

# Influence of principal's instructional leadership on teacher performance in secondary schools of Thimphu district, Bhutan

**Mr. Namgyel Tshering**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17102/bjrd.rub.11.2.034>

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence of instructional leadership on level of teacher performance and to find out whether there was a statistically significant positive relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance in the Lower secondary schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used; a quantitative approach was conducted by using PIMRS questionnaires adopted from Hallinger, (1983) for instructional leadership and the researcher developed questionnaires for the teacher performance to collect data. There were 185 respondents from 6 Lower secondary schools for delivering quality lessons aligning the appropriate curriculum where teaching learning takes interview with the principal and one most senior teacher from each school. The data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics consisting of frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation while content analysis was employed to analyze the interview data. The findings showed that the level of teacher performance was at the highest level and the instructional Leadership by the principal was a high level. The data indicated there was statistically significant positive relationship between Principals' instructional leadership and teacher performance. Further, the results from the interviews supported statistical findings that teacher performance strongly correlated to instructional leadership principals' action to delegate teachers to improve schools/ *Bhutan*

## **1. Introduction**

Principal, generally, is the instructional leader in school the responsible to set school goals, and communicate the goals to teacher for effective implementation and better teacher performance. Day, Gu, & Sammons (2016) posits that, an instructional leader

supervises and evaluate instruction, monitor and support for high standard student performance, coach quality instruction, and enhance the professional development of the teachers to infuse the value of GNH in their daily lesson plan. Student performance depends on teachers' performance since they are the main actors in the classroom. Teachers are responsible to deliver quality lessons aligning the appropriate curriculum where teaching learning take place with multiple use of teaching strategies and instructional skills to make students understand the lesson. Besides, teachers need support and cooperation from the principal and colleagues as well to enhance the subject knowledge. The mutual relationship of the instructional leadership by the principal towards teacher would help the teacher to perform well in the classroom where students academically achieve better (Lim, Bishen & Gurcharan, 2020). Therefore, principal's instructional leadership is imperative for the teacher performance in the classroom to achieve the school goals which has indirect effect to students learning.

Instructional leadership refers to teacher perception toward the action of principals to delegate teachers for improvement of students' learning. Instructional leadership has been known to effect educational achievement by improving the quality of classroom instructional hours. Hallinger (1990) studied ten functions of instructional leadership. The current study selected six functions relevant in the lower secondary schools in Bhutan.

Teacher performance refers to a teacher academic achievement in his/her related field (Lineburg, 2010). Teacher performance consisted of Classroom Management practices, Instructional Skills, Examination and Students Assessment, and Professional development as current practices in the lower secondary schools in Bhutan.

The Bhutanese Education System mandated Annual Education Conference to review educational policies for development of better system of education in Bhutan. In 2003 the Department of Education decentralized Education Monitoring and Support Services system to the district and school to enhance the quality provision of Education. It is through regular monitoring that the success of any programmed activities is ensured (EMSS, 2011). Further, as part of a education transformation within the teacher performance system, the Bhutan Professional Standards for

Teachers (BPST) mandate principals and Head of Departments to conduct lesson observation of teachers through specific observation form (MoE, 2021). The principal's role as instructional leader has been strategized through requirements for teachers to fulfill specific performance indicators. Ministry of Education is committed to supporting schools and teachers to build their capacity and resources, and the schools instructional Leaders are expected to institutionalize the monitoring and support services as an integral part of school function. In recent times, importance of instructional leadership is placed on academic standards met by teacher performance. More recently, Lyons (2010) wrote that instructional leadership on teacher performance has been extended to include deeper participation in the core business of schooling, which is teaching and learning.

While school performance was at forefront of discussion among educationists, there was no study on the perceptions to validate principal's performance and teachers' outcomes. Ministry of Education set various measurement indicators through Performance rating mechanism, Individual Work Plan and Monitoring System in the last few years. The current 'BPST' aims to rate and measure instructional leaders' performance and teacher's performance in the school as a response to public concerns on quality of education.

Therefore, the study of the influence of principal's instructional leadership roles on teacher performance attempts to compare relationship between the two with focus on two general questions:

1. What is the influence level of Principals' instructional Leadership on teacher performance in Thimphu District?
2. Is there relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance in Thimphu District?

## **2. Literature review**

According to Hallinger and Murphy (1986), types of leadership behaviors are categorized into transformational leadership, shared leadership, teacher leadership, instructional leadership and distributed leadership. Among these, instructional leadership is direct and focused on school goals, instruction and curriculum; but these are some of the theories behind principal leadership. Researchers underlie school

performance on the leadership effectiveness as foundation for the growth of school institutions as a whole, indicating that learning gains vary significantly across the principal profiles (Bafadal, Ibrahim, Ahmad Nurabadi and Imam Gunawan, 2018; James Sebastian et al, 2019)

Leading towards change is always uncomfortable for most people as it challenges their ideals, beliefs, habits, and present practices and methodologies. Fullan (2001) ascribes change as a necessity for moral purpose, for creating coherence, understanding the change process, creating knowledge and sharing, and relationships as being the framework for leadership to enhance teamwork, continuous improvement, trust building, and eradication of short term goals.

Weber (1996) explained that establishing high expectation for performance by instructional leaders increase teachers' performance towards the school. The leaders, who provide the necessary supervision and evaluate instruction in managing the teachers' performance, have large impact on the work environment in the organization.

Smith & Andrews (1989, as cited in Lyons, 2010) mentioned that teachers see principals as instructional leaders when they communicate school goals in the course of: (a) interacting with them on their classroom performance, (b) being accessible to discuss instructional strategies by letting them know that it is okay to take risks, and (d) clearly communicating a vision for the school". Further, Sheppard, (1996) reiterates that "Communicating school goals was found to positively affect the type of instruction teachers delivered" It is most vital for the principal to communicate the goals of the schools to teacher and to the whole members of the school to bring the achievements.

James Sebastian et al (2019) highlight the principal's supervision of teacher performance as incremental to effective classroom instruction. Supervision includes observing the teacher's lesson or teaching in the classroom, conducting an instructional conference, and using professional development for classroom improvement.

Instructional leadership are responsible to understand varying concepts of curriculum, educational philosophies and beliefs, curricular sources and conflicts, and curriculum evaluation and improvement areas for teacher performance. Hallinger (2011) concludes that coordination and control of the academic programmes of school

are also key leadership responsibilities of the principal. Sim, (2011) showed the existence of concordance between the level of instructional leadership and the level of students' academic achievement of school. It is essentially crucial for leaders to increase competencies and skills in their practice of instructional leadership at the school (Lim, Bishen & Gurcharan, 2020).

Principals who practice instructional leadership have been active in leading and directing teachers to carry out professional development and produced statistical effects on teachers' professional learning competence. Therefore, Herawati & Tjahjono (2020) concludes that effective school principals are the ones who act as instructional leadership: understanding the curriculum, managing teachers and active learning, conducting clinical supervision, and making an effort in the development and assessment of teaching and education personnel.

### 3. Research methodology

The research methods adopted were quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative study was conducted using PIMRS questionnaires adopted from Hallinger (1983) for instructional leadership. The qualitative study was conducted by in-depth interview with the principals and purposively nominated teachers from each school.

#### 3.1 Population.

The sample of the study included 185 teachers who responded to the questionnaires via paper and online survey. The qualitative questionnaire consisted of four functions totalling 25 items as detailed in the table1 below. The respondents were asked to rate each statement in terms of their opinion/observation of the teacher performance over the past school year.

**Table 1** Division of teacher performance practices in the classroom.

| SI.No. | Teacher performance practices     | Items  |
|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| 1      | Classroom Management practices    | 1-8    |
| 2      | Instructional skills              | 9-13   |
| 3      | Examination & Student Assessment  | 14- 19 |
| 4      | Profession growth and development | 20-25  |

The questionnaires for instructional leadership practices were adopted from PIMRS tools developed by Hallinger (1983) to fit to Bhutanese Education system. It consisted of six functions of instructional leadership with five items in each function that describes the principal job practices in the school (refer table 2).

**Table 2** Division of Principal instructional leadership practices.

| Sl. No. | Instructional Leadership practices | Items |
|---------|------------------------------------|-------|
| 1       | Frame the school goals             | 26-30 |
| 2       | Communicate the school goals       | 31-35 |
| 3       | Supervise & evaluate instruction   | 36-40 |
| 4       | Coordinate the curriculum          | 41-45 |
| 5       | Monitor student progress           | 46-50 |
| 6       | Promote professional development   | 51-55 |

The mean score rated the level of performance for principals that was compared to teacher performance (refer table 3).

**Table 3** The meaning of score, (Best, 1977).

| Mean Score | Meaning        |
|------------|----------------|
| 4.21-5.00  | Highest level  |
| 3.41-4.20  | High level     |
| 2.61-3.40  | Moderate level |
| 1.81-2.60  | Low level      |
| 1.00-1.80  | Lowest level   |

### 3.2 Data collection

The focus group, principals and teachers, were interviewed by the researcher in a 15 minutes meeting session to enable correct and specific gathering of themes.

### 4. Data Analysis

The data was analysed to study the general information of the respondents by using descriptive statistics like frequency, mean and standard deviation. It explored the relationship between Principal's instructional leadership and teacher performance by

using Pearson's correlation. The researcher interpreted the qualitative study data by using content analysis for the result of the in-depth interview conducted to the six principals and six teachers.

## 5. Results

### 5.1 Level of teacher performance with functions and items.

Table 4 demonstrates that the total average for teacher performance was highest level with an average mean score of 4.39. Three of the functions were highest and one high. Among four functions Examination & students Assessment has the highest mean score of 4.67. Out of four functions, Professional growth & development has the lowest mean score of 4.07, even though the level of performance indicates high.

**Table 4:** The Overall mean score of teacher performance in the Lower Secondary schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan.(N=185)

|   | Functions                          | Mean        | Standard Deviation | Level of teacher performance |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Classroom Management Practices     | 4.47        | 0.52               | Highest                      |
| 2 | Instructional Skills               | 4.37        | 0.49               | Highest                      |
| 3 | Examination & students Assessment. | <b>4.67</b> | 0.45               | Highest                      |
| 4 | Professional growth & development  | 4.07        | 0.69               | High                         |
|   | <b>Total</b>                       | <b>4.39</b> | <b>0.53</b>        | <b>Highest</b>               |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

Table 5 shows that the total average of classroom Management practices in teacher performance has the highest level with an average mean score of 4.48. There

were eight items in this function and all items had the level of highest score in the mean as precisely shown in the table above with mean and standard deviation against each items.

**Table 5:** Classroom Management Practices.(N=185)

| Items   | Mean        | Standard Deviation | Level of performance |
|---|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1 The classroom is clean.   | 4.41        | 0.67               | Highest              |
| 2 The classroom is safe.  | 4.41        | 0.82               | Highest              |
| 3 The classroom is conducive for teaching-learning activities.                                | 4.50        | 0.68               | Highest              |
| 4 The class practices a variety of positive discipline techniques.                            | 4.52        | 0.66               | Highest              |
| 5 Relevant teaching materials prepared by teachers are neatly displayed in the classroom.     | 4.52        | 0.65               | Highest              |
| 6 Relevant learning materials prepared by learners are neatly displayed in the classroom.     | 4.45        | 0.70               | Highest              |
| 7 Required learning materials like text books and stationery are available with the students. | 4.45        | 0.84               | Highest              |
| 8 Sitting arrangement for students is set properly.   | <b>4.59</b> | 0.69               | Highest              |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>4.48</b> | <b>0.71</b>        | <b>Highest</b>       |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

According to table 6 that the total average of the instructional skills in teacher performance is highest with an average mean score of 4.37. There were five items in this function and “Teachers have daily lesson plans for all teaching subjects”



showed highest level with mean scores of 4.70 where as “Teacher uses ICT for teaching purposes” showed the lowest mean score of 4.08.

**Table 6** *Instructional Skills.*(N=185)

|              | <b>Items</b>  | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard Deviation</b> | <b>Level of performance</b> |
|--------------|---|-------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1            | Teachers have daily lesson plans for all teaching subjects.   | 4.70        | 0.62                      | Highest                     |
| 2            | Teacher uses ICT for teaching purposes.   | 4.08        | 0.74                      | High                        |
| 3            | Teacher uses outdoors for enriching teaching and learning (field trip, local wisdom).                 | 4.18        | 0.74                      | High                        |
| 4            | Teachers inspire positive learning attitudes and behaviors in the learners by modeling good examples. | 4.55        | 0.63                      | Highest                     |
| 5            | The classroom environment is free of graffiti.  | 4.36        | 0.76                      | Highest                     |
| <b>Total</b> |   | <b>4.37</b> | <b>0.69</b>               | <b>Highest</b>              |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

Table 7 demonstrated that the total average of the professional growth and development of the teacher performance is high level with an average mean score of 4.08. In this function there were six items and three items showed highest level and three showed high level of mean scores as shown in the table. “Teachers always learn new knowledge about teaching” has the highest score with a mean of 4.43 and “Teacher gets opportunity for attending on job training” has the lowest score with a mean of 3.68.

**Table 7: Professional growth and development.** (N=185)

| Items   | Mean        | Standard Deviation | Level of performance |
|---|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1 Teachers always learn new knowledge about teaching.                         | 4.43        | 0.74               | Highest              |
| 2 Teachers receive sufficient and quality training/workshop.                  | 3.73        | 1.11               | High                 |
| 3 The school has professional development plan and program in place.          | 4.28        | 0.82               | Highest              |
| 4 Provide professional support to colleagues for their continual development. | 4.27        | 0.75               | Highest              |
| 5 Invite colleagues to observe his/her teaching.                              | 4.09        | 0.83               | High                 |
| 6 Teacher gets opportunity for attending on job training.                     | 3.68        | 1.14               | High                 |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>4.08</b> | <b>0.89</b>        | <b>High</b>          |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

## 5.2 Level of instructional leadership with functions and items.

It was found that the overall level of Principal's instructional leadership with an average means of 4.13 which was high level (refer table 8). The first function; Frame the school goals has the highest level with the mean of 4.28 where as Monitor studentsProgress has the least mean score of 3.95 among the six function.

**Table 8** *level of Principal's instructional leadership*

(N=185)

| Function                           | Mean        | Standard Deviation | Level of instructional leadership |
|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Frame the School Goals           | <b>4.28</b> | 0.67               | Highest                           |
| 2 Communicate the School goals     | 4.26        | 0.72               | Highest                           |
| 3 Supervise & Evaluate Instruction | 3.95        | 0.77               | High                              |
| 4 Coordinate the Curriculum        | 4.09        | 0.74               | High                              |
| 5 Monitor Students Progress        | 4.07        | 1.06               | High                              |
| 6 Professional Development         | 4.14        | 0.76               | High                              |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>4.13</b> | <b>0.78</b>        | <b>High</b>                       |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

Table 9 showed that the total average of the instructional leadership to frame the school goals was highest with the mean score of 4.28. Out of five items, four items showed highest level and only one item showed high. "Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them" has the highest score with a mean of 4.36 and "Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development" has the lowest score with the mean of 4.16

**Table 9:** *Frame the school goals.* (N=185)

| Items  | Mea n       | Std. Deviation | Level of instructional leadership |
|--|-------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Develop a focus set of annual school-wide goals.   | 4.31        | 0.80           | Highest                           |
| 2 Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them.                        | <b>4.36</b> | 0.79           | Highest                           |
| 3 Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development. | 4.16        | 0.86           | High                              |

|              |  |             |             |                |
|--------------|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| 4            | Use date on student performance when developing the school's academic goals. | 4.24        | 0.90        | Highest        |
| 5            | Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school. | 4.35        | 0.84        | Highest        |
| <b>Total</b> |  | <b>4.28</b> | <b>0.83</b> | <b>Highest</b> |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

The following Table 10 showed the dimension to communicate the school goals and the total average is highest level with the mean score of 4.26. There were total of five items in this function. "Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings" Showed the highest level mean score of 4.45 and "Refer to the school's mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussion)" showed the lowest with a mean score of 4.11.

**Table 10:** Communicate the School goals.(N=185)

|              | <b>Items</b>   | <b>Mea<br/>n</b> | <b>Standard<br/>Deviation</b> | <b>Level of<br/>instructional<br/>leadership</b> |
|--------------|--|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 1            | Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community.   | 4.33             | 0.84                          | Highest  |
| 2            | Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings.   | <b>4.45</b>      | 0.80                          | Highest  |
| 3            | Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decision with teachers.  | 4.30             | 0.83                          | Highest  |
| 4            | Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school(e.g., posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress) | 4.12             | 0.98                          | High   |
| 5            | Refer to the school's mission in forums with students(e.g., in assemblies or discussion)   | 4.11             | 1.01                          | High   |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |  | <b>4.26</b>      | <b>0.89</b>                   | <b>Highest</b>                                   |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

Tables 11 showed the function of supervise and Evaluate Instruction in Instructional Leadership and the total average of the practices based on five items were high level with a mean score of 3.95. There were five items and all the items level of mean scores were high level with the mean scores of 4.19, 4.14, 3.85, 3.79, and 3.80 respectively. “Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school” has the highest score with a mean of 4.19 and “Point out specific strength in teacher’s instructional practices in post- observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)” lowest score with the mean of 3.79.

**Table 11:** *Supervise& Evaluate Instruction.(N=185)*

| Items  | Mean | Standard Deviation | Level of                 |
|--|------|--------------------|--------------------------|
|  |      |                    | instructional leadership |
| 1 Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school.  | 4.19 | 0.84               | High                     |
| 2 Review students work products when evaluating classroom instruction.   | 4.14 | 0.82               | High                     |
| 3 Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis(informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference) | 3.85 | 1.00               | High                     |
| 4 Point out specific strength in teacher’s instructional practices in post- observation feedback(e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)  | 3.79 | 1.00               | High                     |
| 5 Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post- observation  | 3.80 | 0.96               | High                     |

feedback(e.g., in conference or written evaluation)

|              |             |             |             |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Total</b> | <b>3.95</b> | <b>0.92</b> | <b>High</b> |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

Table 12 showed to coordinate the curriculum in Instructional Leadership and the total average of the practices is with the mean scores of 4.09 which is high level. There were five items "Make clear who is responding for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, Vice principal, or teacher-leaders)" showed the highest level with a mean of 4.25 whereas "Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement test" showed lowest level with a mean score of 3.98.

**Table 12:** *Coordinate the Curriculum. (N=185)*

|   | <b>Items</b>  | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard Deviation</b> | <b>Level of instructional leadership</b> |
|---|---|-------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | Make clear who is responding for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, Vice principal, or teacher-leaders). | <b>4.25</b> | 0.86                      | Highest                                  |
| 2 | Draw upon the results of school- wide testing when making curricular objectives.  | 4.11        | 0.81                      | High                                     |
| 3 | Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives.  | 4.10        | 0.90                      | High                                     |
| 4 | Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement test.  | 3.98        | 0.96                      | High                                     |
| 5 | Participate actively in the review of curricular materials.   | 4.03        | 0.94                      | High                                     |
|   | <b>Total</b>  | <b>4.09</b> | <b>0.89</b>               | <b>High</b>                              |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

Table 12 showed that the total average of the instructional leadership practices to monitor student's progress with a mean score of 4.07 which indicates that the level was high. There were five items in this dimension and "Inform students of school's academic progress" showed the highest level with a mean score of 4.26 where as "The Principal use tests and other performance measurement to assess progress toward school goals" showed the lowest among the five items with a mean score of 3.84.

**Table 12:** Monitor Students Progress.(N=185)

| Items        |   | Mean        | Standard Deviation | Level of instructional leadership |
|--------------|---|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1            | Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress.  | 4.12        | 3.18               | High                              |
| 2            | Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strength and weaknesses. | 4.15        | 0.93               | High                              |
| 3            | The Principal use tests and other performance measurement to assess progress toward school goals.     | 3.84        | 1.05               | High                              |
| 4            | Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form(e.g., in a memo or newsletter).   | 4.02        | 1.00               | High                              |
| 5            | Inform students of school's academic progress.  | <b>4.26</b> | 0.89               | Highest                           |
| <b>Total</b> |   | <b>4.07</b> | <b>1.41</b>        | <b>High</b>                       |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

Table 13 showed the total average mean score of instructional leadership to promote professional development with an average mean of 4.14 and the overall level was high. There were five items in this function and two items showed highest level

and three items showed high level as shown in the above table. Among five items “Obtain the participation of the whole staff in important in-service activities” showed the highest level with a mean score of 4.25 and “Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction” showed the lowest level with a mean score of 4.06.

**Table 13:** Promote Professional Development.(N=185)

|   | Items  | Mean        | Standard Deviation | Level of instructional leadership |
|---|--|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Ensure that in-service activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals.                | 4.01        | 1.01               | High                              |
| 2 | Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during in-service training.                   | 4.16        | 0.92               | High                              |
| 3 | Obtain the participation of the whole staff in important in-service activities.                            | 4.25        | 0.83               | Highest                           |
| 4 | Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction.                                   | 4.06        | 0.98               | High                              |
| 5 | Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to shared ideas or information from in-service activities. | 4.26        | 0.85               | Highest                           |
|   | <b>Total</b>   | <b>4.14</b> | <b>0.91</b>        | <b>High</b>                       |

Note: 1.00-1.80 = lowest, 1.81-2.60 = low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high, 4.21-5.0 = highest.

### 5.3 Relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance.

The significant level of relationship between Instructional Leadership and teacher performance was determined by Pearson correlation at  $p=.05$ (refer table 14), had statistically significant positive correlation at the 0.01 level. ( $r = 0.66$ ). It indicated that there is positive relationship between Principals Instructional Leadership and Teacher performance in the Lower Secondary School of Thimphu district in Bhutan



*Table 14: Relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance. (N=185)*

| <b>Variables</b>         | <b>Instructional leadership</b> | <b>Teacher performance</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Instructional Leadership | 1.00                            |                            |
| Teacher performance      | 0.66** (P=00)                   | 1.00                       |

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

#### **5.4 Content Analysis from the Interview.**

Principal's role as an instructional leader was seen to important when teachers are involved to establish school goals.

*A Principal said, "School goals are set through a series of staff forum like collaborative discussion and planning, analyzing the pros and cons of the set goals. This provided clarity of direction and purpose that aligned to their classroom teaching."*

To make teacher' role effective, the leader has to be dynamic, a good listener, collaborative decision maker, forward learning and patient. The report concluded that *"Providing moral support, acknowledging good work and giving encouragement, complements performance by teachers."*

Principals are the main source of inspiration for both the teachers and students. An instructional leader influences teacher input through his leadership qualities. A teacher noted: *"My principal creates a healthy and conducive environment by giving proper guidance and direction, passing unbiased judgment and applying the rules indiscriminately. An interactive leader influences how teacher perform in a self-directed way. "*

The consistency in report proved that principals' instructional leadership improve teacher performance in the Lower Secondary schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan.

## 6. Discussion

### 6.1 Overall Level of teacher performance in the lower secondary schools in Thimphu district in Bhutan.

From the findings, the overall teacher performance in the lower secondary schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan was at highest level with a total mean of 4.39. Within the four functions, the teachers' perception toward the examination and students assessment was at a highest level with the highest mean of 4.67, followed by classroom management practices which were at highest level with the mean of 4.47. The teachers perceived that professional growth and development has the lowest level among the four functions with a mean of 4.07. The findings were similar to the concept by the researchers like Smith, (2003), the ability of teachers to organize classroom and manage the behavior of their students is critical to achieving positive outcomes for the student's achievements and the teacher success in performing his/her lesson.

In effect, the current research finding shows that there is a positive relation between influence of an Instructional leadership and teacher performance. The overall perception of the teachers on principal's instructional leadership in the lower secondary schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan was at a high level with a total mean of 4.13. Within the six functions of principal's instructional leadership practices, framing school goals was at high level with a mean of 4.28, followed by teachers' perception towards communicating the school goals at a high level with mean of 4.26. The need for educational reform raised worldwide through enhanced recognition of school effectiveness, and standard-based accountability systems in the twenty-first century highlights importance of principals' instructional leadership (Hou., Cui., & Zhang, 2019) in the modern education systems.

This finding support Blase, & Blase (2000) discovered that 33% of responding teachers felt communicating school goals encouraged them to use more reflection. Among the six principal's instructional leadership functions, teachers' perception towards 'supervise and evaluate instruction' was at lowest score with a mean of 3.95. From the data result it was found that the overall average scores was high level with a mean of 4.07. Among five items, inform students of school's academic progress has the highest level with a mean of 4.26. The teacher respondent indicates

that principal's involvement in monitoring student academic performance directly influences teacher performance.

Hallinger, Wang, Chen & Liare (2015) supports that instructional leader engages directly in empowering teachers to enhance instructional quality to bring organisational vision to realization through participative monitoring and supervision. Blasé and Blasé, (2000), stated that specific behaviors of instructional leadership included making suggestion; giving feed backs, modeling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration providing professional growth and development opportunity. From the perspective of this study, principal instructional leadership and teacher performance had a positive relationship.

The findings indicated that instructional leadership and teacher performance were significantly correlated at the level of  $.01$  ( $r=0.66$ ). There was statistically a strong positive relationship between Principal's instructional leadership and teacher performance in the lower secondary schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan. It further demonstrated that principal's instructional leadership functions were most important for the improvement of teacher performance in the school. This study had a similarity with the study carried out by Sahin (2011); the result indicated that instructional leadership statistically has a significant influence upon all the factors of the school culture and significant relationship on teacher performance to achieve student learning.

From the findings of the principals and teachers interview, it was found that there was a strong positive relationship between the instructional leadership functions of frame the school goals and communicate the school goals to the teachers. Monitor students progress has the least relationship and in teacher performance function classroom management practices, examination and students assessment has more positive relationship whereas instructional skills and professional development has less relationship. Cheryl, Joel & Deborah (2009) however found that professional development programme has been a strong predictor in instructional leadership processes. Therefore, in the current study, principals' instructional leadership functions are more focus on the teacher performance related to student's achievement, and less focus on the curriculum and professional development which are not so much related to student achievement.

## 7. Conclusions

This study was designed to study the influence of instructional leadership and teacher performance in the lower secondary schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan. The data collection instrument for the instructional leadership was conducted using PIMRS questionnaire, adopted from Hallinger, (1983) based on six instructional leadership functions and with slide modification by the researcher to fit in the situation and the researcher developed questionnaires for teacher performance based on the four functions in accordance with its use in actual situation in Bhutan.

The teachers' perception towards the level of teacher performance was measured by four functions consisting of Classroom management practices, Instructional skills, examination and student's assessment and professional growth development.

From the findings, the overall level of teacher performance was at highest level with an average mean score of 4.39 indicating correlation between principal's instructional leadership in teacher performance. In the measure of teachers' perception towards principal's instructional leadership as influential factor, the findings of study showed high level with a total mean score of 4.13.

The principal's instructional leadership and teacher performance significantly correlated at the level of  $p = .01$  and  $r = .66$ . There was statistically positive relationship between principal's instructional leadership and teacher performance in the Lower Secondary Schools of Thimphu district in Bhutan.

## References

Bafadal, Ibrahim, Ahmad Nurabadi, and Imam Gunawan (2018). "The Influence of Instructional Leadership, Change Leadership, and Spiritual Leadership Applied at Schools to Teachers' Performance Quality." *International Conference on Education and Technology (ICET 2018)*. Atlantis Press.

Blase, J. and Blase, J. (2000). "Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 130-

141. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320082>

- Cheryl Graczewski, Joel Knudson & Deborah J. Holtzman (2009). Instructional Leadership in Practice: What Does It Look Like, and What Influence Does It Have?, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 14:1, 72-96, DOI: [10.1080/10824660802715460](https://doi.org/10.1080/10824660802715460)
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258.
- EMSSD. (2011). *Nurturing Green school for Green Bhutan- A guide to school Management*.
- Fullan, M. (2001.). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA, Josey. Bass.
- Hallinger, P. (1983.). *Principal instructional Management rating scale*. Palo alto. Stanford University Press.
- Hallinger, P. (1990.). *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*, Sarasota, FL: Leading Development Associates.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three Decades of Doctoral studies using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale : A lens on Methodological Progress in Educational Leadership. *Educational Administrative Quaterly.*, (2)47.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). *The social context of effective schools*. *American Journal of Education.*, 94(3), 328-355.
- Hallinger, P., Wang, W. C., Chen, C. W., & Liare, D. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale*. Dordrecht: Springer
- Herawati, R., & Tjahjono, H. K. (2020). *The Influence of Instructional Leadership on*

Professional Competence Mediated by Self-Efficacy and Social Capital. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 11(2), 202-213.

Hou, Y., Cui, Y., & Zhang, D. (2019). Impact of instructional leadership on high school student academic achievement in China. *Asia pacific education review*, 20(4), 543-558.

James Sebastian, Elaine Allensworth, Wolfgang Wiedermann, Craig Hochbein & Matthew Cunningham (2019). Principal Leadership and School Performance: An Examination of Instructional Leadership and Organizational Management, Leadership and Policy in Schools, 18:4, 591-613, DOI: 10.1080/15700763.2018.1513151

LIM, Siew Hui; Bischen Singh, Gurcharan Singh(2020). The Influence of Instructional Leadership on Learning Organisation At High Performing Primary Schools in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of University Education*, .

Lineburg, P. N. (2010). The influence of the Instructional leadership of Principals on change in Teachers' Instructional practices. Blacksburg, VA. *dissertation*.

Lyons, B. J. (2010). *Principal instructional leadership behavior as perceived by teachers and principals, at New York state recognized and non-recognized middle schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.

MoE, (2021). Implementation Manual. Bhutan Professional Standard for Teachers. Ministry of Education. Royal Government of Bhutan.

Sahin, S. (2011). *Relationship between Instructional Leadership style and school culture* , Dokuz Eylul University.

Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the Transformational nature of instructional

Leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research.*, 42(4), 325-344.

Sim, Q. C. (2011). Instructional Leadership among principal of Secondary Schools in Malaysia.

Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional Leadership : How principal make a difference*. Alexandria, VA : ASCD.

Weber, J. (1996). *Leading the instructional program*. Clearinghouse of Educational Management. Eugene, Oregon.

### About the author

---

**Namgyal Tshering** is the principal of Dechentsemo Central School, Thinleygang, Punakha. He has published his first research paper 'Effect of Mindfulness Meditation Practices on Students' Behavior Change in Secondary Schools in Trashigang District, Bhutan' and has been part of three other research papers published as a team in the school. He is a master trainer on 'Mindfulness-Based Emotional Intelligence Training for Leaders, Search Inside Yourself. He is the author of *Dragon Delights: A Rosary of Poems*, which symbolizes his versatility in writing and love of literature even as a man of scientific context by educational profession. He has won The Enchanting Muse Award during India world Poetry Festival (2017) in Hyderabad.