Ab Wahab
Dr. Hj Abdul Ghani Kanesan Abdullah

Affiliation:

School of Educational Studies
Universiti Sains Malaysia
11800 Minden
Pulau Pinang

E-mail

Agk @usm.my

Seminar sub-themes

The Pattern in Educational Management and Leadership

Title:

The Impact of Principalôs Instructional Leadership Behavior on PPSMI Teachersôs Teaching Practices

THE IMPACT OF PRINCIPALS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR ON PPSMI TEACHERS' TEACHING PRACTICES

By

Dr. Hj Abdul Ghani Kanesan Abdullah
Datin Hjh Mahidah Bt Datuk Hj Ab Wahab

School of Educational Studies
University Sains Malaysia
Pulau Pinang

The critical role for all principals is that of being an instructional leader. Leadership in instructional matters should emerge freely from both the principal and teachers. Thus it is the principal who should responsible for developing a school climate that is conducive to providing the very best instructional practices. Therfore, the aim of the study are to identify the impact of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviour and PPSMI Teachers' Teaching Practices. A total of 260 PPSMI teachers were randomly selected from 29 secondary schools in District Pulau in Penang. The Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviour was measured from PPSMI Teachers perspectives using questionnaires as of Principal Instructional Management Ratings Scale (PIMRS) by Philip Halliger (2003). Meanwhile, questionnaires for Teachers Teaching Practices were taken from the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) measuring scale. Data was analysed using mean, standard deviation, multiple regressions.. The results revealed that Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Protecting Instructional Time ($\beta = 3.18$; $p < 0.05$) and Promoting Professional Development ($\beta = -0.520$; $p<0.05$) has significant impact upon Teachers' Instructional Materials and Tools. This finding explains that Teachers' Instructional Techniques can be improved further if Principals enhanced Instructional Leadership Behaviour for subscales Protecting Instructional Time and Promoting Professional Development. 45.1% of the change in variance on Teachers' Instructional Materials and Tools is influences by Principals Instructional Leadership Behaviours. Meanwhile, the dimensions subscale for Managing Instructional Program ($\beta = 2.670$; $p < 0.05$) has significant impact on Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools. Implications of study findings are discussed for principals, and futher research.

Strong instructional leadership by the school principal is essential for achieving academic excellence (Alimuddin Mohd Dom, 2006). Thus, it is the principal who should forge a partnership with teachers with the primary goal of the improvement of teaching and learning processes, (Hoy & Miskel, 2006). The Ministry of Education in Malaysia administers strong emphasis on instructional leadership in principals by defining the mission of the school, developing a vision for schools and headcount, (Balasandran A Ramiah, 2006). This is because it has been proven empirically that schools that make a difference in studentsô learning are led by principals who make a significant and measurable contribution to the effectiveness of teachersôinstructional teaching practices or teachersôteaching behaviour (Mohd Nor Jaafar, 2004).

PPSMI Instrumentations such as new terminologies, new methods of teaching using notebooks and LCD projectors, teaching techniques like drumming, saying, delivering lessons or in other words making students do an abrupt turn to learning Mathematics and Science in English is a task. Plain, good instructions make an easy implementation and therefore teaching and learning Mathematics and Science in English should go smoothly without hitches. Hence there is a need to bring the principalsô instructional leadership into the classroom. Teachers should copy and emulate the principalsô behaviour so that classroom management is in order. Instructional leadership is a series of behaviours that is designed to affect classroom instruction. In this environment, principals are responsible for informing teachers about new educational strategies, technologies and tools that apply to effective instruction (Davies, 2003]. Although we recognize the importance of the instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal, in reality, good instructional leadership skills are seldom practiced.

ders in schools, are great influence to effective function as instructional leaders and managers. But because of the complex organizational characteristics of schools today, principals are heavy with work loads of sorts such as entertaining visitors, reading and answering letters. In their daily assignments and appointments, works needed to improvise the process of teaching and learning are not included, (Mohd Hasani Dali,1995). Then what does it means to be an instructional leader if the ability to deliver the best and influence PPSMI teachers in order to give the best is unbecoming of Principals? Arbain Miswan (2005) described an effective principal as one who plays his or her role as an instructional leader that could lead teachers towards school academic excellence. Principals that are instructional leaders manage differently from other principals. They spend their time accordingly with the biggest portion for curriculum quality time. The cultures of their schools are shaped in a way that curriculum matters at the end of the day. They then must be knowledgeable of the subject-matter content or best said to be a know-how personality. Based on the above arguments, the research problem of this study is to examine the impact between the principalsô instructional leadership behaviour and the PPSMI teachersô instructional practices. According to Hallinger (2003), there are many researches on leadership effecting studies that linked instructional leadership to school outcomes including teacher morale and satisfaction (Mohd Hasani Dali,1995; Khalid Ansari,1997; Chee Keat Bee,1998; Lim Lay Hong,1998; Seah Kok Guang, 1998, Mohd Nor Jaafar, 2004), teacher self-efficacy (Anna Christina Abdullah,1989), teacher stress (Rozihaya Yahaya ,1998), principal locus of control, school and organizational culture (Rozihaya Yahaya ,1998), teacher effectiveness and time on task, organisational climate or health and teacher participation in decision-making.

Current literature about instructional leadership falls into four broad areas. First, prescriptive models describe instructional leadership as the integration of the tasks of direct assistance to teachers, group development, staff development, curriculum development, and action research; as a democratic, developmental, and transformational activity based on equality and growth; as an inquiry-oriented endeavor that encourages teacher voice; and as a discursive, critical study of classroom interaction to achieve social justice (Hallinger, 2003).

Second, studies of instructional leadership, though few in number, include exploratory studies of indirect effects of principal-teacher instructional conferences and behaviors such as the effects of monitoring student progress (Hallinger, 2003).

Third, studies of direct effects of principal behavior on teachers and classroom instruction include (Hallinger, 2003) synthesis of research demonstrating the relationship between certain principal behaviors and teacher commitment, involvement and innovation.

Fourth, studies of direct and indirect effects on student achievement include (Quinn, 2002) review of studies investigating the principalõs role (e.g. use of constructs such as participative leadership and decentralized decision making) in school effectiveness.

Given the emergent popularity of this leadership model during the early 1980s, scholars subsequently generated a substantial body of international research. Indeed, in their comprehensive review of research on school leadership and its effects, Quinn, (2002) concluded that this was the most common conceptualization of school leadership used during the period of their review of empirical research on school leadership effects (1980ï 1995). A subsequent review of research focused solely upon instructional leadership found that over 125 empirical studies employed this construct between 1980 and 2000, (Hallinger, 2003).

has yielded a wealth of findings concerning ership behaviour (school level, school size, school SES), the effects of the school context on instructional leadership (e.g., gender, training, experience), as well as the effects of school leadership on the organization (e.g., school mission and goals, expectations, curriculum, teaching, teacher engagement) and school outcomes (e.g., school effectiveness, student achievement). Space limitations make an extended discussion of these findings impractical; interested readers are therefore referred to other relevant sources (Quinn, 2002). Conclusions from researches on instructional leadership are as below.

ÅThe preponderance of evidence indicates that school principals contribute to school effectiveness and student achievement indirectly through actions they take to influence what happens in the school and in classrooms.

ÅThe most influential avenue of effects concerns the principalôs role in shaping the purposes of the school. The actual role that principals play in mission building is influenced by features of the school context such as socio-economic status and school size.

Å Instructional leadership influences the quality of school outcomes through the alignment of school structures (e.g., academic standards, time allocation, and curriculum) with the schoolôs mission.

ÅIt is interesting to note that relatively few studies find a relationship between the principalôs hands-on supervision of classroom instruction, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement. Where effects have been identified, it has generally been at the elementary school level, and could possibly be a function of school size.

Å The school context does have an effect on the type of instructional leadership exercised by principals.

As suggested above, school level as well as the socio-economic status of the school influence the requirements for and exercise of instructional leadership. The influence of the instructional leadership role of principals must be acknowledged.

er be the *only* role of the school principal, (Fulmer, erial, political, instructional, institutional, human resource, and symbolic leadership roles in their schools, (Fulmer, 2006). Critics assert that efforts to limit or even focus narrowly on this single role in an effort to improve student performance will be dysfunctional for the principal, (MacBarth 2003).

Instructional leaders must adjust their performance of this role to the needs, opportunities and constraints imposed by the school context. The principal in a small primary school can more easily spend substantial amounts of time in classrooms working on curriculum and instruction. In one effective elementary school that was studied, there was a consensus among the teachers that the principal knew the reading level and progress of all 450 students in their school, (Hallinger & Murphy, 2003).

However, this type of direct involvement in teaching and learning is simply unrealistic in a larger school, be it elementary or secondary level. Context effects on the principalôs instructional leadership have also been found with respect to school SES (Douglas, 2003). For example, in one comparative study of effective schools serving high vs. low SES student populations, the researchers concluded that both sets of principals were instructional leaders. However, the form of their leadership was adjusted to the needs of their schools. Principals in the low SES effective schools had clear measurable goals focused on academic achievement of the students. These were known and supported throughout the school and its community. In each of the high SES effective schools, there was a clear academic mission known and supported by staff, students and parents. However, the missions were expressed more broadly and several of the schools did not have any measurable goals at all, (Hallinger & Murphy, 2003).

During the 1980s when instructional leadership emerged as a model of choice, numerous scholars questioned the capacity of principals to fulfil this somewhat heroic role. Principals, who demonstrated the type of instructional

mance in their schools, were by definition a small

ics wondered if the majority of principals had the necessary combination of ówill and skillôto carry out this type of hands-on, directive leadership (Kroeze, 1983). Others suggested that the very nature of the principalship renders instructional leadership an ómpossible dreamôfor many principals, (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Hoya and Miskel (2001), a self-described ófriendly criticôof instructional leadership and effective schools described the managerial or maintenance role of the principal as ómbedded in the DNA of the principalshipô). He asserted that efforts by principals to act as instructional leaders in schools inevitably run aground against basic structural and normative conditions of the principalship and the school. For example, principals occupy a middle management position in which their authority to command is severely limited. The limited authority of principals is compounded when considered in light of their need to meet the expectations of those above and below them in the hierarchy. Moreover, any intention to provide instructional leadership, especially in secondary schools, is complicated by the fact that in many cases principals have less expertise than the teachers whom they supervise, (Barth, 1990; Lambert, 1998).

Instructional strategies consist of the unique way a teacher designs and delivers a lesson. Much like a blueprint, each instructional strategy involves following a set of step-by-step procedures that are known to enhance student learning. The value of utilizing research-based instructional strategies to meet the needs of students and improve student achievement is widely recognized in education. The effective teacher knows many strategies and more important, when to use them. While some instructional strategies are relatively straightforward in approach, many require advanced training and repeated practice to develop expertise, (http://www.lewispalmer.org/solo/curric_instruc_strat, 2007).

This research used the MCAS measuring scale which incorporates the various aspects of teaching strategies from writing assignments to the usage of

criteria were noted to be curriculum-related activities gagement. Effective instruction includes questions planned to engage students in sustained discourse structured around powerful ideasand teachers provide the assistance students need to enable them to engage in learning activities productively, (Davies, 2003).

OBJECTIVES

The aim of the this study is to identify :

1. does the principal practice Instructional Leadership in the school?
2. does the principal practice Instructional Leadership have an impact on PPSMI TeachersInstructional Practices in TeachersStrategies?
3. does the principal practice Instructional Leadership have an impact on PPSMI TeachersInstructional Practices in TeachersTeaching Techniques?
4. does the principal practice Instructional Leadership has an impact on PPSMI Teachers Instructional Practices in Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For this study, twenty nine out of 46 secondary schools were chosen randomly (simple random) from the district of Pulau in Penang, Malaysia. Then by using a proportionate stratified random sampling a total number of 260 PPSMI teachers were randomly selected. The approach design is descriptive using two sets of questionnaires Principals Instructional Leadership and Teachers Instructional Practices. These two sections use Likert Scale where 1 represents never, 2 represents seldom, 3 represents sometimes, 4 represents frequently and 5 represents always. The most commonly used of these instruments has been the Principal Instructional Management rating Scale or PIMRS, (Hallinger, 1982, 1983, 1990, 2003) [cited in Halliger, 2003] was used to identify the PrincipalsInstructional

a high-stakes, state-mandated performance
usetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) was designed to evaluate progress in meeting the state's new learning standards in the curriculum frameworks, (Vogler,2002), (http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb? id=237507641&sid=1&Fmt=4&clientId=27905&RQT=309&VName=PQD) was used to identify implementation of PPSMI teachersô instructional practices. A pilot test was carried out to obtain the reliability item used and 30 teachers from one school in Seberang Perai Utara, Pulau Pinang were involved in this test. The result of the pilot test is encouraging with the value of reliability Cronbach Alpha were ranging from 0.96 to 0.89 for these two set of questionnaires.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Analysis on Instructional Leadership Practices:

According to findings in Table 1, the overall Principalsô instructional leadership practices, from the PPSMI teachers perspective is moderate. This is because the mean score obtained for this variable is 3.48. The level is also moderate for Defining School Mission Dimension (mean=3.67); Managing Instructional Program Dimension (mean=3.41) and Creating a Positive School Climate Dimension (mean=3.36). Further analysis was carried out on the subscales dimensions in order to identify the level of the PrincipalsôInstructional Leadership Practices.

Table 1 also shows that while defining school mission dimensions, the level of the principalsôpractices when Framing Clear School Goals subscale, is high with a mean=3.72.; the level of the principalsôpractices when Communicating Clear School Goals subscale, is moderate with a mean=3.672.; the level of the principalsôpractices when Supervising and Evaluating Instruction subscale is moderate with a mean=3.672.; moderate for ôCoordinating Curriculumô (mean=3.58), moderate for ôMonitoring Student Progressô (mean=3.3). As for ôProtecting Instructional Timeô (mean=3.43); ôPromoting Professional Developmentô(mean=3.11); ôMaintaining High

g Incentives for Teachersô (mean=3.47); ôProviding

.41).

Table 1: Mean score and standard deviation of Instructional Leadership subscales variables.

Dimensions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Subscales	Mean	Standard Deviation
Defining school mission	3.67	0.75	Framing Clear School Goals	3.72	0.77
			Communicating Clear School Goals	3.63	0.81
Managing Instructional Program	3.41	0.73	Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	3.32	0.73
			Coordinating Curriculum	3.58	0.84
			Monitoring Student Progress	3.33	0.84
Creating a Positive School Climate	3.36	0.64	Protecting Instructional Time	3.43	0.66
			Promoting Professional Development	3.11	0.73
			Maintaining High Visibility	3.32	0.75
			Providing Incentives for Teachers	3.47	0.90
			Providing Incentives for Learning	3.41	0.84

Impact of principals' instructional leadership behaviour on PPSMI teachers overall instructional strategies.

In order to test this impact, multiple regressions are applied using dimensions of Instructional Leadership as independent variable and PPSMI teachersô Instructional Strategies as dependent variable.

Table 2: Findings of Multiple Regressions on PPSMI Teachers overall Instructional Strategies.

Model	Unstandardised Coefficients	Standardised Coefficients	t	Significant
(Constant)	1.627	-	3.917	0.000
Defining school mission	-0.031	-0.028	-0.279	0.780
Managing Instructional Program	0.227	0.204	1.420	0.158
Creating a Positive School Climate	0.171	0.134	0.973	0.333
R^2 = 0.094 Adjusted R^2 = 0.072 F value = 4.339 (p = 0.006)				

Table 2 shows that 9.4 % from the change in variance for Teachersô Instructional Strategies is connected with the dimensions of Principalsô Instructional

less, not any single one of the dimensions mention
r on the TeachersôInstructional Strategies.

With the result, this allows the hypotheses H_{04} that states there is no significant impact of Principals Instructional Leadership practice on Teachersô Instructional Strategies.

Further analysis was not carried out to identify the effect of all subscale dimensions Principals Instructional Leadership upon Teachers Instructional Strategies because none of the subscales of dimensions Principal Instructional Leadership has any significant effect on Teachers Instructional Strategies.

The impact of principal instructional leadership behaviour on PPSMI Teachers' instructional techniques.

Table 3: Multiple Regressions on PPSMI TeachersôInstructional Techniques.

Model	Unstandardised Coefficients	Standardised Coefficients	t	Significant
(Constant)	1.216	-	3.105	0.002
Defining school mission	-0.060	-0.054	-0.574	0.567
Managing Instructional Program	0.316	0.283	2.101	0.038*
Creating a Positive School Climate	0.280	0.219	1.692	0.093
R^2 = 0.448 Adjusted R^2 = 0.182 F value = 10.572 (p < 0.005)				

* Significant at level p < 0.05

From Table 3, the regressions analysis results shows 44.8 % of the change in variance, Teachers Instructional Techniques is affected by the Instructional Leadership variables. Meanwhile it is also found that dimensions Instructional Leadership subscale Managing Instructional Program has significant influence (ƀ=2.101; p<0.05) on Teachersô Instructional Techniques. Further analysis was carried out to identify the effect of all the subscales of dimension Instructional Leadership on Teachers Instructional Techniques.

Table 4: Multiple Regressions subscale Instructional Leadership on PPSMI Teachers Instructional Techniques.

	ƀ	Beta	t	Significant
(Constant)	0.709	-	1.815	0.022
Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	0.406	0.362	3.195	0.002*
Coordinating Curriculum	-0.302	-0.038	-0.236	0.814
Monitoring Student Progress	-0.086	-0.086	-0.493	0.620
Protecting Instructional Time	0.017	0.013	0.138	0.891
Maintaining High Visibility	-0.044	-0.040	-0.357	0.737
Providing Incentives for Teachers	0.319	0.294	2.772	0.006*
Promoting Professional Development	-0.103	-0.113	-0.812	0.418
Providing Incentives for Learning	0.222	0.229	1.636	0.104
R^2 = 0.551 Adjusted R^2 = 0.304 F value = 6.593 (p < 0.005)				

* Significant at p < 0.05

Table 4 shows that Principalsô Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Supervising and Evaluating Instruction (ƀ=3.195; p<0.05) and Providing Incentives for Teachers (ƀ=2.772; p<0.05) has significant impact upon Teachersô Instructional Techniques. This finding explains that Teachersô Instructional Techniques can be improved further if Principals enhanced Instructional Leadership Behaviour for subscales Supervising and Evaluating Instruction and Providing Incentives for Teachers.

Impact of principals' instructional leadership behaviour on PPSMI teachers instructional materials and tools.

Table 5: Multiple Regressions subscale Instructional Leadership on PPSMI Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools.

Model	ƀ	Beta	t	Significant
(Constant)	1.393	-	4.042	0.000
Defining school mission	0.077	0.079	0.843	0.401
Managing Instructional Program	0.354	0.358	2.670	0.009*
Creating a Positive School Climate	0.073	0.064	0.500	0.618
R^2 = 0.458 Adjusted R^2 = 0.191 F value = 11.145 (p < 0.005)				

* Significant at p < 0.05

Table 5 shows that 45.1% of the change in variance on Teachersô Instructional Materials and Tools is influences by Principals Instructional Leadership Behaviours. Meanwhile, the dimensions subscale for Managing Instructional Program

nt impact on Teachers Instructional Materials and rried to identify the effect of all the subscales of dimension Instructional Leadership on Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools.

Table 6: Multiple Regressions subscale Instructional Leadership on PPSMI Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools.

Model	ƀ	Beta	t	Significant
(Constant)	0.893	-	2.679	0.008
Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	0.112	0.113	1.034	0.303
Coordinating Curriculum	0.044	0.051	0.331	0.741
Monitoring Student Progress	0.271	0.316	1.832	0.069
Protecting Instructional Time	0.347	0.318	3.387	0.001*
Maintaining High Visibility	0.192	0.194	1.718	0.088
Providing Incentives for Teachers	0.187	0.194	1.903	0.059
Promoting Professional Development	-0.419	-0.520	-3.882	0.000*
Providing Incentives for Learning	-0.045	-0.053	-0.392	0.696
R^2 = 0.344 Adjusted R^2 = 0.311 F value = 8.291 (p < 0.005)				

* Significant at p < 0.05

Table 6 shows that Principalsô Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Protecting Instructional Time (ƀ=3.18; p<0.05) and Promoting Professional Development (ƀ=-0.520; p<0.05) has significant impact upon Teachersô Instructional Materials and Tools. This finding explains that Teachersô Instructional Techniques can be improved further if Principals enhanced Instructional Leadership Behaviour for subscales Protecting Instructional Time and Promoting Professional Development.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The results of this research shows that from the PPSMI teachersôperceptions the principalsôinstructional leadership behaviour is relatively moderate. It is clear that principals are more concentrating on defining school mission and a mean for subscale of Framing clear school goals. According to Hallinger, (2003), the research finding shows a high score on a particular function does not necessarily indicate effective performance, only active leadership in that area. Principals who obtain a high rating on a given leadership function are perceived as engaging more frequently in instructional leadership behaviours and practices associated with principals in effective schools, (Halliger, 2003). Therefore, principals are active or engage more

ion or specifically Framing clear school goals. The

al Leadership practices shown according to PPSMI teachersôperspectives is moderate. Defining school mission shows higher level than managing instructional program and creating a positive school climate. This study shows that secondary school principals invest only some of their energy in their instructional roles. According to teachersô reports, secondary school principals maintain visibility, monitor student performance, coordinate curriculum and promote academic standards, while neglecting the other domains of instructional leadership, such as supervising and evaluating instruction, providing incentives to teachers and students, and promoting teachersôprofessional development.

There is significant impact of Principalsô Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Supervising and Evaluating Instruction and Providing Incentives for Teachers upon Teachersô Instructional Techniques. Meanwhile, the dimensions subscale for Managing Instructional Program has significant impact on Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools. PrincipalsôInstructional Leadership Behaviour such as Protecting Instructional Time and Promoting Professional Development has significant impact upon Teachersô Instructional Materials and Tools. The preponderance of evidence indicates that school principals contribute to school effectiveness and student achievement indirectly through actions they take to influence what happens in the school and in classrooms. The most influential avenue of effects concerns the principalôs role in shaping the purposes of the school, (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Goldring & Pasternak, 1994). The actual role that principals play in mission building is influenced by features of the school context such as socio-economic status and school size, (Hallinger & Murphy, 2003). Instructional leadership influences the quality of school outcomes through the alignment of school structures (e.g., academic standards, time allocation, and curriculum) with the schoolôs mission, (Blasé, 2000). It is interesting to note that relatively few studies find

pal's hands-on supervision of classroom instruction, nt achievement, (Fulmer, 2006). Where effects have been identified, it has generally been at the elementary school level, and could possibly be a function of school size, (Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990). The school context does have an effect on the type of instructional leadership exercised by principals, (Hallinger & Heck, 1996a, 1996b). Instructional leadership focuses predominantly on the role of the school principal in coordinating, controlling, supervising, and developing curriculum and instruction in the school (kKoeze, 1983). With its birthplace in the 'instructional effective elementary school', instructional leadership was generally conceived to be a unitary role of the elementary school principal, (Quinn, 2002). Similarly, the fact that studies of effective schools focused on poor urban schools in need of substantial change, it is not surprising to note that instructional leaders were subsequently conceived to be 'strong, directive leaders' (Hallinger & Murphy, 2003). Instructional leaders lead from a combination of expertise and charisma. They are hands-on principals, 'hip-deep' in curriculum and instruction, and unafraid of working with teachers on the improvement of teaching and learning. Instructional leaders are goal-oriented, focusing on the improvement of student academic outcomes. Given the dire straits in which they find their schools, these principals focus on a narrower mission than many of their peers. Instructional leaders are viewed as culture builders. They sought to create an 'academic press' that fosters high expectations and standards for students, as well as for teachers. Teddlie and Reynolds (2000) [cited in Davies, 2003] distil SER findings into nine process areas including the processes of effective leadership as being firm and purposeful, involving others in the process, exhibiting instructional leadership, frequent personal monitoring and selecting and replacing staff. The main event or agenda in the school is to create a learning environment. Principals need to pool in the working force in order to be effectively instructional, (Alimuddin Mohd Dom, 2006). The critical role for all principals is that of being an instructional leader.

leaders manage differently from other principals. y with the biggest portion for curriculum quality time. The cultures of their schools are shaped in a way that curriculum matters at the end of the day. They then must be knowledgeable of the subject-matter content or best said to be a know-how personality. They work with, and develop, other leaders in their schools, (Abdul Shukur Abdullah, 1996). Public examination results are different from school to school. With the curriculum and teachers training tailored to be the same, without doubt, high achieving schools obtained results above national average. Ineffective principals are yet to obtain results that are above national average. Hence, instructional leadership is not just by the principal but by a wider cast of individuals in both and informal leadership roles, can play a central role in shifting the emphasis of school activity more directly onto instructional improvements that lead to enhanced student learning and performance.

CONCLUSION:

The research findings and the literature review advocates that wider dimensions are much needed to enforcee that the vision and mission of schools, management of instructional programs and teaching climate which is conducive must also be clear, if the need to achieve students academic performance goes hand in hand. The instructional leadership from the principal alone does not predict school performance without the participationsof teachers in the schools. The instructional leadership is the responsibility of all and not only the principal alone. Supports from the Education District Offices and the State Education Resource Centre will help principals to create a positive change towards improving the teaching and learning on schools. Hence the instructional leadership functions together side by side with the administrator and the education management, teachers, parents and community. Newly elected principal will have less experience in analyzing and describe the significanct principal instructional leadership in a successful school with outstanding academic

ms planned for the principals to be sensitive so that potential principals implement functional instructional leadership in schools. The problem with implementing the functional behavioral instructional leadership concepts must be encountered the soonest possible. Although research was carried out to emphasise clarity in the functional behavioral instructional leadership but no consensus was made to agree upon one model that will befit all schools in different context. What ever the situation is, the principal himself must ensure that instructions is enhanced and therefore the principal will be able to play his role accordingly accommodating the internal structures and school culture. Davies (2003) suggested that if the principal is interested in implementing his role as an instructional leader, therefore he has to strive to decorate himself with curriculum development and current teaching, organisation direction, methodology and understanding the instructional leadership concepts. The principal role in directing teachers and solely functioning as a policeman will create a negative implication towards teachers. In this situation, principals need to use etiquette and practice his role as a facilitator, work together and be responsible in handling the culture related practices in school. Generally speaking, principals who are attempting to develop as effective instructional leaders should work to integrate reflection and growth to build a school culture of individual and shared critical examination for instructional improvement. Principals should acknowledge the difficulties of growing and changing, including teacher resistance and the difficulty of role changes, recognize that change is a journey of learning and risk taking, demonstrate fundamental respect for the knowledge and abilities of teachers, view the ñteacher as intellectual rather than teacher as technicianò (Little, 1993, p. 129) [cited in Blase 2000], talk openly and frequently with teachers about instruction, make suggestions, give feedback, and solicit teachersôadvice and opinions about classroom instruction, develop cooperative, non threatening partnerships with teachers that are characterized by trust, openness, and freedom to make mistakes, emphasize the

, model teaching skills, support development of onversations among educators, provide time and opportunities for peer connections among teachers, provide resources and support for redesign of programs, apply the principles of adult learning to staff development programs and promote group development, teamwork, collaboration, innovation and continual growth, trust in staff and students, and caring and respect to enhance teacher efficacy. In addition, the preparation and continuing development of instructional leaders should de-emphasize principal control of and encouragement of competition among teachers. Programs should teach practicing and aspiring principals how to develop professional dialogue and collegiality among educators; based on our data, training in group development, theories of teaching and learning, action research methods, change and reflective practice should anchor such programs. Therefore, last but not least, the developments of the school need a principal who can carry out instructional leadership functions effectively and with quality. This principle is important and needs to be enforced if the direction of the school development is the responsibility of the principal. A successful school and outstanding one has an instructional, effective and firm principal as a leader.

REFERENCES

Abdul Shukur Abdullah, (2004), Jun *2004 Kepimpinan Unggul Tonggak Pendidikan Cemerlang, ms 18 Jurnal Pengurusan dan Kepimpinan Pendidikan Jilid 14 Bil 01 ISSN 1511-4147 Institut Aminuddin Baki Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.*

Alimuddin Haji (2006) *Kepimpinan Instruksional Peranan Pengetua dan Guru Besar Dalam Meningkatkan Kualtiti Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran di Bilik Darjah Jemaah Nazir Sekolah Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.*

Anna Christina Abdullah (1989) *Kepercayaan guru terhadap peranan mereka dalam proses perkembangan kurikulum. NO. REKOD: 00314 - 1989. JENIS: M.Ed. No. Panggilan: rb fLB2806.15.A613 rbfLB2806.15A613*

Balasandran A. R, (2006) Headmasters reinforcement behaviour and teachers performance, *Unpublished PhDs' Thesis. UM*

atisfaction with Principals Communication, *Unpublished*

Cuban L (1988) Managerial Imperative and the Practice of Leadership in Schools. SUNY PRESS, State University New York.

Davies B, J. (2003) Handbook of Educational Leadership and Management Pearson Longman

Douglas, H.I.(2003) Relationship between Professional Development, Teachers' Instructional Practices and the Achievement of Students in Science and Mathematics. Educational Leadership (Beyond Instructional Leadership) May2002/ Volume 59/ Number 8 ASCD

Fulmer C. L. (2006) Becoming Instructional Leaders: Lessons Learned from Instructional Leadership Work Samples. Educational Leadership and Administration. San Francisco: Fall 2006.Vol.18 pg. 109, 23 pgs
http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1195704961&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=27905&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Hallinger, P (2003) A Review of Two Decades of Research on the Principalship using the ñ*Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*òVersion 2.1 January 8, 2003.

Hallinger, P & Murphy, J. (2003) Leading Educational Change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. Cambridge Journal of Education Vol 33 (3); 31 - 49

Heck (1992) [cited in Quinn, 2002],"Principals' Instructional Leadership and school performance: Implications for policy development" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol 14 (1); 21-34

Hoy W.K, Miskel C.G. (2001) Sixth Edition Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. Graw Hill International Edition

Blase J., 2000, Effective instructional leadership, Teachersô perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, USA

Khalid Bin Ashari (1997) *Gaya Kepemimpinan & Kepemimpinanan Transformasi Pengetua Sekolah Menengah Hubungannya dengan kepuasan Kerja dan Motivasi Guru Unpublished Masters' Thesis. USM*

Kimbrough R B., Charles W Burket (1990) The Principalship Concepts and Practices Prentice Hall, New Jersey

Kroeze (1983) "Effective Principals as Instructional Leaders: New Direction for Research" Administration Notebook, Prentice Hall, New Jersey

Leithwood (1994) [cited in Quinn, 2002], "Leadership for school restructuring", Educational Administration Quarterly Vol 30; p.3 ï 18.

Lim Lay Hong (1998) The Relationships of perceived principal's power bases and teacher's satisfaction with supervision. *Unpublished Masters' Thesis. USM*

ool Leadership Responding to Change Paul Chapman

McEwan E.K. (2003) 7 Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership Second Edition Corwin Press Inc A Sage Publications Company Thousand Oaks California. LB2831.662M142

Michael J M, Nancy O Berger (2000) Global Leaders 21st Century State University of New York Press

Mohd Hasani Bin Dali (1995) *Hubungan antara tingkah laku kepemimpinan pengajaran guru besar sekolah rendah dengan pencapaian akademik pelajar.Unpublished Masters' Thesis. USM*

Mohd Nor Bin Jaafar, Hj (2004) *Kepemimpinan Pengajaran Guru Besar, Komitment dan Kepuasan Kerja Guru. Satu kajian perbandingan dan hubungan antara sekolah berkesan dan sekolah kurang berkesan. Unpublished PhD' Thesis. USM*

Arbain Miswan, Pengetua Yang Unggul. (2005) Pg 20 Pendidik Bil 17-2005

Quinn DM (2002) The impact of principal leadership behaviours on instructional practice and student engagement, Journal of Education Administration 40,4/5;ABI/INFORM Global pg 447

Ramaiah, (1999), Kepemimpinan Pendidikan, Cabaran Masa Kini, Kuala Lumpur:IBS Buku Sdn Bhd.

Rozihaya Yahaya (1998) Organisational Factors that contribute to Teachers Stress *Unpublished Masters' Thesis. USM*

Seah Kok Guang (1998) *Masalah Pembelajaran Bahasa Bukan Saintifik dalam Pembelajaran Sains Diges Pendidik Jilid 4, Bil 1/2004 ISSN: 1511-8959 http://www.usm.my.education/digest.htm USM*rbfLB2831.9S438

Vogler K E. (2002) The impact of high-stakes, state-mandated student performance assessment on teachers' instructional practices Education. Chula Vista: Fall 2002.Vol.123, Iss. 1; pg. 39, 17 pgs
http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=237507641&sid=1&Fmt=4&clientId=27905&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Vogler K.E (2005) Impact of a High School Graduation Examination on Social Studies Teachers' Instructional Practices
http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=916958211&sid=1&Fmt=4&clientId=27905&RQT=309&VName=PQD