, 2013)

Another study was conducted by Goolamally and Ahmad who examined the Attributes of School Leaders to achieve Sustainable Leadership. The sample population consisted of elementary and secondary school teachers. Through this research, it was found that there are five important characteristics or attributes (indicators) that must be possessed by a school leader or principal in order for a school to excel. The five attributes are: (1) integrity, which has principled and humble sub-attributes; (2) looking ahead, which has strategic sub-attributes of the catalyst and motivator of the mind; (3) inspirational, which has supportive and influential sub-attributes; (4) competent, which has a task competency sub-attribute (there are two components, namely, action oriented and social skills as well as emotional and spiritual competence); and (5) self-efficacy (Goolamally & Ahmad, 2014).

*Indicators Of Good Principal Leadership Based On Principal, Teachers, And Administration Staff Perspectives
In The Era Of Industrial Revolution 4.0 | 96*

Research focused on principals' managerial skills has been conducted by Fauzi, Syafrudin, and Rokhmat. They examined the principal's managerial skills as an indicator of good (high quality) principal leadership. Three sub-indicators are involved, namely planning, organizing, and evaluating (Fauzi & Rokhmat, 2018).

Research on the principal's leadership involving ICTs as the focus of his research was conducted by Wu, Yu, and Hu. The results of his research explain that the (electronic) leadership of the school principal is the key word for ICT transformation in a centralized education system, and its main pathway is transformation (Wu, Yu, & Hu, 2019).

Evaluations for Principal Sorting and Quality Distribution of Principals in Tennessee are conducted formally using Forms and Rubrics from TEAM (Grissom, Bartanen, & Mitani, 2019). The TEAM Form and Rubric contains 7 standards, namely: (1) The quality of teacher evaluation; (2) instructional leadership; (3) Continuous development; (4) Culture of Teaching and Learning; (5) Talent and Management of implementation; (6) Differences; and (7) Ethics (Tennessee State Board of Education, 2017).

The Indonesian Education System has a national standard for selecting principals as stipulated in the Ministry of National Education Regulation (Minister of National Education Regulation) No. 28 of 2010

Concerning the Assignment of Teachers as Principals / Madrasas (Minister of Education Regulation Number 28 of 2010 Concerning Assignment of Teachers as Principals / Madrasas, 2010). However, some school principals have been appointed without consideration of their training or qualifications and have only been 'elected' to assume the position of headmaster by the local Mayor or Regent (Sumintono, Sheyoputri, Jiang, Misbach, & Jumintono, 2015).

Trust, care and organization of learning are part of the principal's role as a leader. Relations

between adults at school are very important. The reason is that leaders who emphasize and strengthen professionalism in their schools will be more successful than those who are more bureaucratic in their orientation. If the principal trusts the teacher, the teacher will tend to be more relational. This relationship is indirect, which indicates that the accuracy of principals' assessment of teacher competencies may be less relevant than how to respect them because respect will give rise to a sense that they are cared for and valued. Maybe in other places this is not a leadership behavior that can be reduced to one indicator. In order to be authentic one must consider the peculiarities of the school and even the direct experience of a teacher. However, if that cannot be an indicator, it shows the need for further research on how principals communicate trust and how they help create environmental care. Certainly it will require far more detailed (and perhaps qualitative) data that takes into account certain interactions and contexts (Louis & Murphy, 2017).

Research involving factors that influence power relations including many teachers, principals, and school background variables is used to predict the principal-teacher power relations. In their study, Xia and Shen conceptualized the concept of power and power relations that shifted the theoretical controversy about the principal-teacher power relationship from three indirect relations (principal-teacher-teacher-power) to two direct relations (principal exercise-teacher power training or influence of power school principal - teacher influence). Their empirical study revealed several important findings and conclusions. They also recommended that future efforts try to examine what factors influence power relations. Some factors that might influence include the pressure of responsibility, school autonomy, or the leadership of the principal faced. Future efforts could also explore the influence of the principal's power relationship with teacher or student outcomes (Xia & Shen, 2019).

A good headmaster, theoretically, can be seen from the principal's performance indicators. According to Sashkin and Huddle as quoted by Lunenburg, effective principals can be seen in two task categories namely building bureaucratic linkages and building cultural linkages. Building bureaucratic linkages for principals are related to (1) building relationships with official offices (2) monitoring organizational information (3) coordinating school activities (4) managing finances (5) maintaining school buildings (6) directing school support services, and (7) Staffing while building cultural linkages categories are related to (1) creating an atmosphere conducive to learning, (2) setting high expectations, (3) setting school goals, (4) learning leadership, (5) organizational communication, (6) establishing community relations (Ekada, Mirfani, & Sutarsih, 2016).

Research on stakeholder perceptions (Teachers, Students, and Parents) on the effectiveness of principals has been carried out at girls' schools in Sydney Australia. The results state that the five main themes emerge through the analysis and interpretation of research data that highlights the way key stakeholders view effective school leadership. These are: (1) the use of administrative power (administrative leadership) of the principal; (2) the principal's responsibility to ensure quality teaching and learning (teaching leadership); (3) relational leadership as important for strong school communities (internal and external relations); (4) the challenging nature of school leadership; and (5) the role of the principal in religious leadership and organizational management (Odhiambo & Hii, 2012).

Based on the results of several studies above shows how important the quality of the principal. However, from the aforementioned researches, research that discusses the indicators used to measure the quality of leadership of principals (good principals) based on the criteria or indicators of teachers and administrative staff as their subordinates has not been many. With the development of information technology in the world of

education, there is a chance that the indicator of the quality of the principal's leadership (the criteria of a good principal) will change or increase in line with the demands of skills that must be possessed by the principal.

Based on the facts above the questions arise:

(1) What are the indicators or criteria for good principals according to the teachers and administrative staff ?; (2) Are there any new indicators that have not yet appeared in previous research on the quality or good of principal?

II. METHODS

This study aims to determine the indicators or criteria of good principals leadership (quality of principals leadership) based on the teachers and administration staff perspectives. This type of research is exploratory research, which reveals the opinions of teachers, school principals, and administration staff about the characteristics or indicators of a 'good principal'. For this reason, integrated research methods or Mixed Methods are used. Qualitative methods are used to analyze the responses of open questions (Onwuegbuzie, Leech, & Collins, 2012), (Bryman, 2012), (Senjaya, 2017); while quantitative methods are used to determine the order or ranking of responses (Senjaya, 2018).

The steps taken are:

- (1) looking for respondents consisting of teachers, principals, and administrative staff. Prospective respondents gathered from several districts totaling 124 respondents with details of 93 teachers, 12 principals, and 19 school administration staff;
- (2) Provide forms that contain: (a) identity of the work position in the school (Headmaster, teacher or administrative staff); (b) an open question about "In your opinion, what is a good principal leadership?". The answer stated written in 3 features (considered indicators) which are stated at most in 3 words (it is

recommended that the answer should spontaneously written) as in Figure 1;

- (3) collecting responses, coding, and analyzing meaning;
- (4) take the first response sheet and write down the response and sequence number as the basis for the next analysis;
- (5) the response from the next respondent, if it is not found in the previous indicator, then it must be added as a new indicator;
- (6) write the sequence number of the features (indicators) in the matrix of the analysis aids table;
- (7) calculate the indicator index (RI) for each response using the formula:

$$RI_i = \frac{(\sum RC_1)(\sum RC_i)}{N \sum RS_i} R$$

Ii: Response Index of indicator ith

RC1: Response Choise As First Indicator

RCi: Response Choise rank of indicator ith

RSi: Sum of Response order of indicator ith

N : The number of Indicators

(0 ≤ RI ≤ 1)

- (8) arranging rank indicators based on response indexes;
- (9) develop indicators of good principal leadership according to teachers, principals, and administrative staff.

Quantitative calculations to calculate the Reponse Index and Rank of responses are performed using the help of a self-made Ms-Excel based program. Tke examples of the intended program design can be seen as in Table 1.

Yth. Bapak/Ibu/Saudara

Untuk keperluan kajian ilmiah, kami mohon kesediaannya untuk mengisi data sebagaimana di bawah ini. Untuk menjaga kerahasiaan Bapak/Ibu/Saudara tidak harus menuliskan nama.

I. Pekerjaan/Jabatan di sekolah (beri silang X):

K Kepala Sekolah G Guru A Tenaga Administratif

II. Jenis kelamin (beri silang X):

L Laki-laki P Perempuan

III. Tuliskan dalam satu, dua, atau 3 kata dengan segera (spontan) apa yang terlintas dalam pikiran Bapak/Ibu/Saudara tentang ciri-ciri "Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah yang baik" menurut Bapak/Ibu/Saudara.

- | | |
|---------|----------|
| 1. | 7. |
| 2. | 8. |
| 3. | 9. |
| 4. | 10. |
| 5. | 11. |
| 6. | 12. |

(minimal 5 ciri, boleh lebih dari 12 ciri)

Figure 1. Open Question Form about the characteristics of good principal leadership

Table 1. Example of table form help for rank indicator analysis

cod e	Response (indicator) Writing Rank									
	R 1	R 2	R 3	R 4	R 5	R 6	R 7	R 8	R 9	R 10
GP										
01										
GL										
01										
AL01										
GL										
02										
KL										
01										
GP										
01										
GP										
02										
GP										
01										
GL										
02										
GP										
01										
GP										
03										
GL										
03										

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Result

From 124 samples, as many as 124 response forms were collected with a total response of 670 statements. After doing content analysis (data reduction) there are 36 different responses, which are considered as indicators. Next, sorting is done based on Response Index

*Indicators Of Good Principal Leadership Based On Principal, Teachers, And Administration Staff Perspectives
In The Era Of Industrial Revolution 4.0 | 99*

(RI) then sorted by ranking the results are as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Indicators (statements) rank of good principals according to Principals, teachers, and Administrative Staff

Tabel 2

No	RI	RANK	CODE	STATEMENT (INDICATOR)
1	0,174	1	R6	Wise
2	0,105	2	R7	Honest
3	0,093	3	R1	To be responsible
4	0,091	4	R27	Role model
5	0,086	5	R2	Assertive
6	0,082	6	R12	Discipline
7	0,047	7	R2	Charismatic
8	0,042	8	R36	Mastering IT
9	0,040	9	R4	Fair
10	0,035	10	R33	Smart
11	0,035	11	R29	Visionary
12	0,027	12	R32	Transparent
13	0,022	13	R13	Democratic
14	0,022	14	R28	Responsive
15	0,020	15	R9	Open
16	0,020	16	R11	Friendly
17	0,020	17	R20	Protect
18	0,020	18	R31	Humble
19	0,016	19	R21	Communicative
20	0,015	20	R8	Motivator
21	0,015	21	R30	Souled leader
22	0,015	22	R25	Able to solve problem
23	0,014	23	R17	Creative
24	0,007	24	R14	Loyal
25	0,007	25	R34	Professional
26	0,007	26	R35	Social soul
27	0,007	27	R24	Positive thinking
28	0,007	28	R22	Confident
29	0,006	29	R10	Trustful
30	0,000	30	R5	Full of love
31	0,000	30	R15	Synergic
32	0,000	30	R16	Innovative
33	0,000	30	R18	Critical
34	0,000	30	R19	Entrepreneur
35	0,000	30	R23	Able to determine priority scale
36	0,000	30	R26	Being able to divide task

Based on the table above, it appears that there are 5 Statements that have RI = 0.00. This means that not even one respondent wrote the statement as the first statement, so can be dropped. Thus, there are 29 statements that can be maintained as indicators of good principal leadership.

B. Discussion

Based on the analysis results obtained by 29 good school principals leadership indicators, namely: Wise, Honest, Responsible, Role Model, Discipline, Decisive, Charismatic, Mastering IT, Fair, Smart/intelligent, Visionary, Transparency, Democratic, Responsive, Open, Friendly, Protect (Nurturing), Humble, Communicative, Motivator, Souled Leaders, Being able to solve problems, Creative, Loyal, Professional, Socially, Positive thinking, Self-confident, and Trustful.

These indicators are explicitly and implicitly found in Chan and Kaur's research such as democratic indicators and leadership spirits (Chan & Gurnam Kaur, 2009). Likewise in Abdikadir's research which summarizes the results of his research into a sentence structure that begins with a capital letter from the word PRINCIPAL, indicators of the results of this study implicitly, there is a part in it namely: the indicator of the transparency is in the sentence with the first capital letter P, responsiveness is in the sentence with capital letter R, democratic is in sentence with capital letter I, communicative is in sentence with capital letter N, able to solve problems in sentence with capital letter C, open in sentence with capital letter I, motivator is in sentence with capital letter The second P and A, as well as spirited leaders are in sentences with capital letters L (Abdikadir, 2013). As for Goomaly and Ahmad's research, the humble indicator is explicitly found in the Integrity sub attribute; while meaning meaning principled words can be paired with the word self confidence. In addition, implicit professional indicators exist in competent attributes (Goolamally & Ahmad, 2014). Another case in the Form and TEAM Rubric which contains 7 standards. About leadership is in the standard B - Instructional leadership. In this standard there are only 4 indicators, namely: (1) Vision and goal, (2) Assessment planning, (3) Challenging content, and (4) Instructional delivery (Tennessee State Board of Education, 2017). Maybe only one that is appropriate, that is only for visionary indicators.

There is one new indicator that is in line with the current situation, the era of the industrial revolution 4.0, namely the indicator of mastering IT. It is predicted that, in the future, mastering IT can be once indikator of a good (qualified) school principal.

IV. CONCLUSION/RECOMENDATION

After being compared with previous studies, the 29 indicators found. There are 12 indicators (41.38%) that have been used by previous researchers, the remaining 17 indicators (58.62%) were found in this study.

This research succeeded in uncovering 29 indicators of good school principal leadership, namely: Wise, Honest, Responsible, Role Model, Discipline, Decisive, Charismatic, Mastering IT, Fair, Smart/Intelligent, Visionary, Transparent, Democratic, Responsive, Transparent, Responsible, Open, Friendly, Protect (Nurturing), Humble, Communicative, Motivator, Souled Leaders, Able to solve problems, Creative, Loyal, Professional, Socially, Positive thinking, Self-Confident, and Trustful.

The 29 indicators there are:

- a. Twelve indicators are the same as the previous researchers, namely: indicators of Confidence, Transparency, Openness, Humble, Professional, Visionary, Democratic, Responsive, Communicative, Motivator, Souled Leaders, Able to solve problems.
- b. Seventeen indicators did not exist in the results of previous studies, namely: Wise, Honest, Responsible, Modeling, Discipline, Decisive, Charismatic, Mastering IT, Fair, Smart/Intelligent, Friendly, Protect/Nurturing, Creative, Loyal, Socially, Positive Thinking, and Trustfull.
- c. From the new indicators there are one indicators that correspond to the era of the industrial revolution 4.0, namely indicators mastering IT.

The implication of the results of this study is that the 29 indicators can be used to develop instruments for the quality of leadership of principals or the satisfaction of teachers and

school administration staff towards leadership of principals.

The limitations of the research that need to be improved further are: (a) the sample is not so large, (b) data analysis is still using semi-conventional, (c) Grouping has not been done based on certain aspects or domains.

V. REFERENCES

- Abdikadir, I. F. (2013). School Management: Characteristics of Effective Principal. *International Journal of Advancemnet in Research & Technology*, 2(10), 168–173. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000198>
- Bentley, K. L. (2011). An Investigation of the Self-Perceived Principal Leadership Styles in an Era of Accountability (p. 170). p. 170. Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Chan, Y. F., & Gurnam Kaur, S. (2009). Leadership Characteristics of An Excellent Principal in Malaysia. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 106–116. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v2n4p106>
- Ekada, A., Mirfani, A. M., & Sutarsih, C. (2016). Kontribusi Kualitas Kehidupan Kerja, Motivasi Berprestasi Kepala Sekolah Dan Kinerja Kepala Sekolah. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan UPI*, 23(2), 141–148.
- Fauzi, M., & Rokhmat, J. (2018). Principal ' s Managerial Skill In Improving Teachers' Performance. 8(3), 77–81. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0803047781>
- Goddard, R. D., & Miller, R. J. (2010). The Conceptualization, Measurement, And Effects Of School Leadership. *The Elementary School Journal*, III(Introduction to the Special Issue), 219–225. Retrieved from <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c>
- Goolamally, N., & Ahmad, J. (2014). Attributes of School Leaders towards Achieving Sustainable Leadership: A Factor Analysis. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v3n1p122>
- Grissom, J. A., Bartanen, B., & Mitani, H. (2019). Principal Sorting and the Distribution of Principal Quality. *AERA Open*, 5(2), 233285841985009. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419850094>
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- Hallinger, P., Lee, M., & Ko, J. (2014). Exploring the Impact of School Principals on Teacher Professional Communities in Hong Kong. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 13(3), 229–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2014.901396>
- Hallinger, P., Liu, S., & Piyaman, P. (2019). Does principal leadership make a difference in teacher professional learning? A comparative study China and Thailand. *Compare*, 49(3), 341–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1407237>
- Hariria, H., Monypenny, R., & Prideaux, M. (2016). Teacher-perceived principal leadership styles, decisionmaking styles and job satisfaction: How congruent are data from Indonesia with the anglophile and western literature? *School Leadership and Management*, 36(1), 41–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1160210>
- Louis, K. S., & Murphy, J. (2017). Trust, caring and organizational learning: the leader's role. *Journal of Educational Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-07-2016-0077>
- Mitchell, R., & Tarter, C. (2016). A Path Analysis of the Effects of Principal Professional Orientation towards Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and School Academic Optimism on School Reading Achievement. *Societies*, 6(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc6010005>
- Nooruddin, S., & Bhamani, S. (2019). Engagement of School Leadership in Teachers' Continuous Professional Development: A Case Study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 6(1), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joeeed.v6i1.1549>
- Odhiambo, G., & Hii, A. (2012). Key stakeholders' perceptions of effective school leadership. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143211432412>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L., & Collins, K. M. T. (2012). Qualitative analysis techniques for the review of the literature. *Qualitative Report*, 17(28), 1–28.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nomor 28 Tahun 2010 tentang Penugasan Guru Sebagai Kepala Sekolah/Madrasah (p. 39). (2010). Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w15827.pdf>
- Senjaya, A. J. (2017). Tinjauan kritis terhadap istilah metode campuran (mixed method) dalam riset sosial. *Risalah, Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Studi Islam*, 4(December), 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1240584>
- Senjaya, A. J. (2018). *Langkah-langkah Analisis Statistik Dalam Riset Pendidikan dan Sosial*. Yogyakarta: K-Media.
- Sumintono, B., Sheyoputri, E. Y. A., Jiang, N., Misbach, I. H., & Jumintono. (2015). Becoming a principal in Indonesia: possibility, pitfalls and potential. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(3), 342–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2015.1056595>
- Tennessee State Board of Eduction. (2017). *Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy*. Retrieved from

- https://www.knoxschools.org/cms/lib/TN01917079/Centricity/Domain/1034/Team_Ultra_Gold_9-07-2018.pdf
- Wu, B., Yu, X., & Hu, Y. (2019). How does principal e-leadership affect ICT transformation across different school stages in K-12 education: Perspectives from teachers in Shanghai. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(3), 1210–1225. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12766>
- Xia, J., & Shen, J. (2019). The Principal-Teacher's Power Relationship Revisited: A National Study Based on the 2011-12 SASS Data. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 0(0), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2019.1586962>