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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presented an introduction section as the framework and guideline of the study for the whole chapters. It included the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the research questions and objectives, the research hypothesis, the theoretical framework, conceptual framework, the scope of the study, the definitions of terms, and the significance of the study.

Background of the Study

Buddhist Monastic Institute was a Buddhist educational organization where Buddhists showed a respect and worship in Asia. Buddhist monasteries are established not only for religious belief and practice but also to educate lay people as well as monks. From the beginning the Buddhist monastery was an educational institute where the monks were educators (Wijebandara, 2013). So far, a monastery is an educational center for common citizens to send their children. Thus, young children have an opportunity to choose their study at either a government school or a Buddhist monastic education institute.

In the past, Buddhist monastic education served two purposes: to educate and produce qualified Buddhist monks and novices to serve in Buddhist affair; and as a path for upward mobility for the less fortunate. These purposes continue into modern times, especially for people living in rural areas of the country. Nonetheless, according to Nimanong (2003), several inherent problems plague the monastic education system at the university level resulting in educational inequality and inconsistency in teaching and learning. These problems include, but are not limited to: lack of clear educational policy and planning; insufficient governmental and Sangha support; and lack of integrative curricular design (Kham-Ai & Asavisanu, 2016).
The curriculum in Buddhist education is an informal curriculum system based on the text books and follows tradition, adopted by previous abbots or monk scholars with experience. As the young novice students and monk students enter into an institute, they must follow the order of Buddhist practice and learning style for waking up early in the morning and going to bed at nighttime after prayer.

The Buddhist education provided in a monastery, as a center of education, has different styles from a government school and a private school. Most of the principals are abbots, being a senior monk is respected by teachers and students who are monks and novices. They all are boys who are difficult to manage, control, govern and change. There are two ways of behavior modification in the Buddhist education, the mind and structure where one can cooperate to acquire the change and update a system. Some institutes maintain that their study provides compelling evidence of the dramatic effects of principal’s behavior on the reflective capacities of teachers. These behaviors include modeling, classroom observation, dialogue, suggestion, and praise (Blase & Blase, 2004). However, the principal behavior has strong positive effects on teachers' motivation, self-esteem, confidence, and sense of the security. Takashi Hashimoto (2011) examined that as for monastic education, it can be argued that the educational policy by the Myanmar government influences not only the Shan monastic education, but also serves to make Shan children literate. There are some arguments against it, but in others hands some students are getting successful through institutes and graduated in higher education.

In addition, an abbot governs upon institute and takes care of teachers, donators, students and others concerned. He is an abbot in religious affairs, and he is a principal of the school similar to a local school principal. Normally monk-principal is an empowered monk as well as an abbot. The purpose of principal and teachers in Buddhist institutes is to maintain the Buddhist literature and tradition. Both Buddhist principal and teachers stand on the ethics
to guide young generation not by the law but by just making students behavior modification. Especially, to encourage students to be good persons, the principal adopts the educational system from Buddha’s teaching. Kham-Ai and Asavisanu (2016) concluded that monastic education, although it may have certain particular traditional characteristics, should have as its aims, the enhancement of education for its students. Viewing monastic education through the lens of modern educational institution, therefore, is necessary to ensure student learning and standardization of school objective.

The Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI) included an educational institute as an educational center for Shan monks and novices. This institute located in Panglong province at Shan State of Myanmar as shown the Appendix C. The supreme scholar monks of Shan State Sangha Council are responsible for controlling and supporting project and curriculum. Although the curriculum in the past was adopted from Buddhist curriculum structure in Myanmar excluding secular subjects, there were later changes in design and an update of the curriculum.

Therefore, today’s Buddhist monastic institutes should open the doors looking at the worldwide view to know what the world administrators are doing. Consequently, as it is still considered an important avenue for education, it follows that traditions of monastic education should be viewed through the lens of the modern educational theories and practices in order to improve the educational experience for all those involved (Kham-Aai & Asvisanu, 2016). Teachers have expertise in teaching and learning, but not managerial decision making. When teachers follow school-based terms, their attention and energies are deflected away from ensuring increased student learning (Lunenburg & Ornsten, 2008). It should help monk-students and novice-students to develop self-esteem and self-awareness not only focusing on the next life but also on today’s requirement.
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify the teachers' perception toward their principal's leadership behavior. In a wider context, the problems with monastic education systems have been expressed as Sangha's gradual loss of cultural leadership (Dhammasami, 2007). An abbot is also often a leader within the Buddhist education system as well as a leader of the local Buddhist monk community is rarely criticized as a result of his high position within the monastery. Furthermore, no research or study has done that is related to the teachers' perception toward their principal’s behavior in the institute. Similarly, there has not been a way for teachers to convey their opinion of the principal to him directly. Part of the problem is that teachers at Pitaka School address issues with the principal individually which often reflects their years of seniority in the school and years teaching in Buddhist institutes. These factors are included in the study.

In order to solve this problem, the researcher used the path-goal theory which attempts to explain the impact of leadership behavior on subordinates’ motivation, satisfaction, effort, and performance as moderated by situational factors of the subordinates and the work environment (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). The researcher believes that other researchers will follow the approach by focusing on other aspects of the school such as teacher’s qualification and capacity, lack of co-operation by government education officials, and lack of interest by committee leader in Panglong in particular and Shan State.

Research Questions

The following primary research questions were formulated to understand and investigate the problem. It described the teachers’ perceptions towards principal’s leadership behavior and the morale of teachers in that Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI). Those research questions were:
1. What is the demographics profile of the teachers according to age, current grade level, teaching experience, education background at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar?

2. What are the teachers' perceptions of principal’s leadership behavior at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar?

3. Are there any significant differences on teachers' perception of principal’s leadership behavior according to their demographics in the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar?

**Research Objectives**

The objectives of regarding teachers’ perception towards principal’s leadership behavior were as following:

1. To identify the demographic profile of the teachers according to age, current grade level, teaching experience, education background at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

2. To determine the teachers' perception of principal’s leadership behavior at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

3. To compare the differences in teachers' perceptions of principal’s leadership behavior according to their demographics profile at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

**Research Hypothesis**

There are significant differences of teachers' perception of principal’s leadership behavior according to age, year of teaching experience, grade level currently teaching and education background at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.
Theoretical Framework

This study theoretically framework was based on four style of Path-Goal theory of leadership involvement. The theory was a well-known for leadership behavior to achieve the goal, and path to the goal. House (1971), Professor of organizational studies and management at Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, developed the path-goal theory of leadership. He used this theory to examine four styles of leadership behaviors that met these needs: supportive, directive, participative, and achievement-oriented.

The path-goal theory has evolved considerably over the past two decades. Essentially, it concentrated on the problem of how a leader influences a subordinate's perception of work and personal goals, as well as the path by which to achieve these goals. In practice, the theory classifies direction about how a leader could help the followers achieve the goal to their work in a satisfactory manner. The four style Path-Goal leadership behaviors were in the following description.

1. **Supportive**: This supportive leadership behavior might be perceived as consideration and expressing concern for subordinates and looking out for their best interests. It is a skill in encouraging when employees are experiencing stress.

2. **Directive**: The directive leaders style behaved in an initiating structure, goal setting, assigning tasks, demonstrating how to complete task and taking concrete steps to improve performance. This is a skill in pointing ways when the followers are having difficulty completing their task.

3. **Participative**: The participative leader behavior took on advising behaves such as the ability to give subordinates a say in matters and decisions that affect them when they need subordinates' support of decision.
4. **Achievement-Oriented**: The achievement-oriented leader behavior would practice to motivate subordinates to perform at the highest level possible. It is the best to motivate levels of capable followers that have too few challenges.

**Conceptual Framework**

This conceptual framework of this study was based on the Path-Goal theory of leadership behavior to utilize the teachers' perception of principal's leadership behavior at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute. The primary variable in this study was the demographic factor of teachers and the other variable was four styles of principal's leadership behavior developed by House (1971). This framework would address to find out teachers' perception and to compare teachers' perception towards principal's leadership behavior in Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar. The formulated conceptual framework was drawn with theory shown as follow.

![Figure 1: Conceptual Framework](image)

**Scope of the Study**

This study was conducted at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI) in Shan State, Union of Myanmar. The study focused on the principal’s leadership behavior and teachers' perception that became the main or central point of study. The study surveyed the full population of all 54 full time teachers, in the institute during academic year of 2018. The study measured the teachers' perception toward principal’s leadership behavior at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan State.
Definitions of Terms

The definitions of key terms used only for this study that would be defined and categorized the topic. Those key terms were the following:

**Teachers' Demographics:** referred to the monk-teachers' age, current grade level, year of teaching experience and education background which related to part one questionnaire from question 1,2,3 and 4 of demographic factor.

- **Age** referred to year period of monk-teachers who were teaching novice-students and monk-students in the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute.
- **Current grade level** referred to the grade level of Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute that monk-teachers and novice-students were teaching and learning in academic year of 2018.
- **Year of teaching experience** referred to the skill and struggle that monk-teachers had performed throughout the teaching previous time.
- **Education background** referred to knowledge or the degrees and the certifications which the monk-teachers gained from others Buddhist institutes or higher educations.

**Pitaka Buddhist Monastic** referred to a residence location which considered a Buddhist organization for Buddhism as well as educational center established by monks’ community.

**Educational Institute** referred to Buddhist educational organization for educational development in Buddhist teaching and social activities.

**Shan State** referred to the location of this study and Shan state was being a part state from Union of Myanmar since 1948.

**Teachers' perception** referred to the attitude or viewpoint of monk-teachers who were teaching novice-students and monk-students at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute.
Principal's Leadership behavior referred to a chief monk (abbot) manners or actions that active as institute’s leader and encouraged monk-teachers, staffs, donors, novice-students and monk-students. This behavior would reflect in the part two of 20 questionnaire items.

- **Directive leadership behavior** referred to the behavior of a monk-principal who let his followers know what was necessary and gave specific guidance to accomplish the tasks. This was measured by questionnaire items 1,2,3,4, and 5 to know the behavior of monk-principal.

- **Supportive leadership behavior** referred to the behavior of monk-principal characterizing as a leadership that was friendly with teachers and students. This was related to questionnaire items 6,7,8,9 and 10 and measured this part.

- **Participative leadership behavior** referred to monk-principal’s behavior that he consults his fellow members such as teachers, students and donors by using their suggestion before making decision. This part questionnaire items 11,12,13,14 and 15 would determine the monk-principal participative and measured.

- **Achievement-oriented leadership behavior** referred to the behavior of monk-principal getting the challenging goal and assuring the followers achieve a higher level. This part was reflected with the questionnaire items 16,17,18,19 and 20.

**Significance of the Study**

This study would provide a contribution to the harmony and improvement of institute. There would be some significant and beneficial achievements as the proposed of study is to provide better education. Although the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute was a well-known and famous institute in Shan State, there were only a few researche for the institute to search about teachers' perception on principal’s leadership behavior. Essentially, the significance of this study provided for monk-principal and monk-
teachers a clear understanding of the respected positions. Likewise, the important contribution of this study was expected to be the following.

First, it might be also beneficial to monk-teachers who were teaching and working in the institute. Monk-teachers may come to know about skill of the professional educator, administrators and the planning by studying this research. They might come to understand their perception in comparison with other groups.

Second, the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute was one of centers of 35 institutes throughout the whole Shan State. This study could be an important example and provided guidelines to other center and other branches of Buddhist Monastic Education Institute, especially, for the monk principals. The monk-principal also might stand as a feedback of past and current time. By his behavior, the monk-principal who would like to keep supporting this study may provide information for further development. Then it would help the monk-principal a clear understanding on the leadership role of the principal.

Third, this study would provide some important information for the supervisory committee of the institute to see the result and to be cautionary to committee members. It could be seen what is an improvement and overcoming since establishment of the institute. Thus, this study would have some data information for the institute significantly.

The last would be a contribution for further researchers who would like to know the function of a monastic education institute. Particularly in that study area, for those who were interested in Buddhist educational organizations, this study would be beneficial. Thus, the researcher believed that these benefits would definitely influence the institute by improving it systematically. Above all, this study would motivate the principal, teachers, committee members and all institute administrators to realize that situation, and working hard and smart for student education.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The aim of this chapter was to investigate that was applicable to the teachers' perception toward principal’s leadership behavior at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar. The questionnaire based on path goal leadership questionnaire developed by Indvik (1985).

In this chapter, the researcher reviewed of the related literature on principal’s leadership behavior and its main theory such as the path-goal theory. To address this study, there was a detailed description including the subheading:

- Path-goal theory of leadership
- Effective of the principal’s leadership behavior
- Others related studies of principal leadership behavior
- Previous studies on principal leadership behavior
- Background of the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute.

Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

Path-goal theory was about how leaders motivate followers to accomplish designated goals. Drawing heavily from research on what motivates followers, path-goal theory first appeared in the leadership literature in the early works of House (1971). Northouse (2016) also supported that path-goal theory emphasized on the relationship between the leader's style and the characteristics of the followers and organizational setting. It was called Path-Goal because its major concern was how the leader influenced the subordinates' perceptions of their work-goals, personal-goal, and path to goal-attainment. It suggested that a leader's behavior is motivating or satisfying to the degree that the behavior increased subordinate-goal-attainment and clarifies the paths to these goals. Leadership
behavior would be motivational to the extent that it helps subordinates cope with environmental-uncertainties, threat from others or sources of frustration (House & Mitchell, 1974). The path-goal theory recognized four leadership behaviors to increase subordinates' motivation (Polston-Murdoch, 2013). The four path-goal leadership style that function to provide the structure and reward to subordinates are directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Supportive leader payed high attention to the subordinates' needs and wellbeing (Alanazi, Ratyana, Alharthey, Khalafa & Raslia, 2013). This behavior makes work a pleasant environment for the followers by showing concern for them and by being friendly and is seen as respectful, caring, and approachable. Supportive leaders demonstrate respect for subordinates' well-being (House, 1971). According to Reardon, Reardon and Rowe (1998), a supportive leader can learn by observing outcomes and how others react to their decision. The supportive style is provided nurturance and is suitable when subordinates show a lack of confidence in ability to complete a task and little motivation (Negron, 2008).

Directive leadership behavior was to give the subordinates task instructions. Hanson (2003) also describe that the leader gives structure to the work situation by establishing specific expectations for the subordinates, such as what, how, and when a task should be performed. Specific performance standards were maintained. The leadership behavior provided the psychological structure and it was authoritarian and dogmatic at subordinates' characteristics, but for the task characteristics was unclear rule and complex. Leader defectiveness had a positive correlation with satisfaction and expectancies of subordinates who engaged in ambiguous tasks have a negative correlation with satisfaction and expectancies of subordinates engage clear task (House & Mitchell, 1975).

According to McShane and Von Glinow (2007), Participative leadership behaviors encouraged and facilitated subordinate involvement in decisions beyond their
normal work activities. The leader consults with employees, asked for their suggestions, and takes these ideas into serious consideration before making a decision. Participative leadership relates to involving employees in decisions. A participative leader consists of inviting followers to share in the decision making. And he consults with followers, obtains their ideas and opinions, and integrates their suggestions into the decisions about how the group or organization will process (Northouse, 2016). Leader defectiveness has a positive correlation with satisfaction and expectancies of subordinates who are engaged in ambiguous tasks and has a negative correlation with satisfaction and expectancies of subordinates engaged in clear task. These findings were predicted by the theory and have been replicated in seven organizations (House & Mitchell, 2008).

Achievement-Oriented leadership behavior sets challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at their highest level, continuously seeks improvement in performance and shows a high degree of confidence that the subordinates will assume responsibility, but forth effort and accomplish challenging goal (House & Mitchell, 1975). It is most effective seeks continuous improvement in professional work environments. In addition to expecting a lot from followers, achievement-oriented leaders show a high degree of confidence so that followers are capable of establishing and accomplishing challenging goals. Northous (2016), identified leader functions, performance motivation of subordinates will increase. Achievement-oriented leadership applies goal-setting theory as well as positive expectation in self-fulfilling prophecy (McShane & VonGlinow, 2007).

When a situation provides a clearly structured task, strong group norms, and an established authority system, followers would find the paths to desired goals apparent and a leader would clarify goals or coach them in how to reach these goals (Northouse, 2013). In addition to the task situation requiring leader involvement, it is considered with obstacles that
anything in the work setting that gets in the way of followers or leader's responsibility in order to help the follower by removing obstacles and helping followers around them.

The path-goal theory advises that leaders use the appropriate style depending on the followers and situation. According to Northouse (2010), in practice, theory provided direction about how leaders can help followers to accomplish their work in a satisfactory manner. Supportive style provides what is missing by nurturing followers when they are engaged in tasks that are repetitive and unchallenging. Then supportive leadership offers a sense of human touch for followers engage in mundane, mechanized activity. Participative leadership has a positive impact when followers are autonomous and have a strong need for control because this kind of follower responds favorably to being involved in decision making and in the structuring of work. The leadership behavior, follower, and task characteristic were affiliated with each other.

Moreover, achievement-oriented leadership is most effective in settings in which followers are required to perform ambiguous tasks. The achievement-oriented also helped the follower feel that their efforts would be result in effective performance.

Effective of Principal's Leadership Behavior

A principal is ultimately responsible for almost everything that happens in the school (Sergionvanni, 1995). Studies of the principal’s duties have been done many times before. Generally, all of them reiterate what is already known, principals spend most of their time on management detail. The sources such as National Professional Standard Board for Educational Administration, the American Association of School Administrators, and the literature dealing with leadership in the schools mention that the principal should be an educational leader (Drake & Roe, 2003). A principal is a head of school, and a head of school is an educational leader, so being an educational leader, he/she must act as a good example, good character and behavior to lead students’ development.
Blases and Blasé (2004) stated that behaviors are associated with providing staff development emphasizing the study of teaching and learning, support for collaboration, development of coaching relationships, use of action research, provision of resources, and application of the principles of adult growth and development to all phases of the staff development program. Both of them also advocated the behaviors such as modeling, classroom observation, dialogue, suggestion, and praise the reflection. They founded that principal’s behavior is associated with collegial inquiry, critical thinking and expanding teaching repertoires. According to their data, principals use these behaviors which have enhancing affective, cognitive, and behavioral effect on teachers.

Other principal’s leadership behaviors that enhance teacher’s reflection include the distributing professional literature, encouraging teachers to attend workshops and conferences, encouraging collaboration with others (Blasé & Blase, 2004). This behavior of the principal should find the cooperation to help teacher achievement and enhancing their knowledge. The purpose for principal’s leadership behavior is to lead the followers by initiating structure and consideration.

The Principal and The School

A school principal is the primary leader in a school building and a good leader always lead by example. A principal should be positive, enthusiastic, have their hand in the day to day activities of the school, and listen to what their followers are saying. An effective leader is available to teachers, staff members, parents, students and community members. Leaders stays calm in difficult situations, think before the act, and puts the needs of the school before themselves. An effective leader steps up to fill in holes as needed, even if it is not a part of his/her daily routine (Meador, 2018). The monk-principal also need the same quality and behavior as in common school. The monastic educational system was characterized by its mutually dependent relationship with the local community, the master-
disciple relationship, primarily between monks and novices and a predominantly religious curriculum (Kaung, 1963). This system of education makes the individual an agreeable person to the society. Buddhist principal in schools have not been without strain the professional focused centrally on supporting the teachers in their emerging understanding of the key elements (Ma-Rhea, 2012).

Holland (2013) suggested that five key responsibilities of a principal as follow;

1. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students,
2. Creating a climate hospitable to education,
3. Cultivating leadership in others,
4. Improving instruction, and
5. Managing people, data and processes to foster school improvement.

By practicing these five key suggestions, principals will be able to pay attention through the characteristic and concentration for student achievement. Lunenburg and Ornstein (2008) quoted Peterson and Deal that a school is a key in shaping school culture. Its principal communicates core values, behaviors, and expectations in everyday work and interaction with staff. His/her actions, words, memos, and even nonverbal behavior send messages, and over time shape culture.

All these suggestions by some educators mentioned above are directed to the right leadership role of the principal. Today’s principals also must accept the responsibilities associated with their schools’ instructional leaders. As instructional leaders, principals maintain the responsibility for the learning of all students, including students with disabilities. This role becomes magnified in rural school systems that typically experience high rates of special education teacher attrition and education for a large percentage of students with disabilities. For these reasons, today’s principals in preparation of school programs need to reconsider and reconstruct philosophies and practices (Lynch, 2016).
Moreover, the role of the principal becomes the primary voice of the school, the champion of freedom, and the chief proponent of the value of education in a democratic society (Wilmore, 2002). Therefore, a principal is a manager of the school facility. The role of manager is essential for the principal and is probably the most important aspect of the school leadership. When school improvements occur, school administrators play a central role in:

1. Ensuring that resources- money, time, and professional development-align with instructional goals,
2. Supporting the professional growth of teachers in a variety of interconnected ways,
3. Including teachers in the information loop,
4. Cultivating the relationship between the school and community, and
5. Managing the day-to-day tasks of running a school (Lunenburg & Lunenburg, 2013).

Thus, a principal also needs skills in the managerial role of the principal apart from leadership skill. Overy (1981) discussed that the managerial role was defined as including five basic management functions: planning, staffing, organizing, directing, and controlling. Today, as leaders seek to improve instruction, thus enhancing student achievement, they perform managerial functions in every step of the process. School improvement requires school leaders to manage the organization, operations, and resources in an efficient and effective manner (Green, 2010).

In conclusion, a principal must be a leader of a school community. If a principal takes these responsibilities of leading and managing for the school, teachers’ development and student achievement are promoted. The developing schools and their principals usually conduct or oversee the management and leadership process.
Others Related Studies of Principal’s Leadership Behavior

Ohio State Leadership Studies

The Ohio State is one of the most well-known studies in behavioral leadership of education. The Ohio State has contributed in general to the fields of management and organizational behavior, and specifically to the field of leader (Schriesheim, & Bird, 1979). Hoy, Miskel and Tarter mentioned (2013) that Ohio State Studies originally developed by Hemphill and Coons in the late 1940s examined leadership traits and later, leadership behaviors or leadership styles. Owings and Kaplan (2012) studied leadership behavior by having subordinate complete questionnaires about their leaders’ behavior and how many times leader exhibited those actions. From an original list of most 2,000 behaviors, Hemphill and Coons develop the 150 items in Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). They found that the LBDQ centered around two basic leader behaviors; initiating structure and consideration.

The Ohio State group delineated the leader behavior associated with the accomplishment of these objectives by referring to initiating structure and consideration. Halpin (1966) stated that initiating structure refers to the leader’s behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group, and in endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the member of his staff.

According to these two leadership behaviors, these describe four major findings emerged from the Ohio State study. First, initiating structure and consideration are fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. Second, the most effective leaders are described as those integrating both high initiating structure and high consideration (high task orientation...
and high people orientation). Third, superiors and subordinates tend to take opposite views in evaluating the leader’s effectiveness. Superiors tend to emphasize initiating structure (getting the job done) whereas subordinates are more concerned with consideration (being treated well). The last is, only a slight relationship exists between how leader say they should behave and how subordinates describe that they do behave (Owings & Kaplan, 2012).

Overall, the theory will be more important for education, especially for the role of educators, principals, and teachers. Hours and Baetz (1979) concluded that when the leadership roles differentiated, group will be most effective if those assuming the roles are mutually supportive and least effective when they are in conflict with each other.

**University of Michigan Studies**

This approach is famous for leadership’s behavior base on production-centered and employee-centered related with education leadership. The behavior categories which emerged from University of Michigan were similar to consideration and initiating structure behaviors identified in the Ohio State studies (Seyranian, 2010). A series of related studies on leadership has been conducted to discover to organizational structure and the principle and the methods of relationship and management which result in the best performance, starting in the 1950s (Likert, 1961).

According to studies of Likert (1967), when coupled with competent management and high-performance goals, these factors promote greater motivation and loyalty as well as better products and higher profits that system which would be characterized by lower scores on these factors. And the approach, Likert defined two styles leadership behavior such as manager production-center (job centered managers) and employee centered (employee centered managers).
Production-centered consists of leadership behaviors that stress the technical and production aspects of a job. From this production, workers are viewed as a means for getting work accomplished (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). This behavior, the leaders organized the task carefully and work method to be followed subordinates’ work. Employee-centered is the behavior of leaders who approach subordinates with strong human relation emphasis. They take an interest in workers as human beings, value their individuality, and give special attention to their personal need (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). It is willing to support and encourage subordinate to achieve high performance goal and emphasis on group rather than individual decision making. Thus, while the two behavior are treated as independent orientations, leaders are seen as being able to be oriented toward both production and employees at the same time. In the 1950s and 1960s, a multitude of studies were conducted by researchers from both Ohio State and University of Michigan to determine how leader could best combine their task and relationship behaviors to maximize the impact of these behaviors on the satisfaction and performance of the followers (Northouse, 2013).

Previous Research on Principal Leadership Behavior

Firstly, Quinn (2002) studied the impact of principal’s leadership behavior on instructional practice and student engagement. He had studied at eight elementary, eight middle, and eight high school involving 24 schools located across Missouri in USA to identify the relationship between principal’s leadership behavior and teachers’ instructional standards. Quinn used six items for his methodology to analyze the data such as participants, instrument, staff assessment questionnaire, and instructional practice inventory. The study considers quantitative data focus on the high correlation and forecasts strong instructional leadership on instructional practice. It has strong leadership characteristic, and the scaled embracing 19 items with reliability of 0.73.
The result of his study showed that the principals who are strong instructional leaders are a basic component in schools that embrace high level of the student engagement as the most effective medium to affect student achievement. It provided new insight into the multifaceted world of instructional leadership. It examines principal’s leadership through the frames of resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence, and analyzing the correlation of the relationship traits.

Next Davis (1992) also studied a comparative leadership behavior of two urban high school principals, and compared them with the six leadership behaviors identified by James Sweeny (1982) as behaviors of principals effective the schools. Davis's responding did identify their principal’s leadership behavior bases on six approaches shown in the following:

1. Coordinating instructional programs,
2. Emphasizes achievement,
3. Frequently evaluates pupil progress,
4. Provides orderly atmosphere,
5. Sets instructional strategies, and

The qualitative approach used to analyze the data and cross-validate the result of the study. Then both questionnaire and interview were given to collect the data from teachers on the Action Planning Team in two high schools. Davis got 9 responses from school A and 13 responses from school B in return questionnaire at teachers and key staff of Action Planning Team. The findings found that the teachers rated the principal with an average score for overall effectiveness at 7.22 on a scale of 1 to 9. The principal’s effective are (7.13) in setting direction for the school through goal and expectations. The principal finally was believed as effective as the educational leader of the school. The Davis concluded that the
principals in school A and school B were perceived by the members of their Action Planning Team as demonstrating behavior which contributed to improvement in their school.

Additionally, the discovered of this study from the objectives summarized that teachers' perception towards principal's leadership behavior indicated high mean score. The demographic profile, majority teacher's age from 21 to 31 year old were 20 teachers which portended PBMEI teacher were in the young age. The current grade level teacher taught from Mula level to Chattha level (Grade one to Grade seven). There were a greater number of teachers taught Mula level (Grade one). Surprisingly, there were a few numbers of monk teachers had 11-30 years and above teaching experience. Majority teachers had 3-year teaching experience in Buddhist study. The same as the teachers' education background, the PBMEI was lack of teachers who had high education. According to the finding there was only on teachers had bachelor degree and 6 teachers had high degree in Buddhist study from 54 teachers.

Generally based on the analysis of the findings from this study, the overall was high and neutral relationship among the teachers' perception towards principal's leadership behavior. The principal who practiced democratic leadership style on achievement-orientated as neutral teachers' perception and high average mean score. This study received hypothesis that there were no significant differences in teachers' perception towards principal's leadership behavior according to their demographic factors. The possible reasons were the institutes' model, technique and residence which followed the ancient theory and concept. The teachers were on the young ages experiencing only in Buddhist study and they might not understand deeply in educational administration or the theory of leadership behavior. According to this study on Buddhist education, the principal and committee play an important role in religious style focusing on Buddhist study. As soon as possible, they behavior what its
satisfying and having natural desire and compassion to make peaceful religious education and not to change any theory and practice.

**Background of the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute**

In Shan State, there are two kinds of monastery, the meditation monastery (Kammaṭhana monastery) and study monastery (Pariyatti monastery). Most of them are study monasteries based on education and founded as Buddhist monastic educational institutes. Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI) is a kind of study monastery to educate students like a boarding school located at Panlong, Shan State, Union of Myanmar. It gives instructions every day in Shan language and Pali in Myanmar alphabet. An abbot or head master is the principal who is leading the institute. The principal, teachers, students are only novice or monks residing in campus.

On the other hand, the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute is one of the main centers of the Shan Buddhist education, running on formal education, having own curriculum but adapting from Myanmar Buddhist education as the old system. The grade levels offered start from level one to level seven, a higher level and master degree, although the primary level is in Shan language. However, higher level students have to learn in Myanmar texts. Specifically, both Myanmar system and Shan system are the same, and focus on examination. The Shan students have to learn the texts in Myanmar but take exam in Shan. It is difficult for them to sit the exam in a language which they have never learned the before, and compete for the same governmental degrees and scholarship opportunities with ethnic Myanmar (Hashimoto, 2011). The Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI) does not have its own curriculum, examination, text books, system, and all most duplicated from Myanmar education.
Furthermore, the institute provided and offered food, clothes, books, dwelling for all students and teachers according to its culture of Buddhist institute. Students are free to apply and no need to pay for tuition fees but they have to comply with the Buddhist monastic order.

**Shan Buddhist Monastic Modern Educational Administration Act**

Apprehensions about modern education in the whole Shan State of professional preparation have been framed primarily by the institute’s administration monk-scholars who were seeking to improve the quality for young generation. Since 1956 there was improvement in modern education by arrangement and administration for translation from Tipitaka into Shan language, governance structure of Sangha, and Sangha education in modern age.

From 1956, a period of organizing took place at Panglong Township. As introduce in chapter one, Panglong is a small town located in Shan State, Union of Myanmar. This town is well known by involving in a historical meeting. The Shan leaders, the Saofa, made an effort to organize a significant political meeting at Panglong, a little town of Lai Kha in the Central Shan State. The Panglong Conference formulated Panglong Agreement, the basis for becoming Union of Myanmar. The Panglong Agreement was a historic landmark in many ways. First, it was the first national unity achieved between the leaders of Myanmar proper and the frontier hill region. Second, it was the historic creation of the first Modern Union of Myanmar on February 12, 1947. Third, its freed Myanmar as a whole from the colonial bondage that had been imposed upon the people for nearly a century. Fourth, it led to the restoration of national sovereignty to the new nation, the Union of Myanmar. Finally, it helped Myanmar to become a sovereign nation on equal footing with other members of the United Nations Organization (Aung-Tun, 2009).

In addition, a Shan monk-scholar named Saosara Paññabhoga, Murng Su (1892-1971) who had a logical and philosophical thinking led all Shan monk-scholars translating
Tipitaka (Buddhist scripture text) from Myanmar alphabet into Shan (Tai) alphabet. In 1957, he had led the translating committee and published totally 35 volumes (Some Prominent Pioneers of Tai Buddhist Scripture, 2008).

By translating, 1956 Shan monks-scholars namely (1) Saosara Paññabhoga (Mourng Su), (2) Saosara Pandita (Murng Nawng), (3) Saosara Nānasambhāra (Dhammacariya, Larngkhur), (4) Saosara Vicittasāra (Wat Tard Daw, Loi Lem), (5) Saosara Kittisāra (Larngkhur) and other Sangha scholars held the first meeting at Wat Moei Daw, Panglong and began to set up “Tipitaka Translation Committee” (‘A Chronicle of the Suvanabhumi Auditorium Hall Donation Ceremony of Golden Jubilee’, 2008). One year later, on 18-20 November 1957, Saosara Paññabhoga and Saofa Khamsurk, the first President of Union of Myanmar encouraged both monk-scholars and laymen scholars organizing a large conference for Shan Buddhist monastic educational administration act at the Awng Siri Cinema-Hall, Loi Lem, Shan State (Paññabhoga, 2008). There was a total of 150 monks, some Saofas and scholars attending. In three day conference, all participants agree Saosara Paññabhoga to be the president of the committee on education and governance, and Saofa Khamsurk to be the president of sponsor committee. Another result of the meeting was getting significance result from discussion. The first was setting up the Shan State Sangha Council and the Shan State Laity Devotee Committee, the second was translating Tipitaka from Pali in Myanmar alphabet into Shan language, and finally they had decided to have a central location at Panglong and start building for Tipitaka translation and office to be a center of the Shan State monastic education institute.

In this Shan Buddhist Monastic Modern Educational Act 1957, four educational purposes were designed as the following (Nānasambhāla, 1977);

1. To transplant the teaching of the Buddha into Shan language.
2. To provide Buddhist education in Shan language to young Sangha and lay Buddhists.

3. To hold the Pali examinations in Shan language for new generations with higher qualification.

4. To train for qualified the Dhamma preachers (Dhammakathika).

Sao Noom, Saofa Lai Kha (1906-1986) was the ruler of that area surrounding Laikha state at that time. He was the one who donated the land to establish a center of excellence in the field for Shan State Sangha Council. Then Saofa Khamsurk (1886-1962) was the first President of Union of Myanmar in 1948. He was graciously satisfied about being a sponsor to Sangha Council to translate Tipitaka into Shan language. He always motivated genuinely and supported Tipitaka translation. When the translation committee had completed translation, he himself was a publisher of totally 35 volumes and donated them to Shan Sangha Council. He also donated two completed volumes of that Tai (Shan) Tipitaka new translation to His Majesty Thai King and one set to Russia when they visited his mansion in Yangon.

Additionally, in 1957, there started constructing the building for the first main hall of the institute and other constructions following the Shan Buddhist traditional style. Saosara Nānasambhāla had been occupied as a representative for a few months during its construction, and then taught young novices. In 1958, after completing the building of the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute, he offered to Shan State Sangha Council at the center of the study. At that time Saosara Paññabhoga came to be the first abbot or principal and he took responsibilities for translating Tipitaka from Myanmar alphabet into Shan language, and assigned other monk-scholars to keep going translating. He also organized new teaching and learning system.

By using the Tipitaka translation advantage of Shan Sangha Council to be more successful, Saosara Nānasambhāla was leading with Saosara Vicitta (Manghala Moei Daw,
Panglong, Sao Vicittasara, and Sao Kittisāra organized the first examination in 1980 at Wat Mangala Moëi Daw, Panglong, Shan State while the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute was under construction. There were 12 novice-students taking the examination. Saosara Nānasambhāla was the one who set an examination papers and he announced the result of the examination (A Chronicle of the Suwanabhumi Auditorium Hall Donation Ceremony of the Golden Jubilee, 2008). According to Saosara Paṇḍita, the second president, Saosara Vicitta, the secretary, lay Buddhist devotees’ request, Saosara Paññabhoga was released from the chair monk, and Saosara Paññabhoga organized examination tasks (Paññabhoga, 2008). From that time, they were allowed to set examinations every year.

Since the early 1960 meeting, the Shan State Pariyatti-saddhammapala Examination was named and ran from second examination and was organized by Shan State Sangha Council. One important decision was to set up the education system with curriculum, examination system, syllabuses, textbooks, and grade level (Vijjārana, 2016). More importantly, from the second examination on November 30, 1961, Shan State Sangha Council developed effectiveness. So far, there was the 60th examination and thousand monk-students and novice-students from the whole Shan State took the exam every year. The name “Shan State Pariyatti-saddhammapala Examination” was given by Saosara Nānasambhāla (Dhammacariya, Government), Saosara Pandita (Murng Nawng), Saosara Vipassana (Murng Narng). Therefore, Saosara Paññabhoga and councilors accepted concurrently and start using (Sukham, 2008).

The Structure of the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute

The Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute system was divided into eight levels based on the teachings of the Buddha. The superintendents are monks such as a principal, teachers and students who practice in Dhamma in a monastery for self-realization. The institute focused on practice, knowledge, and examination by the curriculum system.
According to the curriculum designed, there are eight levels from primary level to higher level. The primary level is taught in Shan language and examine in Shan language: but for higher levels from Chatuta to Dhammacariya level in spit being was a Shan monastic education institute, students have to learn in Myanmar and sit the examination in Shan. Dhammasami (2009) asserted that he himself hold a Dhammacariya degree in in Shan language from this examination board. The difficulty with students in the Shan examinations is that there is no monastery teaching those texts in Shan. They have to learn this in Myanmar, and then sit the exam in Shan language. So far, this system still exists in Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute without updating in detail of the education system. The examination committee should have strategic planning for the all levels available at monastic education institute.

The institute practices under Buddhist system as the institute culture; the novice students respect the principal, and monk-teachers obeying their suggestions while they teach in the class. In the classroom, the students have to attend the whole day according to the syllabuses of the institute. Normally, the students study hard not only in day time but also at night time as they need to attend the class. The institute classrooms are exactly different from normal civil school because there are no chairs and desks for students. Students just sit on the floor in line whenever there is class in session. Mostly the students recite loudly to memorize the text given by their teachers for two or three paragraphs at each time. All teachers and students have to pray to the Buddha image every night led by the principal. For meal, the institute will be getting from donation and the students go for alms-round for food donated by devotees in the morning.

The institute’s education system is based on knowledge and examination. The curriculum of the colonial schools consisted of reading, writing, and arithmetic along with the rudiments of religious faith and lessons designed to develop manners and morality (Ornstein
It is believed that if the students passed the examinations one after another, there would be an honoring ceremony and students will be awarded as they became Buddhist scholars. It means that the institute’s structure behavior and syllabuses are focused on the teaching and learning for the examination and to practice reciting and writing for the examination too. Although the examinations will not in themselves detrimental to the academic or spiritual development of students, they became problematic because of the constant social and political pressure on student-monks and novices, being forced to focus on past examination papers to the neglect of all else (Dhammasami, 2018). Thus, the examination was famous throughout the Shan State monastic education institutes, because the education system just followed Myanmar Buddhist monks’ example and appeared in Shan State monastic institute so far.

The principal and teachers are responsible and support everything in general for the institute which provides finance, food, health care, safety, and instruction. A principal is selected by the Sangha Council to become the head of institute worthily. He is both an abbot and a principal because the institute opens as a school to educate young children. According to institute culture, a principal stay in his own building specified as central place to communicate with others. The principal’s role and responsibilities are to take care deeply about practicing a Buddhist faith, in learning (pariyatti), practicing (paṭipatti), and penetrating (paṭivedha) and instruction (Payutto, 2010).

Teachers are monks, full-time or permanent teachers for the whole year teaching and guiding what they learnt and experienced. Particularly, it has to work hard as a staffs and teacher at the same time because there are no having staffs in monastic institute or organization structure, just only provided with a principal, teachers, students, and devotees. Therefore, the teachers’ job is for teaching and monastic duty without training. All teachers ensure the standard of professional practice and quality teaching, what they learnt and
experienced before. The monastic institute’s principal and teachers arranged and organized the administration of the institute by their own idea and their experience adopted from previous Buddhist monastic institutes in the town or capital city where they used to be students. There is less work-shop and training and no standard professional development of 21 centuries educational system for all teachers.

In summary, this chapter has investigated on the teachers’ perception toward the principal’s leadership behavior in the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute. It is clear that the principal leadership behavior is completely vital to the institute or the school. Several of educational organization must be better understanding of the leadership behavior within the principle to a comprehensive knowledge. The studies used the path-goal theory for the particular theory and related studies Ohio State and University of Michigan Studies. The literature review explored the important principal's leadership behavior base on theory in Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute focus on monk education. In addition, this would result in improving principal's leadership behavior academic achievement. There are other effective of principal's leadership behavior mentioned in this research in regard to four behaviors of the path-goal theory which is directive, supportive, participative, and achievement oriented.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the procedures and process of how the research methodology is. These operations based on the research design, population, research instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument, collection of data, data analysis and summary of the research process. The main objective was to investigate the teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior in the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI) in Shan State.

Research Design

This research aimed to compare teachers’ perception towards principal’s leadership behavior at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan State. The research was designed as a quantitative research to investigate and involved using survey with two parts of questionnaire. The questionnaire approach part one emphasized on the demographics profile such as the age of teachers, teaching experience, grade level, and education background to evaluate the teacher's opinions for each questionnaire. The questionnaire part two placed on the four styles of path-goal leadership questionnaire, was being adopted from Indvik (1985), and recording teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute.

Finally, the researcher used Descriptive Statistic and One-way ANOVA testing technique to examine the comparative study of teachers’ perception toward principals' leadership behavior with demographics profile and the path-goal leadership questionnaire.

Population

The target population was the full-time teachers from the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI) Shan State, Union of Myanmar. There were a total
56 teachers were hand out the questionnaire and 54 teachers returned. This 54 population was referenced from the name list of monk teachers at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in the academic year of 2018. The total number of teachers were a target population as a main target group of this study and all of these teachers would be the participants of the research.

**Research Instrument**

To meet this research finding, researcher provided a questionnaire to identify the data from 54 respondents and employed as a primary research instrument. The questionnaire was comprised and designed into two parts to hand out data collection. The parts one was teachers' demographic information profile including their age, grade level, teaching experience, education background. The part two was based on part-goal theory of leadership behavior. There were four styles to be considered in determining the teachers' perception towards principal’s behavior in the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute.

The part two questionnaire was adopted from Indvik (1985) and the ranges to be chosen in answering part one of survey questionnaires are given below:

### Table 1
*The Ranges of Survey Questions (Demographic profile of teachers)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic profile of teachers</th>
<th>Survey Questionnaire</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 year below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20-30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31 year and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current grade level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Mūla level - Dutiya level (grade 1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tatiya level - Catuttha level (grade 4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pancama level - Chattha level (grade 6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of teaching experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- 5 years below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 11 - 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 21 - 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education background</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- Chattha level (Pangong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Patthama Kyi (Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dhammacariya (Panglong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dhammacariya (government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bachelor degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Kanthisara V, (2018) The Sangha teachers and students' name list data from PBMEI at Panglong, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.
The part two was be the Path-goal theory applied to the respondents to determine about the teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior. The questionnaires were designed to provide 20 statements as per Table 2.

Table 2
**Breakdown of Path-Goal Leadership Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Teachers’ Perception toward Principal behavior</th>
<th>Questionnaire Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supportive leadership behavior</td>
<td>Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Directive leadership behavior</td>
<td>Questions 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participative leadership behavior</td>
<td>Questions 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Achievement-oriented leadership behavior</td>
<td>Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these questionnaires, the researcher has commonly used multiple instruments to study Path-Goal theory of leadership behavior that measure the task structure and follower satisfaction. The above table described the corresponding values based on a five-point Indvik-scale questionnaire. It was based on the ranging from 5 to 1 with interpretation as shown in below of Table 3.

Table 3
**Criteria Scale of Interpretation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangement Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.51 - 5.00</td>
<td>Very Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51 - 4.50</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51 - 2.50</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>Very Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity and Reliability

The research instrument of this study was adopted from Indvik (1985) with the high Cronbach’s alpha in his path-goal theory investigation of superior subordinate relationships study. Indvik study, Cronbach’s alpha was used to appraise the instrument reliability. The questionnaire terminated in overall reliability of .86 that illustrated strongly validity and reliability. Thus, researcher adopted Indvik’s questionnaire for this study teachers’ perception of principal’s leadership behavior.

The researcher followed up Indvik reliability analysis of the questionnaire and assembled from 54 teachers at PBMEI. The Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for all of four evaluations in current survey. Overall alpha of the questionnaire in this study was indicated .73 regarding as trustworthy. Based on these four dimensions of principal’s leadership behavior, the Cronbach’s alpha was demonstrated a high level of internal consistency for the scale with this definitely population.

Table 4

Reliability Report of the Teachers Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four dimensions of principal's leadership behavior</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Reliability (alpha)</th>
<th>Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement - oriented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation of Instrument

The researcher used the translated questionnaire from English to Shan (Tai) language to help teachers at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute comprehending. To ensure the accuracy of the translation, the researcher requested three
lecturers or teachers who have a professional background in English and Shan (Tai) language doing the translating, checking and approving. The translated version was finally confirmed and approved by three experts, this evidence was listed in Appendix B.

**Collection of Data**

In order to collect data from respondents of this study, the researcher followed the appropriate procedure as proposed in the following:

Firstly, this researcher requested permission from the principal of the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute. At the same time, the researcher had discussed the purpose and content of the questionnaire with the principal.

Secondly, the researcher held a seminar for all teachers to share knowledge of modern education. At the end of the seminar the researcher discussed about the questionnaire to all teachers and hand it out to them to get their reaction and feedback. Thus, all teachers at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute got some knowledge from the researcher before they started to fill in the questionnaires.

Thirdly, after collecting filled-up questionnaires, the researcher classified all of questionnaires for data inputting.

Finally, the researcher tabulated and computed those data from each of their information such as the Table 5 for research planning is as follow.
Table 5

*Data Collection Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Data Collection Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} July, 2018</td>
<td>Request permission from the Principal of the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8\textsuperscript{th} November, 2018</td>
<td>Thesis proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18\textsuperscript{th} December, 2018</td>
<td>Discussion of the objectives and distribution of survey questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20\textsuperscript{th} December, 2018</td>
<td>Data collection of survey questionnaires and Categorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th} January, 2019</td>
<td>Tabulation and computation of Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Analysis*

The research statistics of both part one and part two questionnaires, for the purposes of research objectives:

1. To classify and summarize the demographics profiles of the teachers according to age, teaching experience, grade level currently teaching, and educational background. These methods were used with frequency and percentage for the statistical analysis.

2. To identify the teachers' perception toward principal’s leadership behavior in the institute. This process would be used with mean and standard deviation.

3. To determine the significant differences on teachers’ perceptions toward principal’s leadership behavior in relation to their age, teaching experience, grade level currently teaching, education background, by using this for One-way ANOVA.
### Summary of the Research Process

**Table 6**

**Summary of the Research Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objectives</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection Method or Research Instrument</th>
<th>Method of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To identify the demographics profile of each teacher at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.</td>
<td>All 54 full teachers</td>
<td><em>Part I</em> - Demographic profiles of the respondents</td>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To determine the teachers’ perception of principal’s leadership behavior at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Part II</em> - Teacher’s perception toward principal's leadership behaviors</td>
<td>Mean and Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To compare the differences in the teachers’ perceptions of principal’s leadership behavior according to their demographics profile at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Part I and II</em></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter would report the results of the data analysis from 54 respondents of full-time teachers at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute. The descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage, mean and standard deviations) and One-way ANOVA method applied to path-goal empirical finding for each of the four style of leadership behaviors and its demographic factors. Of the 56 full time teachers at PBMEI, 54 teachers received questionnaires and the return rate was 96.4%. The research questionnaires were based on the research objectives and the research hypothesis such as the following:

1. To identify the demographics profile of each teacher according to age, teaching experience, current grade level, education background at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

2. To determine the teachers' perception of the principal's leadership behavior at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

3. To compare the differences in the teachers' perception of the principal's leadership behavior according to their demographics profile at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

Findings for Research Objective One

The research objective one was to identify the demographic profile of the teachers according to age, teaching experience, grade level currently teaching, and educational background as shown in Table 7 to Table 10.

The information provided in Table 7 below showed the age of the teachers who are currently teaching in PBMEI. All of the respondents specified their age at the time of the survey. The results revealed that among 54 full-time teachers, 26 of the teachers (48.1%)
were at the age of 20 years and below, 20 teachers (37.0%) were at the age of 21 to 30 years old, and the percentage of full-time teachers at the age of 31 years old and above was 14.8% with a frequency of age.

Table 7
*The Number of Teachers' Age at PBMEI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years below</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
*The Number of Current Grade Level Teachers Taught at PBMEI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Grade Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mula level - Dutiya level (level 1-3)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiya level - Chatutha level (level 4-5)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancama level - Chattha level (level 6-7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 9, shown below, revealed the teaching experience of the full-time teachers at PBMEI. Again, all respondents answered the survey question. The data shown that 22 teachers (40.7%) had 3 or fewer years teaching, 16 of them (29.6%) had 4 to 6 years teaching, 13 (24.1%) had 7 to 10 years experience, and 3 of them (5.6%) 11 to 30 years teaching experience.

Table 9
*The Number of Teachers Teaching Experience at PBMEI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years below</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in Table 10 shown below, indicated the education level that teachers attained. All 54 teachers responded to question 4 in the questionnaire and revealed their education background. The results showed that 22 teachers (40.7%) were below Tatiya level, 10 of them (18.5%) attained Pathama Kyi level (Government), 5 of them (9.3%) attained Chattha level (Panglong), 1 of them (1.9%) attained Dhammacariya (Government), and the last 1 of them (1.9%) attained Dhammacariya (Panglong). Almost of these teacher’s education background were secondary school and high school diploma in Buddhist religious education. Only one bachelor degree was a secular education from the university. The teachers’ education background revealed in details the discussion of the next chapter.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Background</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tatiya (below)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathama Kyi level (Government)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattha level (Panglong)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammacariya (Government)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammacraiya (Panglong)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings for Research Objective Two

Research objective two was to determine the teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute. Objective two was based on the path-goal theory and was adopted from the research
questionnaire from Indvick (1985). The survey respondents were asked to rate 20 statements regarding their perception of the principal using a Likert scale. The statement items 1-5 reflect supportive leadership behavior, the statements for 6-10 reflected directive leadership behavior, the statements from 11-15 participative leadership behavior, and the statements from 16-20 reflect achievement-oriented leadership behavior. The research findings are shown in Table 11, Table 12, Table 13, and Table 14 are as follows.

1. Supportive Leadership Behavior

Table 11 revealed the mean and standard deviation scores for five statements that reflect the teachers’ opinion of their principal’s leadership behavior. Using the Likert scale each teacher rated the statements from 1 to 5. The average mean score of the responses was 3.04 with a range scale 2.51-3.50. All but one of the statements received neutral scores from the respondents. The one negative (2.8%) was in response to statement #5 “The principal explains the level of performance that is expected of teachers.” Overall, teachers found the principal’s leadership behavior as neither positive nor negative. The mean score of this principal’s leadership behavior was generally in the middle range with the highest mean score of 3.39 and the lowest means score was described as 2.87.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The principal gives vague explanations of what is expected of teachers on the job.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Directive Leadership Behavior**

Table 12 showed mean and standard deviation scores that reflected the teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s directive leadership behavior at PBMEI. The average mean score of 3.16 falls within the scale as a neutral range of 2.51-3.50 and it was construed as neutral according to the interpretation criteria. The results demonstrated that the PBMEI principal was regarded as neutral for directive behavior.

Looking at the five questionnaire statements in Table 12, it was assumed that the teachers’ evaluation of their principal lies within the neutral range with one exception. As in Table 11, Table 12 showed one negative reaction to the Likert statements. Statement #10, “The principal behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of subordinates' personal needs” has an overall negative score of 2.46.

Table 12

| **Directive Leadership Behavior Questionnaire** |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Items**       | **Mean**        | **S. D.**       | **Interpretation** |
| 6. The principal does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. | 3.48            | 1.20            | Neutral            |
7  The principal maintains a friendly working relationship with subordinates. 3.35 1.46 Neutral

8  The principal helps subordinates overcome problems that stop them from carrying out their tasks. 3.15 1.40 Neutral

9  The principal says things that hurt subordinates' personal feelings. 2.78 1.50 Neutral

10 The principal behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of subordinates' personal needs. 2.46 1.41 Negative

| Total          | 3.16 | .578  | Neutral |

3. **Participative Leadership Behavior**

Table 13 expressed the total mean and deviation scores for teachers’ perception of their principal’s leadership behavior based on the path-goal theory. The average mean scores ultimate 3.07 in the range of 2.52-3.50 which interpreted as neutral according to the scale interpretation criteria for participative leadership behavior.

Among of these five questionnaire statements, the teachers’ responses shown they have a neutral perception toward their principal’s leadership behavior. The highest average score of teachers’ perceptions toward the principal’s leadership behavior was 3.37 and the lowest was 2.69. The research findings presented in Table 13 show no negative responses regarding their principal’s participative leadership behavior.

**Table 13**

*Participative Leadership Behavior Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**
The principal listens receptively to subordinates’ idea and suggestions. 3.37 1.23 Neutral

The principal asks for suggestions from the subordinates concerning how to carry out assignments. 3.22 1.19 Neutral

The principal asks subordinates for suggestions on what assignments should be made. 3.19 1.55 Neutral

The principal consults with subordinates when facing a problem. 2.93 1.45 Neutral

The principal acts without consulting his subordinates. 2.69 1.19 Neutral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>.485</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Achievement-orientated Leadership Behavior

The findings of Table 14 indicate the teachers’ perception towards their principal’s leadership behavior, particularly with regards to achievement-oriented leadership, at PBMEI in Shan State, Union of Myanmar. The average mean scores were 3.33 in the five-point Likert scale 2.51-3.50 that indicated the final result in the interpretation criteria finding.

In general, the responses from the five statements again indicate a neutral perception of the principal with one notable exception. Statement #16 “The principal consistently sets challenging goals for subordinates to attain” was rated positive according to the Likert scale criteria. Within the five questionnaire statements of this group, the highest mean score was 3.85 (positive) and the lowest mean score was 2.89 with an overall neutral evaluation of the principal.

Table 14
Achievement-orientated Leadership Behavior Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 The principal consistently sets challenging goals for subordinates to attain.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 The principal encourages continual improvement in teachers’ performance.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 The principal lets subordinates know that he expects them to perform at their highest level.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 The principal shows that he has doubts about subordinates’ ability to meet most objectives.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 The principal sets goals for subordinates' performance that are quite challenging.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 showed the mean scores for each of the four categories of leadership behavior and the teachers’ perception of the principal. The overall total mean scores were 3.15 within the range of 2.51-3.50 falling well within the neutral interpretation of the criteria at PBMEI.

In summary, the data findings analysis showed that the average mean score of supportive leadership was 3.04 in the five-point Likert scale again falling in the 2.51-3.50 or neutral interpretation. Similarly, scores for the directive leadership behavior was 3.16 in the range of 2.51-3.50, slightly higher than the supportive leadership behavior but still being a neutral interpretation. Scores for participative leadership behavior was 3.07 in the same range of 2.51-3.50, and achievement-oriented leadership behavior was 3.33 in the range of 2.51-3.50. Among four teachers’ perception towards principal’s leadership behavior, the highest range of overall rating was 3.33 on achievement-oriented leadership behavior and the lowest was 3.04 on supportive leadership behavior. Finally, the findings of the overall of teachers' perception towards principal's leadership behavior showed as 3.13 in average mean score and interpreted the neutral level.
Summary of Overall of the Teachers’ Perception towards Principal’s Leadership Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s perception towards Principal’s Leadership Behavior</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement-oriented leadership behavior</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive leadership behavior</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative leadership behavior</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive leadership behavior</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding for Research Objective Three

The research Objective Three was to compare the significant differences between teachers’ perception and principal’s leadership behavior according to their demographics (age, teaching experience, current grade level, and educational background) profile at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI) in Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

The research hypothesis was there are significant difference of teachers’ perception towards principal’s leadership behavior according to their demographic profile at PBMEI. For the comparison, this study used One-way ANOVA for data analysis of variance to measure if any differences existed among the teachers’ perception toward and principal’s leadership behavior and their demographic profile.

Using the four demographic characteristics (age, teaching experience, current grade level, and educational background) as a basis for comparison, the study showed little difference among the perception of their principal. The questionnaire statements in part two were based on the path-goal theory containing 20 statements. Respondents were asked to rate each statement using the Likert scale 1-5. The results of these comparisons were presented in four tables such as in Table 16, Table 17, Table 18, and Table 19.
Table 16 explored the comparison of the teachers’ perception towards principal leadership behavior and the teachers’ age at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI). Based on the correlation analyses, the research hypothesis was “there are significant differences of teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior according to age, year of teaching experience, current grade level, and education background.” According to the finding of the data analysis of this study, the One-way ANOVA test value was .056, which was larger than the .05 level of significance value. Therefore, this result was interpreted that there is no statistically significant difference of teachers’ perception towards principal’s leadership behavior according to their demographic profile at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Age</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>3.044</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7.045</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.886</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Table 17 demonstrated the comparison of the teachers’ perception towards the principal’s leadership behavior and the current grade level that teachers were currently teaching in academic year of 2018 at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI). One-way ANOVA was indicated to analyzed significant value and the result utilized .461 which was more than .05 level of significance. The analysis clearly shows that the grade level that teachers were teaching does not make a statistically significant difference among their perception of the principal.

Table 17
Comparison of Teachers’ Perception towards Principal Leadership Behavior According to the Grade Level Teachers Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7.651</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.886</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the table 18 illustrated the comparison of teachers’ perception towards principal’s leadership behavior and teachers’ teaching experience at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute (PBMEI). Based on the research objective of this study, the research hypothesis was “there are significant differences of teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior according to age, year of teaching experience, current grade level, and education background.” Nevertheless, in regards to the data analysis, the researcher rejected the research hypothesis and accepted null the hypothesis for the study. The One-way ANOVA data analysis results utilized that the significant value was .526 which is more than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, there is no statistically significant difference between teachers’ perception toward their principal’s leadership behavior when considering teaching experience.

Table 18
Comparison of Teachers’ Perception towards Principal’s Leadership Behavior According to Teachers’ Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7.545</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.886</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings illustrated in Table 19 expand the comparison of teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior and teachers’ education background. Based on the hypothesis of this study, “there are significant differences of teachers’ perception towards
principal’s leadership behavior according to age, year of teaching experience, current grade level, and education background.” The results of this data analysis from One-way ANOVA test showed that the probability significant value was .254 which is more than .05 the significant level. Thus, the researcher rejects the research hypothesis and accepts a null hypothesis. The results indicate there is no statistically significant difference of teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior when considering education background.

Table 19
Comparison of Teachers’ Perception towards Principal’s Leadership Behavior According to Teachers Education Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Background</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6.905</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.886</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter was considered under three major groups of the conclusions, discussions and recommendations to conduct the result of study. The majority objective of the study was to scrutinize teachers’ perception toward the principal’s leadership behavior using four stages path-goal of leadership behavior theory for the study area. Initially, this study was summarized briefly from the previous chapters finding and included demographics profile.

Overview of the Study

This study was to examine the demographic profile of teachers and their perception toward principal’s leadership behavior. Moreover, the study also compared the teachers’ perception and each demographic profile according to the teachers’ age, current grade level, year of teaching experience, and education background. Data analysis were collected from teachers about their perception towards principal's leadership behavior.

The local framework of this study was the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute, a well-known and famous Buddhist education center for monks and novices located in Shan State of Myanmar. Based on the data analysis and findings of the study, the path-goal leadership theory developed by House (1971), was a study comparison within four styles such as supportive, directive, participative, and achievement-oriented.

This study provided three basic objectives to meet the finding of study as the following:
1. To identify the demographic profile of teachers according to age, teaching experience, grade level currently teaching, education background at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

2. To determine the teachers’ perception toward principal’s behavior at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

3. To compare the difference between teachers’ perception and principal’s leadership behavior according to demographic profiles at the Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

The research was designed based on quantitative design and a comparative study using Indvik (1985) questionnaire to determine the research objectives. This questionnaire was contained and divided into two parts including questionnaire part one for demographic profile and part two for teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior. Data for this study collected from teachers as a target population of 54 full time teachers in academic year of 2018 who were involved in the institute improvement process to complete and return the questionnaire.

Surprisingly, the hypothesis of this study revealed that there was a statistical significance negative correlation among teachers’ perception towards principal' leadership behavior. According to the data analysis, the rating scale for level of the practice was four-point of Linkert scale and applied by frequency and percentage, mean and standard deviation, and One-way ANOVA. The current principal had been working under the committee and was supportive difference in term of behavior. However, teachers currently perceived that the personal behavior they had were the least on willing to engage decision making and responsibilities for the program. Despite assessing the high average mean score, the interpretation was neutral, the principal and teachers satisfied from previous experience and their leadership behavior to apply the institute.
Summary of the Research Finding

1. Teachers’ Demographic Profiles:

   **Age:** The research findings of teachers’ age corroborated that 26 teachers (48.1%) were in the age of 20 years and below, 20 teachers (37.0%) were 21-30 years old, and 8 teachers (14.8%) were 31 years old and above.

   **Current grade level:** According to the findings, grade level show, 25 teachers (46.3%) were teaching in Mula level to Dutiya level (level 1-3), 24 teachers (44.4%) were teaching in Tatiya level to Chatutha level (level 4-5), and 5 teachers (9.3%) were teaching in Pancama level to Chattha level (level 6-7) at PBMEI institute.

   **Year of Teaching Experience:** The findings show that the teaching experience for teachers at PBMEI institute were 22 teachers (40.7%) had 3 years or less of teaching experience, 16 teachers (29.6%) had 4 to 6 year of teaching experience, 13 teachers (24.1%) had 7 to 10 years of teaching experience, and 3 teachers (5.6%) had 11 to 30 years of teaching experience.

   **Education Background:** The findings show the education background of the teachers as follows; 22 teachers (40.7%) terminated Tatiya or below this level; 10 teachers (18.5%) terminated Pathama Kyi level (Government), 15 teachers (27.8%) terminated Chattha level (Panglong), 5 teachers (9.3%) graduated Dhammacariya level (Government), 1 teacher (1.9%) graduated Dhammacariya (Panglong), and 1 teacher (1.9%) graduated Bachelor degree.

2. Teachers’ Perception toward Principal’s leadership Behavior at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan Stat, Union of Myanmar

   The results based on the second objective, illustrated the teachers’ perception toward the principal’s leadership behavior was neutral. There were four styles of teachers’
perception based on path-goal leadership behavior, including supportive leadership behavior, directive leadership behavior, participative leadership behavior, and achievement-orientated leadership behavior.

2.1. The teachers’ perception of the principal’s supportive leadership behavior are, the total average mean score 3.04, highest mean score 3.39, and the lowest mean score 2.87.

2.2. The total mean score of directive leadership behavior is 3.16 within the range scale of 2.51-3.50, the highest mean score 3.48, and the lowest mean score 2.46.

2.3. Regarding participative leadership behavior, the total mean score was 3.07, the highest average mean score was 3.37, and the lowest average mean score was 2.69.

2.4. The total mean score of achievement-orientated behavior showed 3.33, the highest average mean score was 3.85, and the lowest average mean score was 2.89.

2.5. Overall, the average mean score of teachers’ perceptions toward principal’s leadership behavior according to path-goal theory was 3.15 and interpreted neutral involvement.

3. Teachers’ Perception toward Principal’s Leadership Behavior at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan State, Union of Myanmar

The findings was used in this data analysis come from a comparison of the teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior and the teacher’s demographic profile. In addition to this comparison, respondents were required teachers’ opinion to measure among two dimensions of principal’s behavior and teachers’ perception.

3.1. In the case of this comparison finding results, the probability of significant value among teachers’ perception and their age was .056. There was no significant difference in teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior according to their age at PBMEI because .056 was more than .05 in the result.
3.1. The results of this comparison revealed that there was no significant difference in teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior according to the grade level that teachers were teaching. The significant value was shown that .461 is more than .05 PBMEI.

3.1. Based on this data the comparison found that there was no significant difference between teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior and their teaching experience. The significant value was .526 is more than .05 at PBMEI.

3.1. The results from this comparison indicate that there was no significant difference between teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior and their education background. The significant value was .254 is more than .05 at PBMEI.

**Conclusion**

This study found correlation between principal's leadership behavior and dependent variable on teachers' perception. Based on the analysis of data, the following major conclusions were drawn from the quantitative research study. The objectives of this study were to demonstrated current and expected academic principal's leadership behavior perceived by teacher's perception.

The data were procured from 54 full time teachers in academic year of 2018 at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute in Shan State, Union of Myanmar. This study surveyed the teachers' perception towards principal's leadership behavior using by descriptive statistics. Those full-time teachers were perceived from two parts of the questionnaire based on the demographic and four styles of path-goal leadership behavior.

From current finding of demographic profile in PBMEI, the majority teachers were young generation teachers. According to the survey responses, teachers identified themselves as 20 years of age and below. Other teachers were at the age of 21 old and above and mostly they were teaching in low level, Mula level to Dutiya level (grade one to grade
Some teachers were teaching in Pali but at a higher skill level from Tatiya level to Chattha (grade three to grade seven). Moreover, the number of teachers teaching experience showed that majority teachers had experience of teaching for 3 years below. Some of them had over 4 years of experience in Buddhist study and few teachers experienced a teacher training course at public or international provided. Furthermore, most of the teachers obtained certificates but less teachers hold for high degree as well. According to this function of teachers' demographic profile, the majority respondents were young and teaching in primary grade level, then they had less teaching experience and obtained certificate in Buddhist Education for their education background.

The second objective was considered principal's leadership behavior perceived by teachers selected to predict occurrence of highest mean score. Unfortunately, the research findings of this study revealed that the mean score of each dimension of principal’s leadership behaviors perceived was as neutral level according to overall of four style of leadership behavior. But even though it obtained as a neutral, it realized as a high average mean score which mean teachers attituded a fresh perspective to the behavior.

As demonstrated by comparative analysis and based on One-way ANOVA, the current principal's leadership behavior that teachers perceived. There was no statistically significant difference among teachers' perception of principal's leadership behavior according to their demographic profile (age, current grade level, teaching experience, and education background) at PBMEI. In this case of comparison teachers' perception and their demographic evinced the probability of significant value was larger than .05 by respondents selected.

**Discussion**

The analysis of data from the teachers’ perception indicated that teachers estimated their principal's leadership behavior high in all areas of leadership. The results were
not harmonious atmosphere with the finding of this study. According to previous study by Indvik (1987) path-goal theory had emerged largely intact from the meta-analysis but the supportive, directive, participative leadership behavior's impact was moderated as well as present study. The results in this study according to the demographic profiles such as teachers' age, current grade level, teaching experience, and education background was specifically analyzed from data provided by the respondents.

Majority PBMEI teachers largely identify within the younger ages. Horner, Murray and Rushton (1989) explained that age related decrements in teaching quality and both specific and general rated teaching effectiveness declines as teachers age. And also, Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) study, exemplified the young teacher were often assigned large introductory course and large classes tend to give lower overall instructor effectiveness ratings than do small classes (Neumann & Neumann, 1985). An increasing number of teachers in 1999 to 2000 in public schools were 50 or older and the young was 30 year older (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). The PBMEI should provide the older teachers or developed a plan for young teachers including classroom training, motivation, professional development and other tasks instead of having young teachers. The teachers might handle all these functions to apply in their experience for instructing.

Lo et al. (2011) pointed out that effects on delinquency made by grade level, school type, and prosocial school climate were assessed, controlling for individual-level risk and protective factors. In addition to the current grade level that teachers were teaching showed that the majority of 25 teachers taught in Mula level to Dutiya level. Mula level was an equality standard of grade one and Dutiya as grade two according to PBMEI institute curriculum which named in Pali language. Moreover, the teachers taught in high level more and low lever less. The curriculum at PBMEI was provided from the Mula to Chatth level as the same as grade one to grade seven in public school, but the subjects were difference.
Furthermore, the current demographic on the year of teachers teaching experience which revealed majority teachers (40.7%) had 3 years teaching experience or less. The discussion by Adesina, Raimi, Bolaji, Adesina (2016), the less experience teachers had less acquaintance with teaching intricacies, they might lack exposure, ideologies and strategies in teaching-learning activities. The more experienced teachers had everything on their side, exposure, acquaintances, ideologies, and strategies that enhanced their productive. But, PBMEI teacher had less experience and might cause ineffectiveness of teaching and learning. Ewetan and Ewentan (2015) also supported that teacher's experience was a prime predictor of students' academic achievement and teachers' productive. The same as Berger, Girardet, Vaudroz and Crahay (2018) concluded that teaching experience was an important variable to take into account, as it was linked to teaching practices, self-efficacy, and general conceptions about teaching and learning.

The emphasis on the other result was demographic of teachers' education background. The finding was illustrated that majority teachers had certificates in Tatiya level or below which mean the teachers were perceived low level for their education background at PBMEI. The only two teachers hold the degree in Buddhist study and one teacher hold a bachelor degree. According to Livingston (2016), teachers need a strong foundation of initial teacher education but they also need to understand themselves as learners ready to learn and adapt their practice throughout their careers, supported and challenged by a range of different teacher education opportunities. The finding of this domain was not surprisingly that teachers perceived a few high degrees of their education background. If the PBMEI had more students and less teachers holding the high degree, the institute might increase an unstable condition and effectiveness.

Considering the demographic factors, the overall age of the majority of teachers falls with the young age range which may contribute to a lack of self-confidence the ability to
recognize the benefits of working with students and principal. Moreover, the level of education obtained by most teachers at PBMEI results in a traditional approach to teaching, with frequent recitation and lack of discussion between students and teachers. McCaslin and Parks (2002) stated that for years, teacher requirements had mandated a number of years of experience in their craft or trade outside the classroom prior to the employment as a teacher. Teachers with minimum levels of education will fail to learn new teaching strategies and improve their classroom management skills because less experienced. The career and technical education teacher for the 21st century must be prepared to relate to an increasingly diverse student clientele. Additionally, this diverse student clientele must perform at higher levels of academic and technical proficiency. Furthermore, the students would need to be able to reason analytically, solve complex problems, and gather and process information and data (McCaslin & Parks, 2002). When teachers exposed to the higher degree of education in order to implement changes in the current system, there can be beneficial for the institute. The age, experience, and the degree of certificate, interactions with various adults and strengthening individual abilities, will also improve the relationships between teachers and students.

Furthermore, most expected principal's leadership behavior distinguished by teachers were on behaving productively with teachers. In this domain of supportive leadership behavior, the principal effectiveness score was perceived to be an average of 3.04 by the 54 teachers with an interpretation in neutral rang. This findings and statistical analysis from five statements appeared that teachers’ perception of principal’ leadership behavior was almost high. The supportive leadership behavior revealed as a lowest mean score from four style of leadership behavior involvement. According to Farhan (2017) study, the supportive can be adopted be learning leaders to motivate the followers through building strong bond and improving trust relationship.
The previous research by Davis (1992) indicated that teachers perceived the behavior of supporting teachers as directly associated with the principal because he empowered teacher to work for the improvement of the school. Subsequently, the innovation and the component of this present study reflection, the teachers’ perception also revealed the lowest mean score shown as at question number #5 “The principal explains the level of performance that is expected of teachers on the job.” The respondents’ average mean scores on each of the different statements provided important supportive items. Based on this supportive behavior, it provided what is missing the nurturing followers when they were engaged in tasks that were repetitive unchallenging. Supportive leadership offered a sense of human touch for followers engaged in mundane, mechanized activity (Northouse, 2016). Attributed by Hoy and Miskel (1991) emphasized that the hypotheses relating the effects of leaders’ behavior to subordinate satisfaction have been supported more consistently than those examining the effects of leaders’ behavior on motivational performance.

The next domain results, principal was perceived as directive leadership behavior (3.16) in developing institute activities which developed neutral interpretational measure. This leadership behavior style was evaluated using the five statements and data analysis collected from the 54 teachers at PBMEI. Within the five statements, one item statement principal perceived as activity (2.46) in setting negative direction from the institute through behavior and the other four items statement receive neutral. This component provided insight into unsatisfied of this directive behavior and the institute where teachers described as less supporting. Therefore, principal encourage changing the behavior that lead to better institute for Buddhist education. As this domain the teachers were

According to previous study by Quinn (2002), all the skill was essential in providing an atmosphere that support effective and engaging teaching that corresponds with student success and academic achievement. But this current study, the involving four
components of directives was satisfied high score within one of them were lower score of the statements. The lowest statement of these five components was illtreated as “the principal behaved in a manner that is thoughtful of subordinates’ personal needs.” The directions of the relationships between directive leadership behavior and follower outcome was consistent with the path-goal theory.

In addition, using participation as a tool successfully requires followers to understand the purpose and benefits of sharing their knowledge and its effective on their organization (Farhan, 2018). Nahavandi (2014) also suggested that the participative behavior allowed for sharing leadership and responsibilities among the followers. Nevertheless, the result of the domain of this study were the opposite side of the effectiveness. Principal participative behavior score was an average 3.07 as perceived by 54 teachers. In this domain of participative demonstrated that the high score showed was the principal listens receptively to the followers’ idea and suggestion and the low score was the principal acted without consulting his followers. All of this five items statement interpreted a neutral level which principal were neglected towards the participative leadership behavior. Northouse (2016) discussed that participative leadership has a positive impact when followers are autonomous and have a strong need for control because this kind of follower responds favorably to being involved in decision making and in the structuring of work. Negron (2008) also supported theory that participative leadership encourages subordinates to get involved with planning, decision making and execution phases.

House and Mitchell (1975) consulted a positive interpretation and higher achievement-orientation of leader. Subsequently, this domain illustrated descriptions of various situations in which a leader was struggling to follow as an achievement-oriented leadership behavior. This component, recent results showed principal's average mean score by teachers’ perception was 3.33 with neutral level. The high score from the five items
considered on the item 16 received as positive range. The less items were all neutral and low score. Farhan (2018) suggested that when leadership takes into consideration their followers’ perception, they might need to use a different leadership tool or style. Achievement as a tool can be used in the case with a challenging activity or challenging goal. Leaders who were willing to achieve their challenge goals usually have high expectations and set neutral standards for followers.

The next components were comparison on teachers’ perception towards principal’s leadership behavior according to their demographic profile (age, current grade level, teaching experience, and education background) at PBMEI institute. The data analysis from PBMEI demonstrated that principal rated themselves high mean score in all areas which was inconsistent with the results. These results of the present study were not consistent with the findings of statistical significance. From perspective of teachers at PBMEI, there were no statistically significant difference between any of the components of principal's leadership behavior and teachers' demographic factor.

In other words, according to previous study by Davis (1992) the teachers rated the principal with overall of mean score were effectiveness. The two principals were perceived to model of the six leadership behaviors associated with principals of effective school. These principals were knowledgeable of education and educational administration and making improvements in their school. The other previous study from Quinn (2002), the principal received strong instructional leaders and embraced high score with most effective medium to students' achievement. The results showed that a correlation matrix was development and the total disengagement had a significant negative correlation with instructional leadership factor at medium effective. In schools where teachers described their principal as less skillful on the leadership factors.
This was consistent of with the finding of Goudarzi (1996) who indicated that there was no significant difference between principals from public school and private school in terms of effectiveness of leadership behaviors. From perspective of current teachers, the present research accepted null hypothesis and rejected research hypothesis when there was no significant difference among two comparisons. One of the possible reasons was because all of the principal, teachers and students were Buddhist monk following the Buddhist concepts and providing only Buddhist education. Within the principal behavior correlation matrix was disagreement and ineffectiveness institute and principal as holding expectation. Even though the scores monks-teachers conveyed to the principal’s leadership behaviors of were less, the score were at an acceptable satisfactory in medium range of interpretation.

The overall for each average mean score of four styles of leadership behavior for the monk-principal in the institute indicated an effective principal with neutral interpretation. Teachers evaluated the principal with high average score (3.13) for overall effectiveness on a scale of 1 to 5. The principal was moderately effective in utilizing effective skills in achievement-oriented. This domain achievement-oriented was the highest score within four styles of leadership behavior and principal more effective achievement for institute. The problem with this present study was lack of available data over a behavior of four styles of leadership. Teachers rating were not systematically acquired and Mehdinezhad and Sardarzahi (2016) who reported that teachers can worked and cooperated with principal in information exchange and resolving the issue related to planning and provided educational program to students. Moreover, In the component of the supportive leadership behavior score was perceived to be an average of 3.04 which ranged the lowest mean score and were in moderately interpretation in four styles of leadership. Teachers rating was consistent because the monk-principal behaved in the simple way with mixed religious style and education system. The principal was perceived as committed to behavioral improvement and was aware
and knowledgeable of present research about leadership behavior. All of these four leadership behaviors were consistently rated as neutral by the teacher responses at PBMEI in relation to their principal. The mean score of four different leadership style and its overall showed high score which was neutral and within all average scores. These mean scores suggest that the leadership style at the institution is neutral or typically only “more or less” supportive, directive, participative, and achievement-oriented.

**Recommendation**

This study was not perfect and the principal received a possibility of error with biasing in instance of comparisons. The four styles of path-goal theory were the important leadership behavior for school or institute improvement in both Buddhist education and local education. Research identified specifically high average score by quantitative research emphasized on the population of 54 monk-teachers as participants at PBMEI and in academic year of 2018. Unsurprisingly the result of this study, principal obtained moderately interpretation range and principal needed to make fundamental change to the development. Based on the findings, the study suggested that the institute could attack leadership issues at PBMEI and better organized the leadership structure for the institution. A principal should practice with teachers and offered an alternative view by using statements reflecting other approaches to leadership. Based on the finding of this study, the recommendation was adduced as the following.

**Recommendation for Committee**

According to the finding shown as negative significant value and neutral interpretation, there was less supported by teachers' perspective towards four style of leadership behavior. Therefore, the committee should mix a modern concept of educational administration and develop a clear vision and mission to apply for PBMEI. In addition to this study received neutral range which in order to require more supportive behavior that ensure
the effective using of educational equipment for principal characters. The finding indicated unclear perception and the committee should provide educational research program and human resource. Although the committee were emphasized on Buddhist study of religious system, it needed to upgrade the system as the same developed countries in the worldwide. The education was one of the cardinal focus of millennium development goal. The developing countries, their professional committees had the prerogative of setting its standards and determining the nature of making decisions. According to teachers receipted no statistically significant regarding to teachers’ demographic, the committee should afford and integrate effort in synergy towards planning, implementing, supervising teachers’ professional development.

**Recommendation for Principal**

Additionally, the assumption was that participants would be honest with the answers upon the reflection their perceptions. From four style of path-goal leadership brought to developing the various leadership style that could potentially support a principal. As principal received the reject null hypothesis and agued significance. The principal must pay attention to the teachers' perceptive and need to make some improvements to the institute standard. The principal should be discussing how to develop the supportive, directive, participative and achievement of four style of leadership and introduce modern methods of pedagogy.

Further, it is recommended that the principal seek opportunities for professional development and promote equality among characteristic of leadership style. The principal should consider establishing a mentoring program for monk-teachers. This allows more experienced teachers to partner with presumably younger and less experienced teachers. Many signals that the principal need to be an educational leader come from such sources as the National Professionals’ Board for Educational Administration. In the following of these
recommendations, the principal needs to state objectives in specific, measurable, and observable terms, and provide a description of the proposed program and think of life long education for the institute area. The principal must establish a framework and be knowledgeable about the strengths and weaknesses of various programs and find ways to help PBMEI develop improvement.

**Recommendation for Teachers**

According to the study, there was no statistically significant difference between teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior and their demographics which was frequently neutral opinion on path-goal theory for leadership behavior. The teachers must look for opportunities at meetings or one on one to address areas of poor performance with the principal. Based on the finding of this study, researcher found that the achievement-oriented leadership behavior obtained high mean score and the supportive leadership behavior obtained low mean score. Additionally, all teachers were suggested to improve and practice their educational level to enhance the skill of professional development. In order to improve that skill of the professional, monk-teacher were required to conduct more educational seminars, workshop trainings, or conferences instead of studying international education.

**Recommendation for Future Researchers**

This study was faced with impossible significance competitive behavior and perception of the monk-teachers. Overall, this study found that no demographic difference and teachers' perception at PBMEI. Therefore, the need for future researchers in several directions had emerged from this study. Future researchers could emphasize a mixed qualitative and quantitative methodology to find more precise results and help transform PBMEI.
In part of this path-goal leadership behavior, future research could keep continue examining to determine the possible effective comparison and benefit result. Additionally, future researchers should consider related topics concerning administration, curriculum development, instructional management, climates change, and institute development to encourage the PBMEI improvement in term of specific education organization.

Furthermore, future researchers observed the principal's leadership behavior interacting with the teachers' perception and compared them with principal. The others theories can also consider evaluating among principal's leadership behavior to find out a signification difference and support principal and teachers' achievement.
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APPENDIX A

Research Questionnaire (English and Shan Version)
1st July, 2018

Ven. Khay Meinda (Jao Khamleng)
Assumption University
Huamark, Bangkok, Thailand
jaokhamleng@gmail.com

RE: Permission to Conduct Research Study

Dear Venerable Saosara Vicarana,

I am writing to request permission to conduct a research study at your institution, Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute. I am currently enrolled in the Master of Education in Administration at Assumption University, and I am in the process of writing my Master’s Thesis. The objective of my study is to investigate the teachers’ perception toward principal’s leadership behavior according to demographic at Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Education Institute in Panglong, Shan State, Union of Myanmar.

I hope that the institute principal (abbot) will allow me to recruit all teachers from the institute to anonymously complete questionnaire including two parts. Part I considers demographic questions such as age, current grade level, teaching experience, and education background. Part II considers four stages as a path-goal leadership questionnaire base on directive, supportive, participative, and achievement orientate leadership behavior.

If you agree, please kindly sign below acknowledging your consent and permission for me to conduct this study/survey at your institute and return the signed form on an enclosing envelope. Your approval to conduct this study will be greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance for your interest and assistance with this research.

Sincerely,
Ven. Khay Meinda
ID 6029577

Approved by

Venerable Saosara Vicarana
Principal (abbot)
Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute
Part I: Demographic information profiles of the respondents.

*Direction*: Please read each question carefully and tick (✓) in the box with the truth to you in the following forms.

1. Please specify your **age**. 

   - ☐ 20 years below
   - ☑ 20 - 30 years
   - ☐ 30 years and above

2. In what **current grade level**, you are teaching? 

   - ☐ Muna Level - Dutiya Level (level 1 - 3)
   - ☐ Tatiya Level - Catuttha Level (level 4 - 5)
   - ☐ Panama Level - Chattha Level (level 6 - 7)

3. Please select your **year of teaching experience**.

   - ☐ 3 years below
   - ☑ 4 - 6 years
   - ☐ 7 - 10 years
   - ☐ 11 - 30 years

4. Please specify your **education background**

   - ☐ Tatiya (bellow)
   - ☐ Pathama Kyi level (Government)
Part II: Questionnaire about the teachers' perception towards principal's leadership behavior

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of teachers' perception toward principal's leadership behavior. There are 20 statements of the questionnaire totally in the following. Please read each statement carefully and tick (√) at a number you are satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappointing</td>
<td>disappointing</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Directive Leadership Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Perception Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The principal lets teachers know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The principal informs subordinated about what needs to be done and how it needs to be done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The principal asks subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The principal explains the level of performance that is expected</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The principal gives vague explanations of what is expected of teachers on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. Supportive Leadership behavior**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The principal maintains a friendly working relationship with subordinates.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The principal does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The principal says things that hurt subordinates' personal feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The principal helps subordinates overcome problems that stop them from carrying out their tasks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The principal behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of subordinates' personal needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. Participative Leadership behavior**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The principal consults with subordinates when facing a problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The principal listens receptively to subordinates' idea and suggestions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The principal acts without consulting his subordinates.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The principal asks for suggestions from the subordinates concerning how to carry out assignments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The principal asks subordinates for suggestions on what assignments should be made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Achievement-oriented Leadership behavior

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The principal lets subordinates know that he expects them to perform at their highest level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The principal sets goals for subordinates’ performance that are quite challenging.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The principal encourages continual improvement in teachers’ performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The principal shows that he has doubts about subordinates’ ability to meet most objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The principal consistently sets challenging goals for subordinates to attain.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. What do you think about the survey? Is the survey clear and easy enough to understand?
   I think this is a good survey and clear easy enough to understand.

2. Is there any grammar mistake, wrong contents or there question which might make the participants confuse?
   There is no grammar mistake and wrong contents and the question can make the participants understand clear.

3. What mistake your find in the survey questionnaires? How could this survey questionnaire be improved?
   I didn’t find any mistake in the survey questionnaires. Hopefully this survey questionnaire would be improved.
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1. What do you think about the survey? Is the survey clear and easy enough to understand?

It's a useful survey and it's clear and easy enough to understand.

2. Is there any grammar mistake, wrong contents or there question which might make the participants confuse?

No.

3. What mistake your find in the survey questionnaires? How could this survey questionnaire be improved?

There are very few mistakes I find in the survey questionnaires.

Of: ; - - ; in Shan spelling.
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APPENDIX C

Pitaka Buddhist Monastic Educational Institute Location Related Map

Shan State Map: A Study Location Related Map
Source: Yawd Serk (1999), The Four Noble Principle and Six Objective
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