



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) D.I. Khan, KP, Pakistan*

Marium Mahsood, *Elementary & Secondary Education Department KP, Pakistan.*

Keywords	Abstract
Instructional Leadership, Performance of Teachers, Student’s Performance	<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. Multistage sampling technique was used and sample of 48 teachers and 200 students from 8 schools of Dera Ismail Khan Division was selected. 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 ANOVA test. Tukey test was also applied in order to know the difference among various groups of independent variable. The results of the analysis leads toward the conclusion that 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 as well as the students. This study addresses the social, dialectal and learning diversity in the schools.</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership is usually termed as the arranging and overseeing of curriculum in educational activity by the head of institution. This terminology emerged from a research carried out in 1980s. The research concluded that the primary element for successful school is the role of 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, schools management is facing complex nature of responsibilities. In almost every sphere of life, the modern society is experiencing rapid transitions. These adaptabilities and modifications have made educational institutions more dynamic and complicated than they were before (Crow, 2006).

a. Approaches of Instructional leadership

Hollinger & Murphy, (1986) described the “exclusive” approach of instructional leadership. According to them 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 head of institution as 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 principal were divided in collaboration between head teacher and teachers to formulate curriculum and guidance for enhancing student’s outcomes. Thus, this approach was further conceptualized as “shared instructional leadership” in which school head was considered as “leaders 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 favorable environment for teaching and learning by assisting teachers in improving their ability to teach (Niqab, Sharma, Wei & Maulod, 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, Foskett & Hemsley-Brown, 2002).

b. Instructional leadership techniques in Pakistan

Khyber Pakhtoonkhawa (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 & Shafa, (2011) study revealed that, to bring a change in present school situation, 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 interacted in teams at various levels and on several events. The school leaders who are effective not only focus on management, but often give consideration to the several tasks faced by them. That means conception of school principals can, at times, must 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 school continuously running on clear, measurable, and time-based goals and the academic progress of students. Heads have the duty in 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 (Muhammad Niqab, Sailesh Sharma, 2014), the character of the principal as instructional

leadership is crucial in overcoming many current problems, enhancement of the school capacity, improvement of teachers' abilities, and in provision of more favorable atmosphere for teaching and learning. According to (Yunas & Iqbal, 2013) an effective school leadership, thus play a key role in the 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 the 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. 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 institution, must conduct consistent meetings with staff in order to discuss those weaknesses being observed during classroom round and provide enough services to get over any difficulties. Variety of procedures being followed for 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 programmes 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 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

- Goals Setting
- Curriculum Management,
- Monitoring lesson plans,
- Resource Allocation
- Teacher's Evaluation for enhancing student growth and learning.
- Time allocation.
- Maintaining effective teacher student relationship.
- Effective teaching methodology

1.1. 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.

1.2. 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.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The method of this study is based on 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 government. A total of 48 teachers and 200 students were included in this population from both the types of schools under study. Multistage sampling technique is used for this study. Population was divided into two clusters namely Government Secondary School and Working Folks Grammar Schools 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 Likert scaled (Strongly Agree, Agree, and Disagree and strongly disagree) well-structured questionnaire comprising of 37 statements was constructed and personally distributed among the sample. Reliability of scale was checked and the result of Cronbach alpha coefficient for all the 37 items was above .821. SPSS software is used for data analysis. ANOVA and Tukey test is applied in order to achieve the study objectives.

3. DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION & INTERPRETATION

The mean difference in the responses of the teacher and students is measured by applying ANOVA test. Since ANOVA test does not explain the source of the difference. 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. Alpha level was set for all tests at .05.

Table No. 1 showing the result of 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 conclude that there is a significant difference in the responses regarding Goals. 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 objective by instructional leader enhance the performance of Teachers and students at 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 No.2 showing the 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 Teacher	Govt Students	.01	.08	.99	-.19	.21
		WFGS Teacher	-.20	.10	.19	-.45	.06
	Govt	WFGS Students	-.11	.08	.51	-.31	.09
		Govt Teacher	-.01	.08	.99	-.21	.19

Students	WFGS Teacher	-.21*	.08	.04	-.41	-.01
	WFGS Students	-.12	.05	.07	-.24	.01
WFGS Teacher	Govt Teacher	.20	.10	.19	-.06	.45
	Govt Students	.21*	.08	.04	.01	.41
WFGS Students	WFGS Students	.09	.08	.65	-.11	.29
	Govt Teacher	.11	.08	.51	-.09	.31
	Govt Students	.12	.05	.07	-.01	.24
	WFGS Teacher	-.09	.08	.65	-.29	.11

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

Table No.3 showing the 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). Result not rejected the null hypothesis (Ho), "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 leader leads towards the achievement of educational objectives".

Table No. 4 showing the result of 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 Result null hypothesis (Ho) 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 provision of appropriate resources for effective teaching learning process by Instructional leader facilitates teachers and students".

Table No. 5 showing the result of 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 ANOVA test, Null hypothesis (Ho) regarding variable “Management of Curriculum” is not rejected states 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 No. 6 showing the results of 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 ANOVA test, null hypothesis (Ho) regarding 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 allotment of time by instructional leader to perform different activities develops the sense of discipline among the student and teachers”.

Table No. 7 showing the results of 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 (Ho) 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 leader can improve teacher student relationship”.

Table No.8 showing the results of 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 conclude that there is a significant difference in the responses regarding Teaching Methodology. Result also rejected the null hypothesis (Ho) 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 leader plays an important role in improving teaching methodology”.

Table No.9 showing the results of 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
Teaching Methodology	Govt Teacher	Govt Students	-.05	.07	.88	-.24	.14
		WFGS Teacher	-.02	.09	.99	-.26	.22
		WFGS Students	-.18	.07	.08	-.37	.01
	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	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 shows that the response of the government school-students is significantly different from the responses of Working Folks Grammar School students.

Table No.10 showing the results of 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 conclude that there is a significant difference in the responses regarding Monitoring Lesson Plan. Result also not supported 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 effective teaching learning process”.

Table No.11 showing the result of 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	Govt School	Govt Students	-.29*	.10	.02	-.55	-.03

Plan	Teacher	WFGS Teacher	-.17	.13	.57	-.50	.17
		WFGS Students	-.27*	.10	.05	-.53	-.00
	Govt	Govt School Teacher	.29*	.10	.02	.03	.55
	Students	WFGS Teacher	.12	.10	.61	-.14	.39
	WFGS	WFGS Students	.03	.06	.98	-.14	.19
		Govt School Teacher	.17	.13	.57	-.17	.50
	Teacher	Govt Students	-.12	.10	.61	-.39	.14
	WFGS	WFGS Students	-.10	.10	.76	-.36	.16
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 shows that the response of the government school teachers is significantly different from the responses of government school students and Working Folks Grammar School students.

4. 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 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 significant difference among the perceptions of Working Folks Grammar school teachers and students and Government teachers and students regarding the opinion that Instructional leader plays an important role in improving teaching methodology and proper monitoring of lesson plans by the instructional leader results in effective teaching learning process. The results of the analysis leads toward the conclusion that 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 as well as the students.

4.1. Recommendations

It is recommended that in 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 trainings and workshops should be arranged for the teachers to improve their teaching skills. It is strongly recommended that in 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 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.

Note: This research paper is part of 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 Gilgit Baltistan, 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.