

DAYANG NORIZAH A.G. KIFLEE @ DZULKIFLI & ROSLEE TALIP

Instructional Leadership, Work Motivation, and Work Performance of History Teachers in Sabah, Malaysia

ABSTRACT: The study involved 120 teachers, who teach History in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia. Respondents were given a questionnaire, which consisted of three parts. Part A consisted of demographic questions. Part B consisted of 55 items that were on instructional leadership. Part C consisted of 20 items on work motivation; and Part D consisted of 30 items on teacher performance. A total of four hypotheses have been presented in this study. Data test has been measured and tested by using descriptive statistics and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) with significance level $p < 0.01$. The findings of Pearson correlation analysis showed a significant relationship of instructional leadership and teacher performance in History ($r = .523$, $sig = .000$). While the findings of Pearson correlation analysis showed no significant difference of work motivation and work performance of History subject teachers ($r = .172$, $sig = .060$). In terms of implications of the study found that History teachers, who practice instructional leadership in their teaching and learning, will show a positive impact on teacher performance in History.

KEY WORD: Instructional leadership, work motivation, work performance, subject of history, and teachers of history in Sabah.

IKHTISAR: “Kepemimpinan Instruksional, Motivasi Kerja, dan Prestasi Kerja Guru-guru Mata Pelajaran Sejarah di Sabah, Malaysia”. Kajian ini melibatkan 120 orang guru yang mengajar mata pelajaran Sejarah di sekitar Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia. Responden telah diberikan satu set borang soal-selidik yang mengandungi 3 bahagian. Bahagian A terdiri daripada soalan demografi responden. Bahagian B terdiri daripada 55 item soalan mengenai kepemimpinan instruksional. Bahagian C terdiri daripada 20 item soalan mengenai motivasi kerja; manakala Bahagian D pula terdiri daripada 30 item soalan mengenai prestasi kerja guru. Sebanyak 4 hipotesis telah dikemukakan dalam kajian ini. Pengujian data diukur serta diuji menggunakan kaedah statistik deskriptif dan ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) dengan paras signifikan $p < 0.01$. Dapatan analisis korelasi Pearson menunjukkan terdapat hubungan yang signifikan antara kepemimpinan instruksional dan prestasi kerja guru mata pelajaran Sejarah ($r = .523$, $sig = .000$). Manakala dapatan analisis korelasi Pearson menunjukkan tidak terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan antara motivasi kerja dan prestasi kerja guru mata pelajaran Sejarah ($r = .172$, $sig = .060$). Dari segi implikasi kajian mendapati bahawa guru mata pelajaran Sejarah, yang mengamalkan kepemimpinan instruksional semasa proses pengajaran dan pembelajaran, akan menunjukkan impak positif terhadap prestasi kerja guru mata pelajaran Sejarah.

KATA KUNCI: Kepemimpinan instruksional, motivasi kerja, prestasi kerja, mata pelajaran sejarah, dan guru-guru sejarah di Sabah.

INTRODUCTION

A History subject is one of core subjects to secondary students in the Integrated Curriculum for Secondary

Schools or KBSM (*Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah*) in Malaysia. In line with the implementation of this KBSM changed the subject position. This

About the Authors: Dayang Norizah A.G. Kiflee @ Dzulkifli, Ph.D. and Roslee Talip, Ph.D. are the Lecturers at the UMS (Malaysia University of Sabah), Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia. For academic interests, the authors can be contacted via their e-mails at: jelita909@gmail.com and roslee_73@ums.edu.my

How to cite this article? Norizah A.G. Kiflee @ Dzulkifli, Dayang & Roslee Talip. (2015). “Instructional Leadership, Work Motivation, and Work Performance of History Teachers in Sabah, Malaysia” in *SUSURGALUR: Jurnal Kajian Sejarah & Pendidikan Sejarah*, Vol.2(2), Maret, pp.147-160. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press and UBD Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam, ISSN 2302-5808. Available online also at: <http://susurgalur-jksp.com/instructional-leadership-work-motivation/>

Chronicle of the article: Accepted (January 1, 2015); Revised (February 9, 2015); and Published (March 24, 2015).

subject is compulsory for all secondary school students on an ongoing basis from form one to five. This is a positive effort of the Ministry of Education in Malaysia, in emphasizing the importance of this subject in the context of an integrated education and school curriculum (KPM, 1990).

History records many events of human life to be learned and guidelines (Arbai'yah, 2002). History should be a fun subject to learn, but so what happened in the History of the school environment is considered a boring subject (cf Abd Rashid, 2000; Razaq Ahmad & Ali Seman, 2000; Razaq Ahmad & Suwirta, 2007; and Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009). It is often stated that student were bored and not interest in History, due to teacher factor (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

This subject has many objectives and goals contained in order to produce students who would know the historical development in Malaysia and around the world, as well as to stimulate the thinking of students through the learning process experienced by them. Teaching and learning of History in the classroom and outside the classroom should not be rigid (cf Abd Rashid, 2002; and Aziz & Nik Ismail, 2007).

In the study of Anuar Ahmad, Siti Haishah Abd Rahman & Nur Atiqah Abdullah, they found that many students experience in the process of teaching and learning of History in secondary schools as boring and pointless (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009). In fact, there are teachers who teach this History are not aware of what is meant by a better History lesson, but they also teach as they were taught by their previous teachers.

They repeated of ideas in the teaching of History, because students to feel bored, tired, and not interested in History. This is due to the methods of teaching History is examination oriented (cf Berliner, 1988; and Jamil, 2003).

Students also thought that this subject is not challenging stereotype, static, and boring (KPM, 2004b).

However, it is obvious that History is not a static subject, traditional, or limited to emphasizing memorization of facts; and to be narrative and descriptive as understood by most people. Therefore, teachers need to choose the method of teaching that can being both exciting and challenging students' ability to stimulate learning fun, social, moral, spiritual; and create a positive perspective since History is useful for the future (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The government of Malaysia stated that students must pass their History examination in SPM (*Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia* or Malaysian Certificate of Education) in 2013; and this has made History an important subject in school. In fact, the subject is the core subjects for all secondary schools from form one to five. The subject must be taken by each PMR (*Penilaian Menengah Rendah* or Lower Secondary Assessment) and SPM candidates. However, according to a report released by the Division of State History Curriculum, the results of the students in the PMR and SPM for the subject of the state were not satisfactory since only SPM 2010 experienced an increase in the percentage pass, while the result of History in the PMR experienced a decrease in percentage of passing for two consecutive years (cited in SPA Negeri Sabah, 2011).

If we look closely, this History subject is an interesting subject, because it contains information about early human history, the remains of artifacts, narration heritage of human civilization, and the struggle of their predecessor (KPM, 2000 and 2001). In addition, the subject is a subject that is full of facts (Aziz & Nik Ismail, 2007); but the method of instruction delivered to students has caused History to turn

into a boring subject (KPM, 2003b; and KPM, 2004b); and poorly absorbed by the student (Razaq Ahmad & Ali Seman, 2000; Abd Rashid, 2001; and Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

Rupawan Ahmad (1990) asserted that History has moral education and nationalism. This has caused the lack of interest among students. This situation, he said, is actually happening in many countries in the world, including our country, Malaysia. In our country, for example, History is not the preferred subject among students. If they were given a choice, many students are not willing to learn History. Generally, the students cannot feel the importance and significance of learning history. Students often responded that learning History is not a fun experience and boring (*cf* Murphy, 1988a; and Ahmad, 1990).

The subject of History contains many abstract ideas and concepts that are sometimes difficult to understand (Ahmad, 1990). This concept is important for shaping the thinking and intellectual form students (Ismail, Aziz & Nur Puteh, 2009). These conditions cause to students to lose interest in this History subject; and, thus, affect their academic performance. Students' academic achievement in public examinations is the main criteria in determining the effectiveness of a school in this country (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

Apart from the fact, History is also loaded with conceptualization. Understanding of the concept needs to be emphasized by teachers when teaching. To understand the concepts, students need to understand the purpose and meaning of the word. Students will not understand the concept if they do not know the purpose and meaning of certain words (Shukor Abdullah, 2000; and Aziz & Jair, 2009).

Teachers are among the key agents in generating quality education. Teaching quality is the result of their knowledge and skills required in a

discipline of knowledge. Effective teachers are teachers who have the following characteristics: (1) deep knowledge in the subjects they teach; (2) plenty of imagination to enable them to make a variety of examples to help students understand a simple concept; and (3) can use the tools and instructional materials well in lessons. Based on this statement, D. Sparks & S. Loucks-Horsley (1989); D. Sparks & S. Hirsh (1997); and G.M. Sparks (1983) suggested that a form of specialized training is essential to provide an effective teacher (*cf* Hallinger *et al.*, 1983; Abdul Kadir, 1997; Abdul Kadir & Ismail, 1997; and Mohamad, 2003).

The effectiveness of teaching depends on how the teacher plans the History lesson and also the teacher's quality. Good history teachers demonstrate the good quality personally, socially, and professional (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009). One of the main factors related to student achievement in SPM (*Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia* or Malaysian Certificate of Education) would be poor teaching quality (*cf* Kerajaan Malaysia, 2009; and KPM, 2003a, 2004a, 2004c, 2005b, and 2006).

J.H. Magisos (1989) and Abd Rahim Abd Rashid (2005) pointed out that the best teachers are those who are knowledgeable, skilled, and competent technical duties as a teacher. Therefore, effective teaching requires skills and extensive knowledge about the subject and has an understanding of aspects of pupils' learning (Magisos, 1989; and Abd Rashid, 2005).

History teachers rarely see whether the information is able to evoke interest or spirit that can help students to understand the History. Thus, many students find the subject very tedious and not encouraging them to think. However, if teachers train students to think, when students leave school and enter the working world, they will become more confident as they are capable and initiative in problem solving

and critical and creative thinking with it (cf JNSP, 1993; dan Zahra, 1999).

The pattern of teaching History in schools is still very traditional and boring students (KPM, 2003b). Teachers' failure in the use of teaching and learning methods caused students to become bored, sleepy, and tired during this subject. Based on the findings, Mohammad Sultan Faujar showed that the teaching of History in schools is poor quality (Sultan Faujar, 2000).

The results of Abdul Razaq Ahmad & Ahmad Ali Seman (2000); Abdul Razaq Ahmad & Andi Suwirta (2007); and Anuar Ahmad, Siti Haishah Abd Rahman & Nur Atiqah Abdullah (2009) have also shown that many students perceived the History is a boring subject. This initial impression will cause students to lose focus and less motivated to learn the subject (Razaq Ahmad & Ali Seman, 2000; Razaq Ahmad & Suwirta, 2007; and Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

The community has not also considered the History as commercial value (Ahmad, 1990). This is supported by Abdullah Mohd Noor (1998) and interview with Abdul Razak Manaf (31/3/2006), based on their findings in the district of Petaling Jaya and Kuala Selangor, Malaysia, they found that students regarded History as not important and has no benefit. Similarly, the results of Sivachandralingam Sundara Raja *et al.* (2008) found that History was not related to job security and has no commercial value. In addition, his study also found that learning and teaching of history was taken for granted and has difficult for teachers (Sundara Raja *et al.*, 2008).

The lack of student interest in learning History has been raised in the Educational Planning Committee 170th (KPM, 2003c). The issues on effectiveness of teaching and learning arose, when teachers could not identify the relevant pass events might not relevant today's. However, according to

the Inspectorate Report in 2004, there are teachers who teach without a set induction, conduct student-centered teaching, not having systematic strategic planning, the quality of teaching is still at a moderate level, the teaching regardless of existing knowledge of their students, less monitoring, and ineffective assessment system (KPM, 2004d).

As a result, teachers do not know how to respond accordingly to any changes that occur in their lessons. The dynamic and rapid changes in classrooms have created a lot of critical issues for the teacher. Therefore, the instructional leadership should be emphasized, so that it can contribute to the school's mission to produce quality teaching and learning (cf Murphy *et al.*, 1984; Smith & Andrews, 1990; Zakaria, Fatimah Mohd & Bong Cheang, 1996; and Abdullah & Ismail, 2007).

Besides that, some teachers have inaccurate perceptions of instructional leadership in terms of the leadership class, because they perceived that it would be the responsibility of school administrators. D. Sparks & S. Loucks-Horsley (1989); D. Sparks & S. Hirsh (1997); D. Sparks (2003); Abd Rahim Abd Rashid (2005); and Yahya Don (2005) felt that teachers are important agents of change in ensuring that their schools would turn into an effective school. Therefore, the teachers play an important role in instructional leadership to ensure that the schools would go through the necessary changes (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997; Sparks, 2003; Abd Rashid, 2005; and Don, 2005).

In educational organizations, the most common problems are about teachers' performances. Soetjipto & Rafli Kosasih (2007) study found that there are teachers who do not demonstrate commitment in performing their duties and do not care about improving the quality of teaching. These attitudes will, then, affect teachers' performances and leave negative impact

on the teaching profession (cf JNS, 2004; and Soetjipto & Kosasih, 2007).

Performance should be evaluated wisely, so that the organization can utilize the available resources to its best advantage (Murphy, 1990; Mat Yusof, 2001; and Lambert, 2003). All these problems imply that the teaching profession, which was once regarded as good, has now faced an increasingly challenging problem. This could have a negative impact on student achievement and the quality of education.

THE HYPOTHESIS AND STUDY DESIGN

The hypothesis of the study is commonly used in quantitative studies to express the relationship and differences between the variables. It is researchers' predictions about the relationship or differences that may exist between the variables. It is also a prediction of what is expected by the researchers on the research issue or problem. In addition, it is also the prediction made by the researchers about a relationship or differences in inferential research before data is collected (cf Murphy, 1988b; Pearson, 2000; Mahdzan, 2005; and Yusri Ibrahim, 2010).

The followings were the hypotheses of this study:

Ho1: "There was no significant difference for the instructional leadership and job performance based on History teachers' teaching experiences".

Ho2: "There was no significant difference in mean scores of the instructional leadership of the teachers who have been to professional development courses and those who have not".

Ho3: "There was no significant relationship between instructional leadership and History teachers' performances".

Ho4: "There was no significant relationship between motivation and History teachers' performances".

This study was to investigate the relationship among instructional

leadership, work motivation, and History teachers' performances in Sabah, Malaysia. This study was a quantitative survey. The questionnaire consisted of 5-point of Likert scale, which was similar to the format of the objective questions of the test or examination at school. Therefore, this facilitates the respondents in answering the questionnaire (Idris, 2010).

According to J. Levin & J.A. Fox (2007), a survey is more representative, because the findings can be generalized or applied to a wider range of individuals. The sampling used in this study was purposive sampling, because it only involved 120 respondents teaching in History of form 1 to 5 only.

The construct of instructional leadership was based on the instructional leadership model from P. Hallinger & J. Murphy (1985); P. Hallinger & J.F. Murphy (1987); P. Hallinger & C.E. McCary (1990); P. Hallinger (1992); P. Hallinger, L. Bickman & K. Davis (1996); P. Hallinger & R.H. Heck (1996); P. Hallinger & K. Leithwood (1996); and P. Hallinger (2003); the work motivation is based on the theories from A. Maslow (1943); H.V. Vroom (1964); and D.C. McClelland (1965)'s motivational needs; and the performance construct was based on the model performance by H.J. Bernardin & J. Russell (1993); P. Hersey & K.H. Blanchard (1996); and K. Timpe (1998).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Ho1: "There was no significant difference for the instructional leadership and job performance based on History teachers' teaching experiences".

As shown in tables 1, 2, and 3, Ho1 was rejected. This was because there were significant differences in instructional leadership and teachers' performances based on their teaching experiences in History ($F = 6095$, $df = 115$, and $sig = .000$). This showed that teachers who have longer teaching experience will show instructional

Table 1:
Post Hoc Analysis Instructional Leadership and Work Performance
Based on Teacher Experience

Dependent Variable		(I) Work Experience	(J) Work Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Instructional Leadership	LSD	3 Years and below	4-9 Years	.18864	.13054	.151
			10-15 Years	-.46273(*)	.14300	.002
			16-20 Years	-.42273(*)	.14300	.004
			Up to 20 Years	-.76818(*)	.18461	.000
		4-9 Years	3 Years and below	-.18864	.13054	.151
			10-15 Years	-.65136(*)	.12152	.000
			16-20 Years	-.61136(*)	.12152	.000
			Up to 20 Years	-.95682(*)	.16852	.000
		10-15 Years	3 Years and below	.46273(*)	.14300	.002
			4-9 Years	.65136(*)	.12152	.000
			16-20 Years	.04000	.13482	.767
			20 Years and over	-.30545	.17835	.089
		16-20 Years	3 Years and below	.42273(*)	.14300	.004
			4-9 Years	.61136(*)	.12152	.000
			10-15 Years	-.04000	.13482	.767
			20 Years and over	-.34545	.17835	.055
		20 Years and over	3 Years and below	.76818(*)	.18461	.000
			4-9 Years	.95682(*)	.16852	.000
			10-15 Years	.30545	.17835	.089
			16-20 Years	.34545	.17835	.055
Work Performance	LSD	3 Years and below	4-9 Years	.06875	.07000	.328
			10-15 Years	-.22000(*)	.07668	.005
			16-20 Years	-.15000	.07668	.053
			20 Years and over	-.10000	.09900	.315
		4-9 Years	3 Years and below	-.06875	.07000	.328
			10-15 Year	-.28875(*)	.06517	.000
			16-20 Year	-.21875(*)	.06517	.001
			20 Years and over	-.16875	.09037	.064
		10-15 Years	3 Years and below	.22000(*)	.07668	.005
			4-9 Years	.28875(*)	.06517	.000
			16-20 Years	.07000	.07230	.335
			20 Years and over	.12000	.09564	.212
		16-20 Years	3 Years and below	.15000	.07668	.053
			4-9 Years	.21875(*)	.06517	.001
			10-15 Years	-.07000	.07230	.335
			20 Years and over	.05000	.09564	.602
		20 Years and over	3 Years and below	.10000	.09900	.315
			4-9 Years	.16875	.09037	.064
			10-15 Years	-.12000	.09564	.212
			16-20 Years	-.05000	.09564	.602

Table 2:
ANOVA Analysis Instructional Leadership Based on Work Performance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	13.011	4	3.253	14.316	.000
Within Groups	26.128	115	.227		
Total	39.139	119			

Table 3:
ANOVA Analysis Work Performance Based on Work Performance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.953	4	.398	6.095	.000
Within Groups	7.513	115	.65		
Total	9.106	119			

Table 4:
Min Score History Subject Teacher Work Performance

History Subject Teacher	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Yes	85	3.8265	.25827	.02801
No	35	3.6071	.26070	.04407
Total	120	3.7625	.27663	.02525

leadership and a good performance.

Ho2: *“There was no significant difference in mean scores of the instructional leadership of the teachers who have been to professional development courses and those who have not”.*

As shown in tables 4 and 5, Ho2 was rejected. This was because there were significant differences between the mean scores of History teacher, who have and have not been to professional development courses. The mean for teachers who have attended professional development courses was 3.82 and its standard deviation was .258. While, the mean for the teachers who have never been to professional development courses was 3.60 and its standard deviation was .260.

Ho3: *“There was no significant relationship between instructional leadership and History teachers’ performances”.*

As shown in table 6, Ho3 was rejected. This was because there was significant relationship between instructional leadership and History teachers’ performances ($r = .523$, sig

= .000). The coefficient of $r = .523$, which showed a moderately strong relationship.

Ho4: *“There was no significant relationship between motivation and History teachers’ performances”.*

As shown in table 7, Ho4 was accepted. This was because there was no significant relationship between work motivation and History teachers’ work performances ($r = .172$, sig = .060). Although the coefficient of $r = .172$, this showed a very weak relationship.

Based on the analysis of data in tables 1, 2, and 3, Ho1 was rejected as there were differences in terms of the instructional leadership based on teaching experiences (min 3 years and under 3.66, 20 and over 4.43). This proved that the more experiences that teachers have, the better their instructional leadership are.

This finding was supported by Noriah Mohd Ishak *et al.* (1999) study that experienced teachers were more responsible towards themselves and the learning process in comparison with inexperienced teachers. This scenario can be attributed to teachers’ age factor.

Table 5:
ANOVA Analysis Work Performance Based on Work Experience

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.193	1	1.193	17.783	.000
Within Groups	7.914	118	.067		
Total	9.106	119			

Table 6:
Pearson Correlation Analysis Leadership Instructional and Work Performance

		Leadership Instructional	Work Performance
Leadership Instructional	Pearson Correlation	1	.523(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	120	120
Work Performance	Pearson Correlation	.523(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	120	120

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7:
Pearson Correlation Analysis Work Motivation and Work Performance

		Work Performance	Work Motivation
Work Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.060
	N	120	120
Work Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.172	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.060	
	N	120	120

The older and experienced teachers would think more about the effects and consequences of their actions (*cf* Mohd Ishak *et al.*, 1999; Southworth, 2002; and Sani Yahya, Rashid Mohamed & Ghani Abdullah, 2007).

In addition, an experienced teacher will portray instructional leadership from time to time. Teachers who are more experienced and older are more likely to improve their work performances in school as compared to teachers who are less experienced and younger. Therefore, the expected quality of teaching and learning is at the highest level (Hussin, 2004; KPM, 2005a; and Wilcox, 2005).

Next, the findings in tables 4 and 5, in which Ho2 was rejected, there was a difference between teachers who have attended professional development courses and those who never attend

professional development courses. This was consistent with the results obtained by Nana Syaodih Sukmadinata (2003) and Nanang Fattah (2008), who found, based on management and psychological education, that teacher training programme could influence teachers' performances.

The data indicated that the training received by teachers has improved teachers' performances. Similar results could be seen in the study by A.L. Uche, D. Fiberesima & O. Christiana (2011) in Nigeria. The study found that teachers, who have attended professional development courses, showed a better performance compared to teachers who never attend professional development courses.

Based on the analysis in table 6, in which Ho3 was rejected, the data showed a significant relationship

between instructional leadership and History teachers' performances. The coefficient of .523 indicated a moderately strong relationship.

Sudarwan Danim (2002)'s study, which involved teachers in Indonesia, stated that the work performance was one of the factors contributing to the education crisis in Indonesia. There are teachers who have not been able to demonstrate adequate performance (Danim, 2002). The survey findings of several studies showed that some teachers were not serious about their work and were ignorant to improving the quality of teaching.

This situation was caused by teachers' low work performances (Soetjipto & Kosasih, 2007). Such situation should not be ignored as it would affect the quality of teaching and learning in a negative manner. Jon R. Katzenbach, in his book, *Peak performance: Aligning the Hearts and Minds of Your Employees* (2000), stated that performance was closely related to the work; a group of individuals that share the same appreciation of the work could help to improve the performance of their organizations (*cf* Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Lambert, 1989; Katzenbach, 2000; and Keow Ngang, 2000 and 2007).

Finally, table 7, which consisted of the analysis of Ho4 was accepted, showed no significant relationship between the work motivation and History teachers' work performances ($r = .172$ and $\text{sig} = .060$). Nonetheless, the data obtained was contrary to the findings of the study by M. Nur Mustafa & Norasmah Othman (2009) in Indonesia; and a study conducted by A.L. Uche, D. Fiberesima & O. Christiana (2011) in Nigeria. Their findings showed a significant relationship between work motivation and performance of teachers (*cf* Main, 1985; KPM, 1992; Hallinger *et al.*, 1994; Mamat, 2006; Mamat & Hassan, 2008; Mustafa & Othman, 2009; and Uche,

Fiberesima & Christiana, 2011).

This further indicated that motivation helped teachers to improve their work performances. This finding was influenced by certain factors, such as different locations, different cultural values work between three different countries, and different number of respondents (120 people in Sabah, Malaysia; and in Indonesia and Nigeria were 327 and 150). This finding was supported by A.M. Sardiman (2000) and E. Mulyasa (2003), who stated that there were several factors that influenced teachers' performances in the context of Indonesian culture. They also stressed that work motivation could influence teachers' performances (Sardiman, 2000; and Mulyasa, 2003).

CONCLUSION

The concept of teacher instructional leadership, within the context of research institutions among the organizations, is not new in developed countries, but this issue seems to be neglected in Malaysia. It also appears that instructional leadership has always been associated with the headmaster or principal, which is a farfetched concept. Linda Lambert (1989 and 2003), who conducted a detailed study of this matter, viewed the context of an institution as empowering the leadership among the school community.

Teachers with instructional leadership are able to implement quality teaching and learning in schools. Hence, in order to make it a success, History teacher should be well-prepared to understand, accept, and implement the changes in History education. Their readiness is actually a major prerequisite of excellence in their profession as History teachers, and those with good quality would always strive to strengthen the instructional leadership in schools. All these positive elements should be blended wisely to empower the education system which is full of challenges.

The escalating focus on the process of globalization has prompted the Ministry of Education in Malaysia to take various measures to improve the quality of education in Malaysia. This scenario demands History teachers to become more proactive and competent. In addition, the instructional leadership is needed to increase the quality of the management of History. Thus, History teachers' instructional leadership component is very important in generating their work performances.¹

Bibliography

- Abd Rashid, Abd Rahim. (2000). *Model dan Pendekatan Pengajaran Sejarah KBSM*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Abd Rashid, Abd Rahim. (2001). "Guru Sejarah Berkesan dan Bermotivasi Tinggi dalam Pengajaran Sejarah dan Penerapan Patriotisme". *Paper* dalam Persidangan Pendidikan Sejarah ke Arah Pembentukan Warganegara Patriotik. Organized by Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum dan Persatuan Sejarah Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: 8-12 October.
- Abd Rashid, Abd Rahim. (2002). *Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Sains Sosial: Teori dan Amalan*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit UM [Universiti Malaya].
- Abd Rashid, Abd Rahim. (2005). *Profesionalisme Keguruan: Prospek dan Cabaran*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Abdullah, Abdul Ghani & Aziah Ismail. (2007). "Membangunkan Kapasiti Kepimpinan Sekolah". *Kertas Kerja* dalam Seminar Nasional Pengurusan dan Kepimpinan Pendidikan ke-14, organized by Institut Aminuddin Baki.
- Abdul Kadir, Abdul Latif. (1997). "Hubungan Keberkesanan Latihan dengan Prestasi Kerja Pegawai-pegawai Kastam". *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Serdang: UPM [Universiti Putra Malaysia].
- Abdul Kadir, Abdul Latif & Maimunah Ismail. (1997). "Hubungan Keberkesanan Latihan dengan Prestasi Kerja" in *PERTANIKA: Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 5(2), pp.73-82.
- Ahmad, Anuar, Siti Haishah Abd Rahman & Nur Atiqah Abdullah. (2009). "Tahap Keupayaan Pengajaran Guru Sejarah dan Hubungannya dengan Pencapaian Murid di Sekolah Berprestasi Rendah" in *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia*, 34(1), pp.53-66.
- Ahmad, Rupawan. (1990). "Sejarah, Masyarakat, dan Pendidikan" in *Jurnal Jebat*, 18, pp.59-69.
- Arbai'yah, Mohd. (2002). *Ilmu Sejarah & Pensejarahan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Aziz, Zahara & Nik Azleena Nik Ismail. (2007). "Kajian Tinjauan Kesediaan Guru-guru Sejarah Menerapkan Kemahiran Pemikiran Sejarah kepada para Pelajar" in *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 32, pp.119-137.
- Aziz, Zahara & Nurliah Jair. (2009). "Penggunaan Peta Konsep untuk Meningkatkan Pencapaian Mata Pelajaran Sejarah bagi Pelajar Tingkatan Dua" in *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia*, 34(1), pp.3-15.
- Berliner, D. (1988). "Implication of Studies on Expertise in Pedagogy for Teacher Education and Evaluation: New Direction for Teacher Assessment" in *Proceedings of the 1988 ETS International Conference*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Teaching Service.
- Bernardin, H.J. & J. Russell. (1993). *Human Resource Management*. Singapore: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Danim, Sudarwan. (2002). *Menjadi Peneliti Kualitatif*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.
- Don, Yahya. (2005). *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan di Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: PTS Professional.
- Fattah, Nanang. (2008). *Landasan Manajemen Pendidikan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Hallinger, P. et al. (1983). "School Effectiveness: Identifying the Specific Practices Behaviors for Principals" in *NASSP Bulletin*, 67(463), pp.83-91.
- Hallinger, P. & J. Murphy. (1985). "Assessing the Instructional Behavior of Principal" in *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), pp.217-247.
- Hallinger, P. & J. Murphy. (1986). "Instructional Leadership in the School Context" in W. Greenfield [ed]. *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues, and Controversies*. Lexington, MA: Allyn and Bacon, pp.179-203.
- Hallinger, P. & J.F. Murphy. (1987). "Assessing and Developing Principal Instructional Leadership" in *Instructional Leadership*, 45(1), pp.54-61.
- Hallinger, P. & C.E. McCary. (1990). "Developing the Strategic Thinking of Instructional Leaders" in *The Elementary School Journal*, 91(2), pp.89-108.
- Hallinger, P. (1992). "The Evolving Role American Principal: From Managerial to Instructional, to Transformational Leaders" in *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(3), pp.35-48.
- Hallinger, P. et al. (1994). "Adapting Problem-Based Learning for Educational Administration Preparation in Thailand". *Paper* in the Seminar Nasional ke-4, Pengurusan Pendidikan, organized by KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia], on November.

¹**Statement:** We would like to declare that this article is our original work; so, it is not product of plagiarism and not yet also be reviewed and published by other scholarly journals.

- Hallinger, P., L. Bickman & K. Davis. (1996). "School Context, Principal Leadership, and Student Achievement" in *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(5), pp.527-549.
- Hallinger, P. & R.H. Heck. (1996). "Reassessing the Principal's Role in School Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Research, 1980-1995" in *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), pp.5-44.
- Hallinger, P. & K. Leithwood. (1996). "Culture and Educational Administration: A Case of Finding Out What You Don't Know" in *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(5), pp.98-116.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). "Leading Educational Change: Reflection on the Practice of Instructional and Transformational Leadership" in *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), pp.329-351.
- Hersey, P. & K.H. Blanchard. (1996). *The Situational Leadership Model*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Hussin, Sufean. (2004). *Dasar Pembangunan Pendidikan Malaysia: Teori dan Analisis*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Idris, Noraini. (2010). *Penyelidikan dalam Pendidikan*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw Hill.
- Interview with Abdul Razak Manaf on "Bagaimana Standard Kompetensi Kepengetuaan Sekolah Malaysia Diwujudkan?" in Pahang, Malaysia: 31 March 2006.
- Ismail, Azwani, Zahara Aziz & Sharifah Nur Puteh. (2009). "Kesan Model Stad terhadap Pelajar dalam Mata Pelajaran Sejarah" in *Prosiding Seminar Penyelidikan Siswazah*. Bangi: UKM [Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia].
- Jamil, Hazri. (2003). *Teknik Mengajar Sejarah*. Kuala Lumpur. PTS Publication & Distributors Sdn Bhd.
- JNSP [Jemaah Nazir Sekolah Persekutuan]. (1993). *Buku Panduan Bidang Profesional Sekolah Menengah*. Kuala Lumpur: KPM [Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia].
- JNS [Jemaah Nazir Sekolah]. (2004). *Standard Kualiti Pendidikan Malaysia – SKPM 2: Instrumen Pemastian Standard*. Kuala Lumpur: KPM [Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia].
- Katzenbach, Jon R. (2000). *Peak performance: Aligning the Hearts and Minds of Your Employees*. Harvard: Harvard Business School Press, and McKinsey & Company, Inc. Available online also at: http://www.stephanehaefliger.com/campus/biblio/017/17_45.pdf [accessed in Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia: January 15, 2015].
- Keow Ngang, Tang. (2000). *Kepimpinan Pengajaran Pengetua dan Guru Besar di Sekolah-sekolah Zon*. Pulau Pinang: Penerbit USM [Universiti Sains Malaysia].
- Keow Ngang, Tang. (2007). *Pengurusan Kualiti Menyeluruh dan Prestasi Kerja*. Pulau Pinang: Penerbit USM [Universiti Sains Malaysia].
- Kerajaan Malaysia. (2009). "Surat Pekeliling Perkhidmatan: Pemantapan Pengurusan Sistem Penilaian Prestasi Pegawai Perkhidmatan Awam" in *JPA(S)K.256/6/27, KLT.2(31)*.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (1990). *Buku Penerangan Kurikulum Baru Sekolah Menengah*. Kuala Lumpur: Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia & Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (1992). *Latihan Dalaman*. Kuala Lumpur: Pusat Perancangan Kurikulum.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2000). *Sukatan Pelajaran Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah Sejarah*. Kuala Lumpur: Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2001). *Sukatan Pelajaran Sejarah KBSM*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2003a). *Analisis SPM 2002*. Kuala Lumpur: Lembaga Peperiksaan Malaysia.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2003b). *Laporan Kajian tentang Isu Kurang Minat Murid terhadap Mata Pelajaran Sejarah di Sekolah Berprestasi Rendah: SPM 2002*. Kuala Lumpur: LPM [Lembaga Peperiksaan Malaysia].
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2003c). *Pengumuman Keputusan Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia Tahun 2002*. Kuala Lumpur: PPK [Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum].
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2004a). *Analisis SPM 2003*. Kuala Lumpur: Lembaga Peperiksaan Malaysia.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2004b). *Laporan Pemantauan Keberkesanan Pelaksanaan Kurikulum Mata Pelajaran Sejarah di Sarawak dan Sabah 2004*. Kuala Lumpur: PPK [Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum].
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2004c). *Pengumuman Keputusan Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia 2003*. Kuala Lumpur: Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum.
- KPM [Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia]. (2004d). *Standard Kualiti Pendidikan Malaysia: Pernyataan Standard*. Kuala Lumpur: Jemaah Nazir Sekolah.
- KPM [Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia]. (2005a). *Pendidikan di Malaysia: Memartabatkan Kecemerlangan Pendidikan Negara*. Putrajaya: Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- KPM [Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia]. (2005b). *Pengumuman Keputusan Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia 2004*. Kuala Lumpur: Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum.
- KPM [Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia]. (2006). *SKKSM*. Genting Highland, Pahang, Malaysia: Institut Aminuddin Baki.
- Lambert, Linda. (1989). "The End of an Era of

- Staff Development” in *Education Leadership*, 47, pp.78-81.
- Lambert, Linda. (2003). “Leadership Refined: An Evocative Context for Teacher Leadership” in *School Leadership and Management*, 23(4), pp.421-430.
- Levin, J. & J.A. Fox. (2007). *Elementary Statistics in Social Science Research*. New York: Allyn and Bacon, 2nd edition.
- Magisos, J.H. (1989). *Vocational Teacher: Principles, Practices, Problem, and Promising Direction*. London: The Palmer Press.
- Mahdzan, Ahmad. (2005). *Kaedah Penyelidikan Sosio-Ekonomi*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, edisi ketiga.
- Main, A. (1985). *Educational Staff Development*. Dover, NH: Croom Helm.
- Mamat, Ibrahim. (2006). *Reka Bentuk dan Pengurusan Latihan: Konsep dan Amalan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Mamat, Ibrahim & Zaiton Hassan. (2008). *Pengurusan Sumber Manusia: Perspektif Modal Insan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Maslow, A. (1943). “A Theory of Human Motivation” in *Psychological Review*, 50, pp.370-396.
- Mat Yusof, Mohammad. (2001). “Prestasi Kerja di Kalangan Perkhidmatan Awam” in *Buletin Perkhidmatan Awam*, November, pp.23-30.
- McClelland, D.C. (1965). “Toward a Theory of Motive Acquisition” in *American Psychologist*, 20, pp.321-333.
- Mohamad, Ainon. (2003). *Teori dan Teknik Kepimpinan: Panduan Aplikasi di Tempat Kerja*. Pahang: PTS Publication & Distributors Sdn Bhd.
- Mohd Ishak, Noriah *et al.* (1999). “Hubungan antara Tanggungjawab kepada Diri, Pelajaran, Pelajar, dan Masyarakat di Kalangan Guru-guru” in *Jurnal Pendidikan* 24, pp.548-555.
- Mohd Noor, Abdullah. (1998). “Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran: Isu Strategi dan Pendekatan dalam Pendidikan”. *Kertas Kerja dalam Maktab Perguruan Perempuan Melayu*, Melaka, Malaysia, on 26 September.
- Mulyasa, E. (2003). *Manajemen dan Organisasi Sekolah*. Bandung, Indonesia: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Murphy, J.F. *et al.* (1984). “Instructional Leadership: A Conceptual Framework” in *The Education Digest*, September, pp.28-31.
- Murphy, J.F. (1988a). “Improving the Achievement of Minority Students” in *Instructional Leadership*, 46(2), pp.41-42.
- Murphy, J.F. (1988b). “Methodological, Measurement, and Conceptual Problems in the Study of Instructional Leadership” in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(2), pp.117-139.
- Murphy, J.F. (1990). “Principal Instructional Leadership: Changing Perspectives on the School” in *Advances in Educational Administration*, 1, pp.163-200.
- Mustafa, M. Nur & Norasmah Othman. (2009). “Motivasi Kerja, Latihan dalam Perkhidmatan, dan Kompetensi Profesional, serta Hubungannya terhadap Prestasi Kerja Guru di Pekan Baru, Provinsi Riau, Indonesia” in *Prosiding Penyelidikan Siswazah*. Bangi: UKM [Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia].
- Pearson, D. (2000). “The Application of Research-Based Staff Development Practices in Rural North California Elementary and Middle School: A Comparative Analysis of the Perception of Teacher from High-Standard and Low-Achieving School”. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. Releigh: North Carolina State University.
- Razaq Ahmad, Abdul & Ahmad Ali Seman. (2000). “Menangani Kepelbagaian Pelajar dalam Pendidikan Sejarah” in *Prosiding Seminar Pendidikan Kebangsaan*. Bangi: Fakulti Pendidikan UKM [Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia].
- Razaq Ahmad, Abdul & Andi Suwirta. (2007). *Sejarah dan Pendidikan Sejarah: Perspektif Malaysia dan Indonesia*. Bandung, Indonesia: Historia Utama Press.
- Sani Yahya, Abdullah, Abdullah Rashid Mohamed & Abdul Ghani Abdullah. (2007). *Guru sebagai Pemimpin*. Kuala Lumpur: PTS Professional.
- Sardiman, A.M. (2000). *Interaksi dan Motivasi Belajar-Mengajar*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Shukor Abdullah, Abdul. (2000). “Sistem Pemastian Peningkatan Standard Kualiti Pendidikan: Teori Praktis”. *Kertas Kerja dalam Seminar Jemaah Nazir Sekolah*, organized by Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia, in Port Dickson, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia, on 11-13 August.
- Smith, W. & R. Andrews. (1990). *Instructional Leadership: How Principals Make a Difference*. Alexandria, VA: ASCM.
- Soetjipto & Rafis Kosasih. (2007). *Profesi Keguruan*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Southworth, G. (2002). “Instructional Leadership in Schools: Reflections and Empirical Evidence” in *School Leadership and Management*, 22(1), pp.73-92.
- SPA [Sektor Pengurusan Akademik] Negeri Sabah. (2011). *Laporan Sijil Peperiksaan Malaysia dan Peperiksaan Menengah Rendah Negeri Sabah 2010*. Kota Kinabalu: Sektor Pengurusan Akademik Negeri Sabah, Malaysia.
- Sparks, D. (2003). “Interview with Fullan: Change Agent” in *Journal of Staff Development*, 24(1). Available online also at: <http://www.nsd.org/library/publications/jsd/fullan241.cfm> [accessed in Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia: January 15, 2015].

- Sparks, D. & S. Loucks-Horsley. (1989). "Five Models of Staff Development for Teachers" in *Journal of Staff Development*, 10(4), pp.40-57.
- Sparks, D. & S. Hirsh. (1997). *A New Vision for Staff Development*. Alexandria and Virginia: Assosiation for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sparks, G.M. (1983). "Synthesis of Research on Staff Development for Effective Teaching" in *Educational Leadership*, 41, pp.65-72.
- Sukmadinata, Nana Syaodih. (2003). *Landasan Psikologi: Proses Pendidikan*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sultan Faujar, Mohammad. (2000). "Kualiti Pengajaran Sejarah di Sekolah Menengah Daerah Sabak Bernam". *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: UM [University of Malaya].
- Sundara Raja, Sivachandralingam *et al.* (2008). *Sejarah Masih Relevan*. Kuala Lumpur: Karisma Publication Sdn Bhd.
- Timpe, K. (1998). *Sourcehood and its Alternatives*. New York: Harcour Brace Jovanavich Inc.
- Uche, A.L., D. Fiberesima & O. Christiana. (2011). "Relationship between Motivational Factors and Teachers' Performance on the Job in Ogbal/Egbema/Ndoni Local Government Area, of Rivers State" in *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol.5(2), October.
- Vroom, H.V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Willey & Sons, Inc.
- Wilcox, S. (2005). "Leadership in the Classroom". Available online also at: www.queensu.ca/idc/trainerslhandlleaderlhtml [accessed in Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia: August 9, 2014].
- Yusri Ibrahim, Mohd. (2010). *Analisis Data Penyelidikan untuk Pendidikan & Sains Sosial*. Kuantan: Bandar Ilmu.
- Zahra, S.A. (1999). "Corporate Entrepreneurship, Knowledge, and Competence Development" in *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 23(3), pp.169-190.
- Zakaria, Azmi, Wan Fatimah Mohd & Quek Bong Cheang. (1996). "Indikator Kepimpinan Cemerlang: Satu Analisis Pengurusan" in *Jurnal Pengurusan Pendidikan*, 6(1), pp.1-17.



Teachers of Sabah, Malaysia
(Photo Album of ASPENSI, 2/3/2015)

Teachers are among the key agents in generating quality education. Teaching quality is the result of their knowledge and skills required in a discipline of knowledge. Effective teachers are teachers who have the following characteristics: (1) deep knowledge in the subjects they teach; (2) plenty of imagination to enable them to make a variety of examples to help students understand a simple concept; and (3) can use the tools and instructional materials well in lessons.