



APEC



ICER

THE 12th APEC-KHON KAEN INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

“Innovation of Mathematics Education through Lesson Study
Textbook Development for SDGs,STEM, and Energy by Cross-border Education”

THE 10th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

“Challenging Education for Future Change”

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION
KHON KAEN UNIVERSITY | THAILAND**

SEPTEMBER

9-12, 2017

CONFERENCE

PROCEEDINGS



CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Editorial Staff:

Dr. Ariyaporn Kuroda
Assoc. Prof. On-anong Rittruechai
Asst. Prof. Dr. Prin Thananchaibutr
Asst. Prof. Dr. Siribhong Biasiri
Asst. Prof. Pattamaporn Thananchaibutr
Mr. Jakkrapong Thongpai
Mr. Witthawat Patham

ISBN: 978-616-438-066-0
Anna Offset, Khon Kaen, THAILAND

CD-Rom of Conference Proceedings
Published 600 copies

Published by Faculty of Education
Khon Kaen University

Copyright ©2017

Copyright of the abstracts belongs to the authors.

The contents may not be reproduced without permission of the respective authors.

National Library of Thailand Cataloging in Publication Data

Faculty of Education Khon Kaen University.

12th APEC and 10th ICER Conference Proceedings.--: Faculty of Education Khon
Kaen University, 2017.

997.

1. Educational Science -- Conference. 2. Education -- Research -- Conference. I.
Title.

ISBN: 978-616-438-066-0

Table of Contents

	Page
Review Committee	3
Rationale and Themes	13
Message from Khon Kaen University	14
Message from Education University of Hong Kong	15
Message from Mindanao State University -Iligan Institute of Technology	16
Message from State University of Surabaya	17
Message from Central University of Technology, Free State	18
Keynote Address:	
Gregory Alexander	20
Imelu G. Mordeno	21
Yatim Riyanto	22
Oral Presentation:	
Achara Nuntasri	24
The Results of Using Training Package to Develop Counseling Competencies for Peer Counselor of Loei Rajabhat University, Khon Kaen Education Center Students.	
Agnes Dianita, et al	34
The Improvement of Indonesian Language Learning Outcomes for Hearing Impairment Students in Special School Through Maternal Reflective Method	
Ali Mustofa	41
School Leadership and School Effectiveness: Teachers and Students in Madrasah at East Java	
Amarawadee Tappoon	48
Anxiety in Learning English among Thai Undergraduates: Effects on Listening Abilities	
Amarawadee Tappoon	60
Applying Speaking Strategies to Overcome Communication Difficulties in Thai EFL Learners	
Amelia Tia Buan, et al	70
Teaching Mathematics through Active Learning Approach	
Andhika Dwi Hardana, et al	75
The Influence of Demonstration Learning Method Toward Fine Motor Ability of Autism Children in Kindergarten Mentari School Sidoarjo	
Andiek Widodo	87
Education and Training Model For the Candidate of Lecturer's State Islamic Religious College (PTKIN) in East Java Province	
Angelo Bernaldo Dalaguit	95
Power Supply Problems and Safety	
Angelo B. Dalaguit, et al	101
Structural Conduciveness of National High Schools in Camotes Island Philippines: Basis for Empowerment	

School Leadership and School Effectiveness; Teachers and Student's in Madrasah At East Java

Ali Mustofa¹

(ali_mustofa76@yahoo.co.id)

A. Introduction

School effectiveness is very important to improve school for enhancing quality of school. School improvement concerns the raising of students' achievements and the school's ability to manage change (Reynolds *et al.* 2001). One can compare one's own school and individual performance against a set of benchmarks and criteria from the international literature on school effectiveness and school improvement.

In Indonesia, there are many school to be effectiveness, but there are to many school not be effective specially in madrasah school. For example the school effectiveness have characteristic there are *Leadership at all levels*: strong, purposeful, adoption of more than one style, *Management and organisation*: clear, simple, flatter structures, *Collective self-review*: involving all staff and leading to developing new practices, *Staff development*: systematic and involving collective and individual needs. *Teaching and learning*: creative debate amongst teachers and curricula and pedagogy, and *Parental involvement*: parents as partners in education

One characteristic is leadership, school leadership has been identified in the last few years in several international reports and as a key function to assuring quality in education. Research on the subject of leadership has increased and has focused on analysis of the leader as a person and on leadership functions and tasks. Furthermore, it has been stressed in studies that school leadership can be the solution to many problems arising in schools (Bolívar *et al.*, 2013).

It is a complex concept, which cannot be understood or applied in a single way and which is defined in terms of a demanding set of functions that include financial administration, human resources management and leadership for learning (Pont *et al.* 2008). School leadership is basically underpinned by two conceptual features (Spillane *et al.*, 2010). The first concerns the individual's personality, style and ability; the second links leadership to forms of organization and, to a smaller extent, to individual practices. School leadership has historically been connected with the role and functions of school-management teams (Schleicher, 2012). During the last decade, however, it has been stressed both in reports by international organizations and in academic works that leadership involves a common culture of expectations, in which everyone is accountable for individual contributions to the collective outcome (Leithwood and Louis, 2011).

The idea of organizing schools as learning organizations where the practices allow for continuous learning is rapidly and steadily considered as the mediator for achieving school improvement (Silins and Mulford, 2002). The school is gradually transformed into a learning organization which needs to refresh the processes involving its current and future needs (Huber, 2004). A great deal of research on factors promoting teacher effectiveness has been conducted by educational scholars. Leadership practices seem to have quite positive effects on teacher's

¹ Student of Doctoral Program of Management of Education of Universitas Negeri Surabaya Indonesia and lecturer of State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya Indonesia

impact of leadership on school effectiveness and improvement. Case studies of “turn around” schools and of interventions into teaching and learning invariably credit school and district leadership with considerable responsibility for school and teaching effectiveness (Edmonds, 1979). The literature on sustainability also sees the quality of school leadership as a key to continued organizational learning and improvement (Datnow, 2005; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006). However, the picture one gains from the qualitative evidence for the impact of leadership is very different from that gained from quantitative analyses of the direct and indirect effects of leadership on students’ academic and social outcomes. In a meta-analysis of 37 multinational studies of the direct effects of leadership on student outcomes, Witziers reports an average effect (reported as a *z* score) of 0.02, an estimate that is typically interpreted as indicating no or a very weak impact (Witziers et al., 2003). Most subsequent quantitative research has conceptualized the relationship between leadership and student outcomes as indirect, with leaders establishing the conditions (e.g., provision of teacher professional learning opportunities, forms of student grouping) through which teachers make a more direct impact on students. In the only published meta-analysis of such research, Marzano reports an average effect of approximately 0.4 between leadership and student academic outcomes (Marzano et al., 2005).

Effective leadership has a key role in motivating teachers towards individual and shared learning, a factor which is considered to be quite important for school effectiveness to be achieved (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Consequently, it becomes clear that leadership is the mediator which has the authority to develop and empower teachers in the quest of school effectiveness (Huber, 2004). Over the past 25 years there are several different theoretical models concerning the educational leadership. However, two basic models have dominated: the instructional leadership and the transformational leadership (Hallinger, 2003). Each one of these models considers the school principal’s role and its characteristics from a different perspective. The idea of the educational instructional leadership which was introduced during the early 1980s describes a principal who wants to manage, supervise and develop curriculum and instruction in the school context (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990). Instructional leaders usually aim to school improvement having a strong goal orientation (Hallinger, 2003) but at the same time they construct an academic pressure because of indicating high expectations from the teachers (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986). According to Hallinger (2000), an instructional leader specifies the school’s aims, organizes the instructional program in order to achieve these goals and tries to promote learning by constructing the appropriate climate. Several additional practices are also applied by the principal in the school setting. For example, the communication between the leader and the teaching staff seems to be quite important for the specific educational and learning goals to be extensively known and supported by the total school community. Additionally, the principal should manage the instruction procedure on the whole and supervise the student’s progress. An instructional principal tries also to create a positive learning environment by supporting the professional development, sharing his vision and providing strong motivations and inspirations for learning to the teaching staff (Hallinger, 2000). Instructional Leadership has adopted a top-down approach. On the other side, Transformational Leadership seems to have a bottom-up focus. Specifically, it does not come exclusively from the principal; the teaching staff participate too (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000) and teachers’ needs and views are usually taken into consideration. For this reason transformational model of leadership is thought to be a kind of shared or distributed leadership which, based on bottom-up participation, aims to striking educational change (Day et al, 2001). Moreover, contrary to the instructional leadership which is established on direct management and supervision of teaching (Leitner, 1994), transformational principals enforce teachers’

capacity and engage them in collaboratively learning. This type of head teachers attempts to link the individual goals with the organizational ones and as a consequence creates the climate where the educators have the chance to be self-motivated towards the achievement of school effectiveness, without the principal's guidance being necessary (Hallinger, 2003).

C. Method

The study used sequential explanatory mixed methods research with quantitative and qualitative approaches. Sequential explanatory mixed method have characteristic an initial phase of qualitative data collection and analysis followed by a phase quantitative data collection and analysis. Qualitative research uses phenomenological studies to describe early school leadership and school effectiveness in this case relating to teachers and students, whereas quantitative research uses SEM (Structured equational modeling) based on qualitative research results to be identified.

Design of this study

The design study was adopted from Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003 in Cameron, 2009), with sequential mixed method quantitative and qualitative approach. There are two phase, the first phase ex post facto, survey and focus group, and the second phase is formative evaluation design sub type, field study combined process and product evaluation. The data will get from qualitative approach, and to be continue with quantitative analysis and meta inference confirmatory.

Subject and method for data collection

This study used subject leader of school, teachers and students throughout East Java specially in madrasah school. Data collection with in-dept interview, observation, focus group discussion for qualitative, and questioner and surveys for quantitative research.

Analysis data

Analysis data for quantitative used structure equation model (SEM), while qualitative data used procedure analysis there are example ; transcrip data, coding and member checking.

Result

the results of this research have been proposed, (1) effective schools are schools that have good programs, are able to carry out planned programs and conduct measurable evaluations. In preparing the school program engages the community actively with the 8 national standards of education and school vision that have been agreed upon (2). In effective school assistance, it has been found that the results of this study are management involving school residents and stakeholders of interest and are actively receiving input and advice from parents and students. (3). Effective school impact can be measured from the productivity of teachers in the work and for students is the whole potential of students can be accommodated and can be developed in sustainability. (4). The principal has an important role because the whole line so that all school structures can run as plans and procedures that have been mutually agreed. The above results are the result of the quantitative as an ingredient in the development of instruments or measuring instruments in quantitative research. This research has not presented a quantitative result using a structural equation model approach.

D. References

Bamburg, J. and Andrews, R. (1990). School goals, principals and achievement, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2(3), 175–191

