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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. Therefore, 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 further 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 students’ learning are led by principals who make a significant and measurable contribution to the effectiveness of teachers’ instructional teaching practices or teachers’ teaching 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 principals’ instructional leadership into the classroom. Teachers should copy and emulate the principals’ 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.
Principals, who are leaders in schools, are great influence to effective teaching and learning only if they 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 principals’ instructional leadership behaviour and the PPSMI teachers’ 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 principal’s 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 (1980–1995). 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 antecedents of instructional leadership 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, teacherengagement) 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.

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 principal’s 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.

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

It is interesting to note that relatively few studies find a relationship between the principal’s 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.

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.
However, it was not and will never be the only role of the school principal (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 principal’s 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
leadership needed to lift performance in their schools, were by definition a small minority, (Kroeze, 1983). Skeptics wondered if the majority of principals had the necessary combination of 'will and skill' to carry out this type of hands-on, directive leadership (Kroeze, 1983). Others suggested that the very nature of the principalship renders instructional leadership an 'impossible dream' for many principals, (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Hoya and Miskel (2001), a self-described 'friendly critic' of instructional leadership and effective schools described the managerial or maintenance role of the principal as 'embedded in the DNA of the principalship'). 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
Rubrics or scoring guides. These criteria were noted to be curriculum-related activities which will maintain student engagement. Effective instruction includes questions planned to engage students in sustained discourse structured around powerful ideas and teachers provide the assistance students need to enable them to engage in learning activities productively, (Davies, 2003).

OBJECTIVES

The aim of 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 Teachers' Instructional Practices in Teachers' Strategies?
3. does the principal practice Instructional Leadership have an impact on PPSMI Teachers' Instructional Practices in Teachers' Teaching Techniques?
4. does the principal practice Instructional Leadership have 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 Principals' Instructional
Leadership Behaviour. While a high-stakes, state-mandated performance assessment called the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) was designed to evaluate progress in meeting the state's new learning standards in the curriculum frameworks, (Vogler, 2002), was used to identify implementation of PPSMI teachers' 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 Principals' 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 Principals' Instructional Leadership Practices.

Table 1 also shows that while defining school mission dimensions, the level of the principals' practices when Framing Clear School Goals subscale, is high with a mean=3.72.; the level of the principals' practices when Communicating Clear School Goals subscale, is moderate with a mean=3.672.; the level of the principals' practices when Supervising and Evaluating Instruction subscale is moderate with a mean=3.672.; moderate for Coordinating Curriculum (mean=3.58), moderate for Monitoring Student Progress (mean=3.3). As for Protecting Instructional Time (mean=3.43); Promoting Professional Development (mean=3.11); Maintaining High
Table 1: Mean score and standard deviation of Instructional Leadership subscales variables.

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

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 teachers' Instructional Strategies as dependent variable.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.917</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining school mission</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Instructional Program</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Positive School Climate</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.094$  
Adjusted $R^2 = 0.072$  
$F$ value $= 4.339$  
($p = 0.006$)

Table 2 shows that 9.4 % from the change in variance for Teachers' Instructional Strategies is connected with the dimensions of Principals' Instructional
Leadership practices. None the less, not any single one of the dimensions mention
above has any affect what so ever on the Teachers Instructional Strategies.

With the result, this allows the hypotheses $H_0$ that states there is no
significant impact of Principals Instructional Leadership practice on Teachers 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 Teachers' Instructional Techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.105</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining school mission</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.574</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Instructional Program</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Positive School Climate</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.448$
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 ($\beta=2.101; p<0.05$) on Teachers 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 shows that Principals’ Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Supervising and Evaluating Instruction ($\beta=3.195$; $p<0.05$) and Providing Incentives for Teachers ($\beta=2.772$; $p<0.05$) has significant impact upon Teachers’ Instructional Techniques. This finding explains that Teachers’ 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining school mission</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Instructional Program</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Positive School Climate</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.458$

Adjusted $R^2 = 0.419$

F value $= 11.145$

(p < 0.005)

* Significant at $p < 0.05$

Table 5 shows that 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...
impact on Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools. The study attempted to identify the effect of all the subscales of the dimension Instructional Leadership on Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising and Evaluating Instruction</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Curriculum</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>1.832</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Instructional Time</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>3.387</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining High Visibility</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Incentives for Teachers</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Professional Development</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>-0.520</td>
<td>-3.882</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Incentives for Learning</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.392</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = 0.344 \]
\[ \text{Adjusted } R^2 = 0.311 \]
\[ F \text{ value } = 8.291 \]
\[ (p < 0.005) \]

* Significant at p < 0.05

Table 6 shows that Principals’ Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Protecting Instructional Time (b=3.18; p<0.05) and Promoting Professional Development (b=-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.

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

The results of this research shows that from the PPSMI teachers’ perceptions, the principals’ instructional 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, (Hallinger, 2003). Therefore, principals are active or engage more
Framing clear school goals. The instructional Leadership practices shown according to PPSMI teachers’ perspectives 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 teachers’ 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 teachers’ professional development.

There is significant impact of Principals’ Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Supervising and Evaluating Instruction and Providing Incentives for Teachers upon Teachers’ Instructional Techniques. Meanwhile, the dimensions subscale for Managing Instructional Program has significant impact on Teachers Instructional Materials and Tools. Principals’ Instructional Leadership Behaviour such as Protecting Instructional Time and Promoting Professional Development has significant impact upon Teachers’ 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 principals’ 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 school’s mission, (Blasé, 2000). It is interesting to note that relatively few studies find
a relationship between the principal’s hands-on supervision of classroom instruction, teacher effectiveness, and student 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 (Koeze, 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. 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. 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 enforce 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 participation of 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 significant principal instructional leadership in a successful school with outstanding academic
Performance. Preparation programs 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. Whatever 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 teacher as intellectual rather than teacher as technician (Little, 1993, p. 129) [cited in Blase 2000], talk openly and frequently with teachers about instruction, make suggestions, give feedback, and solicit teachers' advice 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 conversations 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.
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