

Impact of Instructional Leadership Practices on the Performance of Teachers and Students

Gul Amber Ikhlas Khan, *Working Folks Grammar Higher Secondary School Dera Township (F), Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan*

Marium Mahsood, *Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan*

Keywords	Abstract
Instructional Leadership, Performance of Teachers, Student's Performance.	<p><i>The purpose of the study was to compare how instructional leadership affected both teacher and student behaviour. All secondary-level teachers and students at Working Folks Grammar Schools and selected government schools in Dera Ismail Khan comprised the study's population. The multistage sampling technique was used, and a sample of 48 teachers and 200 students from 8 schools of the Dera Ismail Khan Division was selected. A well-structured questionnaire was used for data collection. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software was used for data analysis to find out the mean difference in the responses of the teacher and students by applying the ANOVA test. The Tukey test was also applied in order to know the difference among various groups of independent variables. The results of the analysis lead toward the conclusion that the majority of the respondents were of the view that instructional leadership should be followed in the schools. Most of the respondents showed that the instructional leadership can influence the performance of both the teachers and the students. This study addresses the social, dialectal and learning diversity in the schools.</i></p>

INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership is usually termed as the arranging and overseeing of curriculum in educational activity by the head of the institution. This terminology emerged from research carried out in the 1980s. The research concluded that the primary element for a successful school is the role of the principal. But the instructional leadership expanded recently with the addition of some dynamic models like distributed leadership, shared leadership and transformational leadership. Without a doubt, the foundation of any educational system is the school. Due to the increasing importance of 'schooling' all around the world, school management is facing the complex nature of responsibilities. In almost every sphere of life, modern society is experiencing rapid transitions. These adaptabilities and modifications have made educational institutions more dynamic and complicated than they were before (Crow, 2006).

Approaches of Instructional Leadership: Hollinger and Murphy (1986) described the "exclusive" approach of instructional leadership. According to them, the principal or school leader is the sole holder of all responsibilities. He or she is the only commandant for decision-making, either in setting predefined objectives for the institution and/or for developing guidance in making academic endeavors. This approach was criticized by several researchers, as this approach focused only on the role of head of institution as instructional leadership.

Later on, other researchers developed the ideology of instructional leadership to include not only the head of the institution as the sole holder for all responsibilities but also other school staff. Marks and Printy (2003) took an “inclusive” approach to instructional leadership. In this approach the responsibilities of the principal were divided in collaboration between the head teacher and teachers to formulate curriculum and guidance for enhancing students’ outcomes. Thus, this approach was further conceptualized as “shared instructional leadership”, in which the school head was considered as “leader of instructional leaders”.

In terms of school leadership, the head teacher's duty and obligations as an instructional leader are to overcome challenges and increase the school's capacity. He must provide a favorable environment for teaching and learning by assisting teachers in improving their ability to teach (Niqab et al., 2014). This can only be attained if the head teachers take on their proper responsibilities. An effective instructional leader enhances his relations with the teachers and strengthens his role and responsibilities in the local community for school enhancement (Yunas & Iqbal, 2013). The school principals/head teachers must manage, adapt, and react according to the changing requirements of the society (Oplatka et al., 2002).

Instructional Leadership Techniques in Pakistan: Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), one of Pakistan's four provinces, is the only one where head teachers' duties now include instructional leadership to some extent (Mustafa, 2012). In many cases in the government-run educational sector in Pakistan, the head teachers are unwilling to share leadership because they feel threatened, and teachers don't demonstrate their willingness to take on leadership roles because they already feel overwhelmed by their workload from academic and administrative responsibilities. Yet, the head teachers were held accountable for creating a collaborative workplace and encouraging teachers to take more initiative (Mustafa, 2012). Baig and Shafa's (2011) study revealed that, to bring a change in the present school situation, the private values of the leader cannot be ignored. Certain individual values are presented on a mental level, whereas some remain acting in various groups and interacting in teams at various levels and at several events. The school leaders who are effective not only focus on management but also often give consideration to the several tasks faced by them. That means the conception of school principals can, at times, be shifted to the investigation of more “energetic” personalities, having numerous characteristics and qualities? Principals who are well-found with energetic personal qualities will, no doubt, accomplish their roles more actively (Alam, 2012).

According to Banach (2015), in instructional leadership, the principal's role determines the school's direction. The “mission” dimension focuses on the principal's role in cooperation with staff, ensuring that the school is continuously running on clear, measurable, and time-based goals and the academic progress of students. Heads have the duty of communicating goals, which should be broadly known and supported all over the school. The research has proven that the principal should set the goals, in collaboration with staff, for achieving effectiveness. According to Niqab et al. (2014), the character of the principal as instructional leader is crucial in overcoming many current problems, enhancing the school capacity, improving teachers' abilities, and providing a more favorable atmosphere for teaching and learning. According to Yunas and Iqbal (2013), effective school leadership thus plays a key role in facilitating effective teaching and learning processes. School principals are thought to be the key actors in enhancing school efficiency by bringing indispensable changes, which finally result in enhancing the

achievement of the students. This is possible only when the institutional leaders plan correctly and then implement their developmental programs to the desired level. The relationship between heads and staff is one of the most important features of running an effective school. In order to achieve this, heads, being leaders of the institution, must conduct consistent meetings with staff in order to discuss those weaknesses being observed during classroom rounds and provide enough services to get over any difficulties. A variety of procedures being followed for the best output give enough information for fruitful changes and update teachers for the elimination of deficiencies, if any; no doubt all this will lead to school development (Yunas & Iqbal, 2013).

Thus, schools may not achieve the expected student outcomes if head teachers prioritise administrative activities over curricula and demonstrate a lack of interest in staff meetings. This could result in school failure, for which the head teacher will unquestionably accept responsibility. As a result, an effective instructional leader concentrates on programs for teachers' development, holds staff meetings to discuss ideas and collaborate with staff, demonstrates a high level of staff collaboration, frequently visits classrooms, and regularly provides feedback (Niazi, 2012). This aroused our attention and caused us to concentrate on conducting a study to examine instructors' and students' opinions of principals and head teachers in Working Folk Grammar Schools and Government Schools, as well as their views on the idea of instructional leadership. This study is an investigation of current instructional models being followed by principals and teachers and their impact on students at the secondary school level. The role of instructional leadership was selected for research because it's been considered as a critical part of an effective school. In the present study, eight characteristics of instructional leadership are considered. These characteristics are goal setting, curriculum management, monitoring lesson plans, resource allocation, teacher evaluation for enhancing student growth and learning, time allocation, maintaining effective teacher-student relationships and effective teaching methodology.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed at directly probing the impact of instructional leadership on the educational behavior of students and teachers.

1. To identify the impact of Instructional leadership on academic behavior of secondary school students.
2. To identify the impact of instructional Leadership on academic behavior of WFG secondary school students.
3. To identify the impact of instructional leadership on academic behavior of Govt secondary school students.
4. To identify the impact of instructional leadership on teacher class room behavior.
5. To identify the impact of instructional leadership on WFGS teacher class room behavior.
6. To identify the impact of instructional leadership on Govt teacher class room behavior.
7. To compare the impact of instructional leadership on teachers and students academic behavior in WFGS (Working folks grammar secondary School) and GSS.

Hypotheses

Following will be the research hypotheses to be tested in the study.

- Ho₁: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS students and teachers and Govt teachers and students regarding the opinion that properly formulated and clearly defined goals and objective by instructional leader enhance the performance of Teachers and students at secondary school level.
- Ho₂: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that effective evaluation techniques adopted by instructional leader leads towards the achievement of educational objectives.
- Ho₃: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that provision of appropriate resources for effective teaching learning process by Instructional leader facilitates teachers and students.
- Ho₄: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that proper management of curriculum results in promotion of learning outcomes.
- Ho₅: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that allotment of time by instructional leader to perform different activities develops the sense of discipline among the student and teachers.
- Ho₆: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that Instructional leader can improve teacher student relationship.
- Ho₇: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that Instructional leader plays an important role in improving teaching methodology.
- Ho₈: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of WFGS teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that proper monitoring of lesson plans by the instructional leader results in effective teaching learning process.

RESEARCH METHOD

The method of this study is based on a cross-sectional survey for data collection. In this study, the population consists of teachers and students of four (4) “Working Folks Grammar Schools” and four (4) secondary schools run by the government. A total of 48 teachers and 200 students were included in this population from both types of schools under study. The multistage sampling technique is used for this study. The population was divided into two clusters, namely the Government Secondary School and the Working Folks Grammar School system. Out of these two clusters, 4 government schools and 4 Working Folks Grammar Schools were selected randomly. From each cluster 6 teachers were selected randomly. In total 48 teachers were selected. From each school 25 students were selected randomly. In total 200 students sample size were selected. A 4-point Likert-scaled (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree) well-structured questionnaire comprising 37 statements was constructed and personally distributed among the sample. Reliability of scale was checked, and the result of the Cronbach alpha coefficient for all 37 items was above .821. SPSS software is used for data analysis. ANOVA and Tukey’s test are applied in order to achieve the study objectives.

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

The mean difference in the responses of the teacher and students is measured by applying the ANOVA test. Since the ANOVA test does not explain the source of the difference. The Tukey test is also applied in order to know in detail whose response is differing from the other respondents. The data were organized, analyzed and interpreted using SPSS, which are tabulated below. The alpha level was set for all tests at .05.

Table 1: Result of the ANOVA Test on Goals

Goals	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.26	3	.42	3.60	.01
Within Groups	28.45	244	.12		
Total	29.71	247			

Results of the ANOVA table show that the *p*-value is $0.01 < 0.05$; therefore, it is concluded that there is a significant difference in the responses regarding goals. The result rejected the null hypothesis (H_0), “There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools students and teachers and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that properly formulated and clearly defined goals and objectives by instructional leaders enhance the performance of teachers and students at the secondary school level.” The students and teachers of the two categories of schools have different opinions regarding the formulation and clearly defined goals and objectives by their respective heads of the institute.

Table 2: Results of TUKEY Test on the Goals

Dependent Variable	(I) Respondent	(J) Respondent	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Goals	Govt	Govt Students	.01	.08	.99	-.19	.21
	Teacher	WFGS Teacher	-.20	.10	.19	-.45	.06
		WFGS Students	-.11	.08	.51	-.31	.09
	Govt	Govt Teacher	-.01	.08	.99	-.21	.19
	Students	WFGS Teacher	-.21*	.08	.04	-.41	-.01
		WFGS Students	-.12	.05	.07	-.24	.01
	WFGS	Govt Teacher	.20	.10	.19	-.06	.45
	Teacher	Govt Students	.21*	.08	.04	.01	.41
		WFGS Students	.09	.08	.65	-.11	.29
	WFGS	Govt Teacher	.11	.08	.51	-.09	.31
	Students	Govt Students	.12	.05	.07	-.01	.24
		WFGS Teacher	-.09	.08	.65	-.29	.11

The Tukey test was applied. The results of the TUKEY test show that the main and only difference is between the students of government schools and the teachers of WFGS schools (.04). There is no difference among the other categories.

Table 3: Result of ANOVA Test on Evaluation

Evaluation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.69	3	.23	1.72	.16
Within Groups	32.53	244	.13		
Total	33.22	247			

Results of the ANOVA table show that the p -value is $0.16 > 0.05$; therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference in the responses of the respondents regarding evaluation. The result does not reject the null hypothesis (H_0), "There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools teachers and students and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that effective evaluation techniques adopted by instructional leaders lead towards the achievement of educational objectives."

Table 4: Result of the ANOVA Test on Resources

Resources	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.53	3	.18	1.60	.19
Within Groups	27.23	244	.11		
Total	27.76	247			

Results of the ANOVA table show that the p -value is $0.19 > 0.05$; therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference in the responses of the respondents regarding resources. On the basis of the result, the null hypothesis (H_0) is not rejected: "There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools teachers and students and Govt teachers and students regarding the opinion that the provision of appropriate resources for an effective teaching-learning process by the instructional leader facilitates teachers and students."

Table 5: Result of the ANOVA Test on Management of Curriculum

Management	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.64	3	.21	1.54	.20
Within Groups	33.91	244	.14		
Total	34.55	247			

Results of the ANOVA table show that the p -value is $0.20 > 0.05$; therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference in the responses of the respondents regarding management of curriculum. On the basis of the ANOVA test, the null hypothesis (H_0) regarding the variable "Management of Curriculum" is not rejected, stating that "There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools teachers and students and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that proper management of curriculum results in promotion of learning outcomes."

Table 6: Results of the ANOVA Test on Time Allocation

Time Allocation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.80	3	.27	2.13	.10

Within Groups	30.63	244	.13
Total	31.43	247	

Results of the ANOVA table show that the p -value is $0.10 > 0.05$; therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference in the responses of the respondents regarding time allocation. On the basis of the ANOVA test, the null hypothesis (H_0) regarding the variable "Time Allocation" is not rejected: "There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools teachers and students and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that the allotment of time by the instructional leader to perform different activities develops the sense of discipline among the students and teachers."

Table 7: Results of the ANOVA Test on Teacher-Student Relationship

Teacher Student Relationship	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.63	3	.21	1.53	.21
Within Groups	33.31	244	.14		
Total	33.94	247			

Results of the ANOVA table show that the p -value is $0.21 > 0.05$; therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference in the responses of the respondents regarding teacher-student relationship. This finding does not reject the null hypothesis (H_0) that "There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools teachers and students and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that instructional leaders can improve teacher-student relationships."

Table 8: Results of the ANOVA Test on Teaching Methodology

Teaching Methodology	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.19	3	.40	3.82	.01
Within Groups	25.32	244	.10		
Total	26.51	247			

Results of the ANOVA table show that the p -value is $0.01 < 0.05$; therefore, it is concluded that there is a significant difference in the responses regarding teaching methodology. The result also rejected the null hypothesis (H_0) that "There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools teachers and students and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that instructional leaders play an important role in improving teaching methodology."

Table 9: Results of the TUKEY Test on Teaching Methodology

Dependent Variable	(I) Respondent	(J) Respondent	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	Govt	Govt Students	-.05	.07	.88	-.24	.14
	Teacher	WFGS Teacher	-.02	.09	.99	-.26	.22

		WFGS Students	-.18	.07	.08	-.37	.01
Teaching Methodology	Govt Students	Govt Teacher	.05	.07	.88	-.14	.24
		WFGS Teacher	.04	.07	.96	-.15	.23
		WFGS Students	-.12*	.05	.04	-.24	-.00
	WFGS Teacher	Govt Teacher	.02	.09	.99	-.22	.26
		Govt Students	-.04	.07	.96	-.23	.15
		WFGS Students	-.16	.07	.13	-.35	.03
WFGS Students	WFGS Teacher	Govt Teacher	.18	.07	.08	-.01	.37
		Govt Students	.12*	.05	.04	.00	.24
		WFGS Teacher	.16	.07	.13	-.03	.35

The results of the Tukey test show that the response of the government school students is significantly different from the responses of the Working Folks Grammar School students.

Table 10: Results of the ANOVA Test on Monitoring Lesson Plans

Lesson Plan	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.84	3	.61	3.07	.03
Within Groups	48.69	244	.20		
Total	50.52	247			

Results of the ANOVA table show that the *p*-value is $0.03 < 0.05$; therefore, it is concluded that there is a significant difference in the responses regarding monitoring lesson plans. The result also did not support the null hypothesis (H_0) that "There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folk Grammar Schools teachers and students and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that proper monitoring of lesson plans by the instructional leader results in an effective teaching-learning process".

Table 11: Result of the TUKEY Test on Monitoring Lesson Plans

Dependent Variable	(I) Respondent	(J) Respondent	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Lesson Plan	Govt School Teacher	Govt Students	-.29*	.10	.02	-.55	-.03
		WFGS Teacher	-.17	.13	.57	-.50	.17
		WFGS Students	-.27*	.10	.05	-.53	-.00
	Govt Students	Govt School Teacher	.29*	.10	.02	.03	.55
		WFGS Teacher	.12	.10	.61	-.14	.39
		WFGS Students	.03	.06	.98	-.14	.19
	WFGS Teacher	Govt School Teacher	.17	.13	.57	-.17	.50
		Govt Students	-.12	.10	.61	-.39	.14
		WFGS Students	-.10	.10	.76	-.36	.16
	WFGS Students	Govt School Teacher	.27*	.10	.05	.00	.53
		Govt Students	-.03	.06	.98	-.19	.14
		WFGS Teacher	.10	.10	.76	-.16	.36

The results of the Tukey test show that the response of the government school teachers is significantly different from the responses of government school students and Working Folks Grammar School students.

CONCLUSIONS

It is concluded by the study that goals may be clearly defined and formulated by the instructional leader in order to enhance the performance of the government school teachers and government school students at the secondary level. There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folks Grammar School teachers and students and Government School Teachers and students regarding the opinion that effective evaluation techniques adopted by instructional leader leads towards the achievement of educational objectives, provision of appropriate resources for effective teaching learning process by Instructional leader facilitates teachers and students, proper management of curriculum results in promotion of learning outcomes, allotment of time by instructional leader to perform different activities develops the sense of discipline among the student and teachers, Instructional leader can improve teacher student relationship.

There is a significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folks Grammar School teachers and students and government teachers and students regarding the opinion that the instructional leader plays an important role in improving teaching methodology and proper monitoring of lesson plans by the instructional leader results in an effective teaching-learning process. The results of the analysis lead toward the conclusion that the majority of the respondents were of the view that instructional leadership should be followed in the schools. Most of the respondents showed that the instructional leadership can influence the performance of both the teachers and the students.

Recommendations

It is recommended that in the government sector the goals and objectives should be discussed by the instructional leader with the teachers in order to enhance the performances of the teachers and students. It is suggested that in the government sector the instructional leader should conduct meetings with the teachers regarding their performance, and also training and workshops should be arranged for the teachers to improve their teaching skills. It is strongly recommended that in the government sector the instructional leader should check the lesson plans of the teachers to make sure that they are following the directions given to them by the instructional leader. It is suggested that in the government sector the instructional leader must take surprise assessments, keeping in view the lesson plans, so that the progress of the teachers can be determined.

Conflict of Interests: The authors claim that there are no conflicting interests.

Author's Contributions: Both authors contributed equally to the theoretical development, analysis, interpretation, and writing of the manuscript.

Funding Information: There was no particular grant for this study from any public, private, or nonprofit funding organization.

Note: This research paper is part of the MPhil thesis of Gul Amber Ikhlas Khan.

REFERENCES

Alam, S. (2012). Crafting Leaders for Educational Change: Head Teacher's Perspectives. International. *Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 2(1), 193.

Baig, S., & Shafa, M. D. (2011). The Influence of a Whole School Improvement Program on the Value Orientation of a Head Teacher in the Mountainous Region of Gilgitbaltistan, Pakistan. *Journal of Authentic Leadership in Education*, 2(1), 1.

Banach, M. H. (2015). Instructional Leadership and Deliberate Practice: A Framework for Improving Student Achievement (Doctoral Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago).

Gary M. Crow, (2006). Complexity and the Beginning Principal in the United States: Perspectives on Socialization. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 44 Iss: 4, pp.310-325.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1986). The Social Context of Effective Schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94(3), 328-355.

Mustafa, G. (2012). Education Policy Analysis Report Of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Islamabad: UNESCO, Pakistan.

Niazi, S. (2012). School Leadership and Educational Practices in Pakistan. *Academic Research International*, 3(2), 312-319.

Niqab, M., Sharma, S., Wei, L. M., & Maulod, S. B. A. (2014). Instructional Leadership Potential among School Principals in Pakistan. *International Education Studies*, 7(6), 74-85.

Oplatka, I., Foskett, N., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2002). Educational Marketisation and the Head's Psychological Well-Being: A Speculative Conceptualisation. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50(4), 419-441.

Yunas, M., & Iqbal, M. (2013). Dimensions of Instructional Leadership Role of Principal. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(10), 629-637.