

**EXAMINATION OF SCHOOL HEADS' EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

Nazım MASALI¹
Zekiye YETER²
Ergun ERDEM³
Ayfer BEDİR⁴

ABSTRACT

School principals are generally recognized as human resource development leaders due to their abilities to encourage, direct, and support school workers. As a result, among educators who accept that role, performance, and leadership skills do not necessarily make strong instructional leaders, the factors influencing the effectiveness of instructional leadership behaviors have become an increasingly relevant subject of study. It is at this moment that the instructional leadership actions of school principals should be closely studied. Studies in the related literature have demonstrated that instructional leadership behaviors have favorable outcomes at the level of instructors and students in the school environment. Based on this backdrop, the goal of the research is to analyze school administrators' instructional leadership actions within the framework of the relevant literature. This literature review is expected to contribute to the disciplines of educational sciences, educational administration, and educational supervision by putting light on fresh studies and applications linked to the issue.

Keywords: Instructional Leadership, School Principals, Leadership, Leadership Behaviors.

¹ MEB, Etimesgut İlçe Milli Eğitim Müd., ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1364-5612, nzmzasali@gmail.com

² MEB, Etimesgut İlçe Milli Eğitim Müd., ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4765-8809, zekiyeyeter6@gmail.com

³ MEB, Etimesgut İlçe Milli Eğitim Müd., ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4303-5874, ergunerdem0626@gmail.com

⁴ MEB; Etimesgut İlçe Milli Eğitim Müd., ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5530-5731, ayferbedir@gmail.com

Arařtırma Makalesi/Research Article, Geliř Tarihi/Received: 14/02/2023–Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 27/03/2023

OKUL YÖNETİCİLERİNİN ÖĞRETİMSSEL LİDERLİK DAVRANIŞLARININ İNCELENMESİ: LİTERATÜR TARAMASI

ÖZET

Genel olarak okul müdürleri, okul personelinin motive etme, yönlendirme ve destekleme yeteneklerinden dolayı insan kaynaklarının geliştirilmesinde lider olarak kabul edilmektedir. Bu nedenle, öğretim liderliği davranışlarının etkililiğini etkileyen faktörler, rol, performans ve liderlik becerilerinin mutlaka iyi öğretim liderleri üretmediğini kabul eden eğitimciler arasında giderek önemli bir çalışma alanı haline gelmiştir. Tam da bu noktada okul müdürlerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarının dikkatle incelenmesi gerektiği ön plana çıkmaktadır. İlgili literatürde yapılmış araştırmalar öğretimsel liderlik davranışları okul ikliminde öğretmen ve öğrenci düzeyinde olumlu sonuçlar oluşturduğu yapılan araştırmalarda rastlanılmıştır. Bu bağlamdan yola çıkılarak araştırmanın amacı, okul yöneticilerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarının ilgili literatür kapsamında incelenmesidir. Yapılan bu literatür araştırmasının yeni çalışmalara ve konuyla ilgili uygulamalara ışık tutarak eğitim bilimleri ve eğitim yönetimi ve denetimi alanlarına katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretim Liderliği, Okul Müdürleri, Liderlik, Liderlik Davranışları

INTRODUCTION

It is believed that in today's conditions, organizations need capable leaders to achieve their goals. The subject of leadership is very important for educational organizations as well, due to the social impact of these establishments have on society (Karadag, 2020). Leadership behaviors are often considered amongst the most important predictors of effectiveness and progress in training programs. Schools are not only places for students and teachers to learn, but also for parents and the community as well (Kazak & Polat, 2018). In schools, principals are responsible for all administrative activities, and their approach to teachers, students, and parents affects school atmosphere and overall success levels (Kars & Inandi, 2018). School principals provide the necessary resources for learners, prepare the learning environment, and support and guide the learning activities (Kazak & Polat, 2018).

Teachers must also be sufficiently motivated to achieve school goals, and in this regard, Cansoy and Parlar (2018) state that principals have a significant contribution to the effectiveness and self-efficacy of teachers). A leader's behavior has an effect on building self-confidence, high energy, and self-efficacy, and positive use of power and acts as an external stimulus that increase the teachers' efforts and satisfaction levels (Thomas & Madden, 2018). Considering all of these, school principals must acquire and nurture leadership abilities and skills to help the school achieve its goals and to increase the motivation of the employees (Mphale, 2014). Koran and Koran (2017) in a study on the behavior of educational administrators in Erbil, Iraq, state that expectations from school principals are at the highest point today in history.

In the public eye they are not just seen as school principals, but are also expected to support student learning, make financial decisions for schools, manage staff, and operate in a complex environment.

It can be said that the effectiveness of a school is determined by the behaviors of the school principal as an instructional leader. One of the most important missions of school principals is to create an appropriate learning culture that supports a strong and open environment to enable teachers to communicate, participate and collaborate to support school success. Furthermore, in schools where the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals are high, teachers feel safe in their choices and do not feel threatened in using their teaching methods, are not criticized by their principals, and interaction between teachers is supported. Such a culture in the school strengthens the relationship between teachers and principals and thus increases school success (Kazak & Polat, 2018).

Given the importance of the role of school principals, the changes in school management methods in recent decades has been one of the trending subjects considered by researchers in this field. The most prominent change in attitudes toward school management is focused on “leadership behavior”, which has been examined under the heading of “Instructional leadership” (Wiseman, 2004) in educational context. This subject has explicitly improved since the beginning of the school effectiveness movement in the United States around 1980 (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1986) and continues to lead ideas on how managers can meet the educational challenges of the new century.

According to Ahmad and Hussain (2013), the term "instructional leadership" refers to activities that school principals do, or delegate, to enhance student learning. The instructional leader gives high priority to improving the quality of education and works hard to realize this vision. According to Alig – Mielcarek (2003), instructional leadership is defined as principal behaviors that lead the school to train all students to achieve highlevel academic achievement.

In fact, since the beginning of the 21st century, interest in instructional leadership has increased as it is believed that the quality of leadership makes a significant difference for schools and students (Kazak & Polat, 2018). During the 1980s, research communities and educational policies encouraged principals to nurture activities that enhance classroom teaching and learning. This means that principals are responsible for certain outcomes related to school activities, such as student progress. Proponents of the instructional leadership model say that managers are more effective than all potential instructional leaders because, unlike senior managers in ministries, they are located in a school environment (Pont, Nusche and Moorman, 2008). While emphasizing accountability, decentralization of school management and the transfer of educational control has increased in most parts of the world (Baker and LeTendre, 2005). The most important feature of instructional leadership is its focus on teaching and learning processes. Instructional leadership is about educational processes that involve students, teachers, and the learning curriculum. Therefore, a school principal should use the role of instructional leader instead of the classical principal to make his / her school a better place (Niqab et al, 2014).

In general, school principals are considered leaders in human resource development because of their ability to motivate, guide, and bolster school staff. Thus, the factors influencing the effectiveness of instructional leadership behaviors have gradually become a significant area of study among educators who acknowledge that knowledge of the role, performance, and leadership skills does not necessarily produce good instructional leaders (Thomas & Madden, 2018). Therefore, it is necessary to carefully examine the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals. As the literature shows, these behaviors pave the way for positive results at the teacher and student level for schools.

However, a review of the research background shows that despite the high importance of instructional leadership and its role in school development, such an important issue has not been studied as extensively as it should be, and while the general concept of leadership in the existing resources related to education has been addressed, the study of instructional leadership behaviors in the form of duties and functions of the school principal is almost neglected (Mard et al, 2018). Wilkey (2013) also believes that the lack of leadership in many public high schools in the United States has led to a leadership crisis, a lack of ability to transform schools, and poor student achievement.

On the other hand, the elementary course is one of the most important courses in the educational systems, because the background and conditions for the formation of personality and the allround development of individuals are provided in this course. According to some experts, this course is the most suitable opportunity for study and learning. Given that elementary school students spend a considerable amount of time in school and also the importance of this course in the students' mentality towards education and school, the behavior of school principals in this course is very important in academic outcomes and students' interest in education.

Undoubtedly, leadership in schools cannot rely solely on the models and theories of instructional leadership proposed by foreign experts in this field. The cultural, political, social and economic structure of society has a different impact on the education system in general and the leadership of schools in particular. Based on this context, the purpose of this study is to examine the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators within the relevant literature.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF RESEARCH

Leadership is an integral part of management and its most difficult principle. Today, the role of the manager as a leader has become so important that the public and private sectors are looking for managers who have the power and ability to lead the organization. The duties of managers in organizations are planning, organizing, leading and controlling. But the essential role of leaders in the organization is to influence others in such a way that employees work willingly and show more activity (Hunt, 1991).

Leadership refers to a field of research. Moreover, it constitutes a skill that includes the capability of a person, a number of people, or an organization to "lead," affect, or lead other people or organizations. Researchers define leadership as a "process of social influence" in which one can help and support others to do a common task (Chin, 2015).

Lessem (1991) identifies the four leadership skills needed:

- Influencing skills such as encouraging the other individuals, discussing various issues with other people, giving a speech and entrepreneurship
- Acquisition skills such as fast reading, reflecting skills, processing and predicting information
- Facilitate skills such as listening, recognizing possibilities, building a team, forming an alliance
- Creative skills such as visualization, inspiration, empowerment and adjustment

It is clear that leadership is integrated with its relevant skills including administration and management. These concepts have attracted considerable attention in diverse settings. Their application changes in different contexts. In Englishspeaking countries including Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States, leadership affects standards and ameliorates school performance. Nonetheless in other countries such as the Netherlands and Scandinavia it is not considered to be very a significant skill. This difference reflects changes in the performance of educational systems and their political, culturebased, and local contexts that reflect the different effects of the role of leaders in schools (Pashiardis & Johansson, 2016).

The concept of school leadership became popular during the previous due to a number of reasons. Requests have been made to schools to reach a higher level of students and schools are expected to be reformed. Moreover, the schools were required to be accountable. To be more specific, schools have to make an effort to improve the students' learning (Karaxha, 2013).

School leaders have to show that they have a profound impact on the development of school. This issue has motivated research on the role of leaders in the progress of schools (Pashiardis & Johansson, 2016). Administration and management result in steadiness due to their impact on control and monitoring of the educational process. This aspect of leadership has recently received attention due to the fact that it evinces action and support. The principal is usually regarded to be the school leader. Nonetheless, school leadership may comprise other people who make an effort to achieve the school's goals. The leadership in the setting of school has attracted attention as an alternative to educational management in recent years (Karaxha, 2013). This concept will be discussed in the following sections.

Historical Course of Instructional Leadership

The consequential role of instructional leadership has been recognized across the world. The academic debates about the foundations of instructional leadership can be traced back to the 1980s in US schools. Since then, a large number of studies have underpinned the idea that instructional leadership is an important approach today for educational researchers, physicians, and policymakers (Wei, Lu, & Qian, 2018). But the first significant attempt to conceptually define and empirically study what we now call instructional leadership was made by Gross and Herriot (1965). They conducted a study on the principals of the elementary schools in the United States during the 1960s. These scientists adjusted the structure of "managerial professional leadership" and created the associated scale for experimental studies.

Components in the conceptual definition and measurement tools of "principal professional leadership" include: school principals' attention to academic criteria, teachers' academic progress, school aims and criteria, and the effect of the principals' efforts on the meaningfulness of the teachers' work (Hallinger et al., 2010).

Nonetheless, the principals' instructional leadership became a popular concept due to the research into efficient schools from the mid to late 1970s. Including Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), who found a clear link between effective schools and the implementation of instructional leadership by the school principal. The findings came at a time when policymakers, particularly in the United States, paid attention to unsatisfactory school performance. Following the findings of these studies, the slogan of the importance of instructional leadership became widespread during the 1980s. Based on these results, policymakers made an endeavor to strengthen their capacity to play an instructional leadership role and to create effective schools (Barth, 1996).

In the 1990s, instructional leadership became a prominent legal role in the United States, where managers willing to be effective were expected to perform it (Hallinger et al., 2010). In the early 1990s, instructional leaders in schools have been described as successful schools in difficult situations. Various researchers believed that instructional leaders define a clear vision for the school that focuses primarily on improving student achievement, and that an effective instructional leader can equate. The techniques of the school are in line with the school's scientific mission, led by combining the power of expertise and intellectual power, take the lead in curriculum planning, are inclined to collaborate with teachers to ameliorate the educational process, and overcome the many pressures they face. During the 1990s, the focus on teacher professionalism led to a rethinking of the role of instructional leadership in schools and the idea of how much a leader can meet the complicated needs of the role. To meet instructional leadership, it seemed that instructional leadership had lost its power and ability as an organizational concept for school leadership (Hallinger, 2001).

As a result, in the late 1990s, researchers developed participatory instructional leadership models. In this decade, several cases are involved in the development of the instructional leadership perspective to participatory in schools (Jackson, 2001). At this point of time, it is believed that the deep and continuous improvement of educational centers depends on the leadership and guidance of many people. This means that leadership in educational institutions such as schools, universities, educational institutions is not unique to one person, but leadership in these organizations is an approach to integrate all capabilities for promoting learning (Harris, 2003).

The entry into the 21st century and the emergence of the accountability movement led to increasing attention to the learning outcomes of students and schools. In addition, while instructional leadership was previously the primary focus, global interest in educational reform and accountability at the school level led to a new interest in instructional leadership, so that instructional leadership became a new term for learning leadership (Hallinger, 2009).

Definitions of Instructional Leadership

A large number of studies have focused on instructional leadership during the past three decades. Nonetheless, the conceptualization of instructional leadership has changed during these decades (Boyce and Bowers, 2018). Instructional leadership is an organizational activity that provides learning opportunities for the academic progress of teachers and for the advancement of students in educational activities. An instructional leader focuses on the quality of education as the school's first priority. In instructional leadership, the focus is on learning rather than teaching. Dufour proposed the term "learning leader" instead of instructional leadership (Ramatseba, 2012).

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) argue that instructional leaders define the mission of the training center, manage the training program, and advance the training center as a whole.

Glickman et al. (2001) believe that instructional leadership results in the existence of effective schools and has an impact on student success.

According to Wales and Bundy (2004), instructional leadership helps to improve educational work and any action that can take the teacher one step further. He believes that the role of the instructional leader is to support, strengthen, help and ultimately cooperate, not to command.

Fiore (2004) considers instructional leadership as a process in which a clear vision of the future of the educational environment that includes high standards of learning for all students, is drawn with the participation of all stakeholders and then directed by collective efforts to achieve this vision.

According to Leithwood et al (2008), instructional leadership is the behavior and attention that managers show when performing activities that have a direct impact on learners' growth. According to them, instructional leaders have useful information and authority in order to affect teachers.

Based on Ahmed and Hussain (2013), the term "instructional leadership" refers to activities that school principals or delegate do, to enhance student learning. The instructional leader gives high priority to improving the quality of education and works hard to realize this vision. Whitaker (1998) argues that instructional leadership constitutes a set of behaviors which affect classroom teaching. The aforementioned behaviors comprise educating teachers by principals about new teaching techniques and efficient teaching. According to AligMielcarek (2003), instructional leadership is defined as principal behaviors that lead the school to teach all of the learners to achieve highlevel academic achievement.

Hallinger and Murphy (2012) argued that today, we see instructional leadership as an effective tool which can be utilized to determine, encourage staff, and develop classroom and schoolbased strategies, and coordinate the goal of improvement in education (Gurley et al, 2016).

According to Ismail et al. (2018), instructional leadership is an approach that school leaders use to examine the instructors' practices which indirectly influence the learners' educational development.

Bush (2003), Southworth (2002) and Bush and Glover (2002) believe that the instructional leadership model is important and valuable, because it focuses on the main activities or processes of schools, namely teaching and learning. Bush (2003) argues that instructional leadership is related to direction and does not deal with its structure. Consequently, there is a difference between this concept and the similar models. The attention to the management of the educational processes of the various institutes has led to the endorsement of this approach, especially by the National College of School Leadership, which has been classified as one of the ten leadership theories. Has classified itself. Southworth (2002) also states that instructional leadership is strongly related to the teaching and learning process.

Instructional leadership refers to a cooperative process that unifies the teachers, learners and parents' capabilities. It makes an effort to ameliorate education and to deal with the educational issues (Thien, 2020).

School leaders are regarded to be instructional leaders in setting highlevel goals and expectations for learners and instructors' performance. Moreover, instructional leaders perform other essential activities: striving for professional development, selecting and evaluating teachers, monitoring and supervising teaching time, setting and monitoring school standards, supervising class size, supervising and facilitating the use of instructional materials and overseeing the implementation of the school curriculum (Smith and Piele, 1997).

The school principals are required to depend on instructional leadership due to the fact that it is related to implementing an innovation promotion program and improving students' learning innovation knowledge. In addition, instructional leadership is compatible with the responsibilities of school principal, including the specification of school aims, determination of relevant school criteria, development of the curriculum, monitoring and evaluating teacher classroom guidelines, motivating learners to study, and enhancing teacher professional development as well as involving administrative staff (Ismail et al., 2018).

Glickman, Gordon, and Rose Gordon (2007) see the goal of instructional leadership as improving the education and success of the school through democratic work and teacher participation for student achievement, teacher professional development, and educational equity. Some of the important functions of instructional leadership are defined as supervising classroom instruction and staff development.

Instructional Leadership Behavior

Recently, the role of the school principals has changed in various ways. For instance, the focus on their instructional leadership skills constitutes one of the aforementioned changes (Gurley et al, 2016). According to Ma and Marion (2019), school leaders play an important role in the success of their schools. They manage tasks such as budget and timeline, student order, syllabus development, facilities, safety, hiring and supervising instructors, evaluations, syllabus, instruction of academic development materials, and teacher relations. In addition, they define students' relationships with parents and the community (Ma and Marion, 2019).

Research shows that, in this century principals have to be highly skilled in teaching leadership in order to improve schools. The literature on instructional leaders says that, in addition to instruction, the school leader is an important factor in the improvement of school (Thien, 2020).

Hallinger and Heck (1998) examined the effect of leadership in terms of categorizing school mission definition, curriculum management, and school space enhancement. They also identified leadership impact in terms of how it impacts directly, mediates, and interacts (Gurley et al, 2016).

Leithwood et al. (2004), stated that instructional leaders should engage in their schools by a) building and establishing engaging communication; b) developing common goals. c) Participating in efficient planning and arrangement; d) providing information on roles and aims; e) motivating and inspiring others, and f) setting high performing expectations for all to improve school performance (Gurley et al, 2016).

Nowadays, efficient school leadership has to be combined with conventional school management tasks such as instructor assessment, budgeting, planning, facility maintenance, and attention to particular aspects of instruction. Effective instructional leaders deal with curricula and educational issues that influence student achievement (Cotton, 2003).

Chase and Kane (2003) list the following three elements for instructional leadership:

Prioritization: instruction should be the most important issue in the school principal's list of priorities. Leaders cannot disregard other tasks. Nonetheless, education should be part of the programs in which the leader spends most of his or her planned time.

Scientific supervision based on research studies: instructional leaders should be well aware of the opinions based on research and educational studies in order to facilitate the specification and application of educational materials and to supervise its application. Managers' presence in academic development sessions encourages them to stay focused.

Attention to Curriculum Alignment, Teaching, Evaluation, and Criteria: If learners' progress is an aim and that aim is measured through standardsbased tests, the curriculum, teaching, and assessment should all align with standards. If these elements are disconnected, the success of the students will not be apparent. Alignment is a steady process as the cycle of criteria, syllabus, teaching, and evaluation improves.

Joyner (2005) lists the following two elements for instructional leadership:

The analysis of the data: efficient leaders utilize various pieces of information to evaluate the progress of performance. Decisions at all levels must be made on the basis of relevant information. Administrators can utilize the data to guide teachers' educational focus and academic progress and examine the efficacy of educational techniques. They can also help teachers use the data to make arrangements for learner grouping.

Continuing acquisition culture for adults: Efficient teaching constitutes a developing skill. All of the instructors can take advantage of the extra time to train and support their progress. Principals who support learning as a priority provide teachers with free time to attend relevant training. They monitor teachers' learning through supervision and provide support that preserves new learning.

Glickman et al. (2007) suggest five roles of instructional leadership: explicit teacher support, teacher professional development, teacher team development, syllabus planning, and action research.

Quinn (2004) identified effective instructional leadership for four motivating functions: resource provider, educational resource, goal interface, and open presence.

In a study conducted by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), they divided instructional leadership into three areas: explaining the mission of the school, managing educational programs, and improving the school climate.

Blase and Blase (1999) studied the effect of instructional leadership on teaching and finally expressed instructional leadership behaviors in three perspectives, which are: talking to teachers, enhancing teachers' professional growth and creating opportunities for feedback.

Wiles and Bondi (2004) state that leadership in schools is the product of things such as clear insights, guiding goals and planned efforts, selective use of resources, and increasing teacher employment. There are several qualities needed for effective instructional leadership: Understanding an organization's position, tasks, goals, and ability to internally link these tasks to the basic motivational needs of the people who work and learn. The main task of leadership is to ameliorate the learners' education. In this regard, the functions of instructional leadership are described as follows. Leadership functions are divided into three dimensions, which are the following three: administrative, curriculum and curriculum, and each of which them has different tasks.

Also, in instructional leadership research, a large number of studies highlight the fact that communication, sharing, and cooperation are increasingly needed in modern instructional leadership since educational experts benefit and help other individuals to deal with problems and to accomplish goals (Yada and Jappinen, 2019). According to Yada and Jappinen (2019), instructional leaders should have the following characteristics: social motivation, social behavior and social impact.

Instructional Leadership Models

Instructional leadership has become a very significant factor in ameliorating and developing the performance of schools. As a result, there are many conceptual models for describing instructional leadership.

In comparison between Murphy and Hallinger (1985), Murphy (1990), Weber (1996) and Hallinger (2011) models, all four models have defined or specified the responsibilities and objectives of the school as the first component of the instructional leadership model (Table 2). 5). In school management, the mission and goals lead to the advancement of teachers, students and schools. The second component of the instructional leadership model of Hallinger and Murphy (1985) is educational management, which includes "educational monitoring and evaluation, coordination between curricula, and monitoring student achievement."

The second component of Murphy's model (1990) is the management of educational programs, which includes "educational monitoring and evaluation, coordination between curricula and monitoring the progress of knowledge educational monitoring and evaluation, coordination between curricula, protection of educational time, improvement "The quality of education is to monitor students' progress." The second component of Hallinger (2011) is the management of educational programs. Obviously, the educational management component of the Weber model (1960) has two more subcomponents than the Hallinger and Murphy model (1990), which only provides more descriptions of the behaviors and activities to be performed by the instructional leader, and obviously it is similar to the second the component of Murphy and Hallinger (1985) model. In addition, in Weber's (1996) model, the three components of "curriculum management, observing and improving education, and curriculum evaluation" describe different aspects of educational management; therefore, in comparing the three models of instructional leadership, they were called educational program management. The third component in Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Hallinger (2011) models is to create a positive atmosphere in school. In Murphy's (1990) model, this component is divided into components of improving the learning atmosphere and creating a supportive work environment. This component in Weber's (1996) model emphasizes only the creation of a positive learning atmosphere. Therefore, all four models of instructional leadership emphasize on specifying the responsibility and objectives of the school, managing educational programs and creating a positive atmosphere in the school. Hoy and Mielcarek (2003) presented their model by combining these models and emphasizing their common factors. Their model also includes almost all the elements of the other three models.

However, the weakness of Murphy and Hallinger (1985) model is that it has not been studied in an experimental study and no questionnaire tool has been developed for this model. Weber's (1996) model has also not been experimentally evaluated, and it is not clear whether the instructional leaders who implement this model can increase learners' educational achievement or vice versa. Based on the discussed models, the instructional leadership model developed by Hallinger (2011) is selected as the best model. First, due to the reliability of the model. Hallinger's instructional leadership model has been experimentally tested in many studies on instructional leadership and is most used in measuring school principal instructional leadership (Gurley et al, 2016). Second, the model has developed "Main Scale for Educational Management Ranking" (PIMRS) which is a robust, and sustainable research instrument that has been employed in diverse studies on the management of school. This tool has been used many times in the past years in the studies of instructional leadership of school leaders and is still used (Hassan et al., 2019).

COMPONENTS OF MANAGERS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

Based on the existing models of instructional leadership of principals, three aspects of explaining school goals, managing educational programs and creating a good atmosphere in the school are considered as the main components of effective instructional leadership behavior for principals. Each of these three dimensions will be defined below.

Defining School Goals

The school goals definition component has two functions, which have already been stated: building the school objective and expanding it (Hallinger, 2011; 2000; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985). Based on this aspect, the school leaders' responsibility is to determine the purpose of the school. School principals need to know about the capabilities of the school and the path they take. A school that is not in the educational process has no criteria for measuring whether it has been successful in carrying out the processes. This aspect examines the responsibility of leaders in carrying out their responsibilities in collaboration with their subordinates so that the school has a definite objective and has a timetable for learners' educational achievement. Leaders also have a duty to specify the objective set so that all of the individuals are aware of it, and this can reduce the support and assistance of the school staff to make sure that the objective is achieved (Hallinger, 2005). According to this model, the objective might be created by the school leader or in collaboration with other school staff. Nonetheless, the school must have a specific goal that enables all members of the school staff to underpin and collaborate in achieving the objective. This issue stems from the fact that sometimes, there is an ambiguous, confusing and even contradictory objective that can make it hard to achieve the intended result based on the set goal (Hallinger, 2011; 2000; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985). Educational guides in defining the purpose of the school which is obvious in the research conducted by Hallinger and Murphy (1986) on an efficient elementary school in California. Based on the results of the school principal and teachers' interviews, the school leaders' six characteristics in explaining the purpose of the school are summarized. First, the vision and responsibility of the school must be obvious and definite to all members of the school staff. The objective must be written or shown about the school to make sure that everyone can easily see it and inform them of the school's orientation. Second, the school's goal should be to concentrate on educational achievement on the basis of the needs and appropriateness of the school. Third, the objective of the school must be the instructors' priority in fulfilling their duties. Fourth, the objective must be approved by all school instructors. Fifth, the goal must be stated by the supreme leader. Finally, the goal must be underpinned by school staff. Hence, the school leader himself should set the best example in achieving the goal (Hassan et al., 2019).

Management of Educational Programs

The second component is curriculum management. This dimension focuses on the examination and coordination of syllabus and education issues. James and Balasandran (2013) noted that this aspect is considered to be the major responsibility of the school and is considered to be the school leaders' formidable challenge. Failure to fulfill the task of efficient and effective management of the educational program leads to failure to achieve the desired result in students' academic achievement. This component has three subcomponents, firstly, monitoring and evaluating the instructions, secondly, syllabus coordination, and finally, supervising learners' achievement (Hallinger, 2011; 2000; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985).

According to Hallinger (2011, 2000), this aspect monitors and evaluates education, which refers to the initiative of school leaders to make sure that the school's objective can be realized in the classroom education process. Curriculum coordination is the second function which requires the school leaders to align teaching goals with classroom learning tasks, the evaluation process, and curriculum coordination. School leaders must also nominate several people who are responsible for coordinating the curriculum, analyzing student test scores, and deciding which materials to select as instructional aids. In addition, the third component is supervising student progress. School leaders should have a steady discussion with instructors about educational achievement and student achievement, with specific ideas and innovative ways to improve the education process to increase student progress. The second dimension requires the active participation of school leaders in strengthening, monitoring and overseeing the research and development process in the school. Therefore, school principals must be knowledgeable and experienced experts in the field of education and at the same time be committed to all school development programs. Based on the aforementioned dimension, school leaders will specialize in all school education programs (Marshall, 2003). Hallinger and Murphy (1986) carried out a study on efficient schools in California found that schoolteachers observed several principal behaviors that were said to control student growth. They observed that the school principal could be aware of the literacy level and progress of all 650 students in the school. This behavior is not mandatory in instructional leadership. Nonetheless, it shows the principal's efforts to supervise student achievement other than managing school curricula.

Creating a Positive Atmosphere in School

The third component is creating a school atmosphere. In this dimension, there are five functions that include (1) protecting the course, (2) high vision, (3) motivating instructors, (4) increasing academic progress, and (5) motivating students to learn. (Hallinger, 2011; 2000). Hallinger (2011, 2000) has changed the model and concept of leadership on the basis of the instructional leadership model of Hallinger and Murphy (1985). However, after examining the reliability and validity of the model, he excluded one of the third dimension's functions, which is to strengthen the scientific standard. Therefore, for this revised leadership model, the component of creating a positive school atmosphere has only the five functions mentioned above and has remained the same to this day. Hallinger (2011, 2000) argued that, the third dimension comprises instructors and learners' conventions and assumptions which influence the acquisition process in school. School leaders have to explicitly or implicitly, using their capability to maintain a vision to facilitate communication, discussion and create a platform for approaching instructors and learners, by developing an award system to increase the productivity of the school staff in order to increase learners' academic achievement and create a school atmosphere. Obvious criteria include school expectations of learners, protection of the teaching course and participation in school community development programs that are in line with the school's mission. This aspect has a wider scope and aim than the previous two aspects. It supports the idea that an efficient school usually creates a school atmosphere by setting strict criteria and expectations for learners and instructors in the field of science and learning (Hassan et al., 2019).

Challenges of Instructional Leadership

A large number of studies have shown the shortcomings of school leaders and the practical challenges of instructional leadership. According to Heck and Hallinger (2010), despite the reference leadership model, there are many weaknesses in creating instructional leadership. First, the topdown hierarchal model depicts that school leaders are regarded to be superior to the teachers. According to the teaching leadership practice, school leaders perform the role of curriculum experts and supervisors of the instruction and curriculum process. The superiority of the supervisors to the instructors causes discomfort to the instructors, when school principals intend to control the education process or when reviewing the outcome of their work (Goddard, 2003). The second problem for school leaders is that they have to specialize in all areas of teaching or curriculum (Hallinger, 2015). Therefore, in this situation, school leaders must create a culture of learning in the school community, especially with teachers, so that the school can use all kinds of skills in each teacher for the students' academic progress. The third issue is that in addition to instructional leaders in the school, they also have to do other work such as office work, and this means that they do not have enough time to do their job as instructional leaders (Hallinger, 2003).

Goodwin et al. (2003) noted that district officials often have excessive demands on school leaders. This leads to an imbalance in the management and leadership of the school, in addition to the increase in the complexity of these tasks, this can lead to a decrease in the morale and eagerness of school principals. In addition, high community expectations of school leaders add more responsibilities to leaders than the diverse requirements of the society, and this leads to failure to perform the duties of instructional leaders (Catano & Stronge, 2007).

It also reduces the ability of school leaders to practice instructional leadership in enhancing students' academic achievement. Research highlights the school leaders' inability to ameliorate learners' educational achievement even after applying instructional leadership behaviors (Hallinger, 2008). In another study, Leithwood (2010) argued that learners realized that the role of school leaders in ameliorating the quality of their learning was low, ranging from 12 to 25 percent, while the impact of the external environment and the family factor was up to 50 percent of influence. Learners' educational achievement is enjoyed (Leithwood et al., 2010).

There has been pressure to force school leaders to reduce managerial responsibilities and concentrate on the responsibilities of instructional leaders. The school leaders who have not dealt with instruction (due to school issues), reengaging in educational settings with the aim of increasing teachers' educational performance is certainly a major challenge for them (Hallinger, 2003). Hallinger (2011) stated that school leaders are required to fulfill their responsibilities as instructional leaders because they are convinced that it will increase students' academic achievement; however, other leaders such as school management and office work are also expected. Being busy with a variety of managerial and administrative tasks limits school leaders from fulfilling their responsibilities as instructional leaders, especially in overseeing teacher research and development sessions and overseeing education tasks (Hallinger, 2015).

Goodwin et al. (2003) state that the issue of bureaucracy, the pressure of social society, the interparty negotiations, and the ongoing educational reforms have undermined the role of school principals as instructional leaders. As far as they think of themselves as a coach and not a leader. Their role as school leaders has also undergone major changes over the previous decades, which only adds to the difficulty of performing their leadership tasks. This major change requires school leaders to spend more time performing their duties in leading and administering their school than previous leaders (Goodwin et al., 2003; Lashway, 2003). As a result, school administrators today have to perform their duties in stressful situations (which increase with time), the need for very difficult reports and the lack of time (Volante et al, 2008).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Today instructional leadership is one of the necessities of the country's schools. School principals will not be able to achieve the goals of schools without playing the role of instructional leader. In this regard, this study is conducted with the aim of a qualitative study to identify the behaviors of educational managers. In the present chapter, conclusions, discussions, comparisons, suggestions and management applications and then suggestions are provided for future researchers.

Thien (2020) evaluated convergent, divergent, and criterionbased validity from a hierarchical point of view, with a Malay language version of the PIMRS Instructional leadership Scale. The researcher gathered data from 375 elementary school instructors from 30 chosen schools in Penang and Kode, Malaysia. The data were analyzed by means of the partial least square's structural equation modeling approach with SmartPLS 3.2.9 software. The results showed that four items should be discarded to ensure the validity of the structures of third, second and first order structures. Convergent validity and differentiation validity for all second and firstorder structures were determined by statistical estimation over the corresponding threshold. The redundancy analysis validated the convergence of instructional leadership as a constructive third structure. Criteria validity was determined by a significant and positive impact of instructional leadership on collective effectiveness of teachers (CTE).

Ma. & Marion (2019) used a multilevel modeling method to investigate the effect of principals 'instructional leadership on instructor effectiveness and the mediating role of faculty members' trust in that process. Fifty high school principals and 714 instructors in a minority area in western China took part in the study. The findings show that instructional leadership, in terms of creating a positive learning environment, directly and positively affects the teacher's influence. The teaching leadership practices that determine the school's mission, manage the curriculum, and create a school learning environment have a positive effect on teachers' trust. The results show the fact that specific methods of instructional leadership have a greater impact on the effectiveness of teachers than the direct effect through faculty members' trust in the principal. The findings of this study may guide policymakers and stakeholders to make major decisions to increase teacher efficiency.

Thessin (2019) examined what each supervisor and manager bring as instructional leadership. A multiple case study method was utilized to collect data from 12 principals / principals during 16 months in a midAtlantic middle school area. The sources of data include interviews, observations, and documentation provided by study participants.

The results showed that the main supervisor and the main manager, each brought certain previous characteristics to their participation and each of them contributed to the improvement of effective participation during their joint work. When these characteristics of partnership existed, supervisors and managers engaged in collaborative work that led to fundamental modifications in the performance of managers' training leadership.

Liu, S., & Hallinger (2018) investigated the relationship between managers' instructional leadership and teacher learning. This model proposes the core skills of time management and self-efficacy as a background of instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy as a mediator for the effects of managers' instructional leadership on teachers' professional learning. The researchers gathered survey data from 3,414 instructors and 186 principals at 186 middle schools in Qingdao, China. Confirmatory factor analysis, structural equation modeling and bootstrap were used to analyze the multipurpose data. The findings of this study confirmed a mediation model according to which the instructional leadership of principals proves moderate direct and indirect impacts on the professional learning of the teacher. Key time management and self-efficacy have little effect on managers' training leadership.

Boyce and Bowers (2018) examined the leadership research over the past 25 years. The authors surveyed 109 studies using the Schools and Staff Survey (SASS) which was employed by the US National Education Statistics Center, which examines at least one aspect of instructional leadership. The findings showed that there were four main topics of instructional leadership research that analyzed SASS data: leadership and core impact, instructor independence and impact, adult learning, and school atmosphere. The three factors that were most examined in relation to the themes of instructional leadership are: teacher satisfaction, teacher commitment and teacher retention. This study provides information each topic, explains the interrelationships among all of the factors, and summarizes the interrelationships in the form of a model.

Hallinger et al. (2018) evaluated the conceptual models, research methods, and centers of science in the study of instructional leadership in Malaysia during the previous 30 years. A number of techniques were utilized to determine all the studies carried out in Malaysia that utilized the main educational management ranking scale (PIMRS) as a data collection tool. The search includes a database of 120 studies conducted between 1989 and 2016, published in both English and Bahasa Malay. Collaborative data were gathered based on 120 research reports, coded, and entered into MS Excel software for analysis. The researchers used quantitative methods to analyze certain trends and synthesize patterns in the data during the studies. This search identified 120 PIMRS studies, 90% of which have been conducted since 2005. More than 75% of Malaysian studies on managerial leadership training have been conducted as postgraduate dissertations (master's and doctoral), of which almost a few have been published in journals.

The results showed that most studies use lowerorder conceptual models (i.e., direct effects of variable) and are largely limited to descriptive and simple statistical correlation tests. The researchers argued that designbased issues resulted in the inconclusive results of the study.

Ismail et al (2018) examined the relationship between the instructional leadership of school principals and the functional competence of teachers in prestigious schools in the northern part of the Malaysian Peninsula. The study used a descriptive correlational survey research design. The survey was conducted to collect the necessary information on 225 instructors from 12 secondary and elementary schools. The main questionnaire of the Educational Management Rating Scale was adopted by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and the integrated assessment module for educational service officers (2014) was utilized to gather data. This study showed that the level of instructional leadership among leaders is very high and the level of functional competence of teachers is very high. These findings also showed that there is a very strong relationship between the instructional leadership of school leaders and the functional competence of teachers. Findings also indicate that there is an average significant relationship between instructional leadership of school leaders and instructors' knowledge. In addition, there is a positive but relatively weak relationship between the instructional leadership of school leaders and the skills of teachers. This study advises the school leaders to use instructional leadership to improve teachers' functional competencies.

Wi et al. (2018) presented the Chinese version of the Educational Management Rating Scale (PIMRS). This study consists of three stages. In Phase 1, PIMRS was adapted based on the recent work of Qian et al. (2017) on teaching leadership practices in China, followed by semistructured interviews with 15 elementary school principals to examine the dimensions and cases of PIMRS compatibility. In Phase 2, a Chinese PIMRS was validated and further modified on the basis of data gathered from 159 principals and instructors. In Step 3, using survey data gathered from 1,100 principals and instructors, the build level, case level, and benchmark for the final validity of the modified Chinese PIMRS were established. The results show that consistent PIMRS can better demonstrate the Chinese manager's training leadership.

Nguyen et al (2018) translated, adapted and validated the Educational Management Scale Measurement Tool (PIMRS) for use in Vietnam. In the next step, its purpose was to explain the patterns of instructional leadership that is evident among an example of urban and rural elementary school principals. The researchers then investigated whether these leadership patterns of principals could be related to one or more "prior variables": school size, school location (urban / rural), principal gender, and previous teaching experience. Lastly, the article examined principals and instructors' perspectives on how to strengthen instructional leadership in Vietnam education. In this study, quantitative and qualitative methods have been used. Based on this issue, 569 instructors and 117 principals working in 117 elementary schools in Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh Province were selected as the sample of the study. In data collection, the PIMRS form is a translated form that fits the Vietnamese language. An openended question posed by instructors and administrators was examined in this tool to specify suggestions for strengthening instructional leadership in Vietnam. This study used Rush analysis, Cronbach's test, confirmatory factor analysis, ttest and analysis of variance in data analysis.

This study provided preliminary confirmation of the PIMRS Vietnamese Language Teacher Form. Analysis of PIMRS data collected from instructors showed that elementary school principals have an amazing level of instructional leadership. According to international research findings, the selected evidence indicates stronger leadership by female executives, although this pattern was not strong. None of the other predecessors had a significant relationship with managers' instructional leadership patterns.

Leaf and Odhiambo (2017) examined the perspectives of principals, assistants, and instructors about the Vice Chancellor for Instructional leadership, as well as the professional learning needs of assistants. In the context of an interpretive approach, the specific aims of this study were: to examine the level of understanding of the educational assistant as a learning leader, to examine his real responsibilities, to discover the professional learning that supports the role of the educational assistant. The researchers utilized multiperspective case studies that involved semistructured interviews and core analysis of school records. Thematic content analysis examines descriptions and qualitative insights from the perspectives of principals, assistants and instructors of four highperformance high schools in Sydney, Australia. The results showed that the delegates perform a wide range of tasks. All managers depended on their deputies to develop leadership capacity and support professional learning in different ways. In the three schools studied, most delegates typically acted as instructional leaders, ameliorating their school performance through leadership distribution, team building, and objective setting.

Gurley et al (2016) examined the instructional leadership behaviors of managers. Using the Principal Instructional leadership Rating Scale (PIMRS), it measured principals' perception of the pattern of instructional leadership behaviors applied to leadership, then compared their reports with teachers' reports (n = 407). The results highlighted the lack of a significant difference between the respondent groups. However, further investigation of these insignificant differences showed that the extent and direction of principal and teacher differences in sample schools were different.

Peariso (2011) in a study entitled "Study of managers' instructional leadership behaviors and their ideas about good education practices in effective high schools in California" with a descriptive and causal method compared the instructional leadership behaviors of efficient high school principals in California and their beliefs about education and examined training, related topics, and constructive or nonconstructive professional issues. The results showed that effective school principals are often engaged in instructional leadership behaviors.

According to the results, it is suggested to use the indicators of a successful instructional leader to select school principals and to select principals for schools who can play the role of leadership well in addition to management. The results of this study can also be used to prepare and empower principals. It is suggested that the characteristics of an instructional leader taught to school principals through regular and classified educational programs.

In terms of factors that strengthen instructional leadership, it is suggested that the characteristics required by instructional leaders are considered as a skill or task that a manager to play the role of leadership, that must have that skill or be aware of how to perform that task.

Strengthen participation by overcoming the extensive involvement of teachers and parents in organizational planning, the problems of resistance, control, and power can be overcome. For example, giving employees the right to vote when drafting research projects makes them feel they have the power and control to govern their own destiny and this feeling may lead to their support during the change period.

Also, make sure that the top management of the organization supports it: The main condition for the success of the training leadership measures is the support of the top management. The support of top management is like the cohesion that governs the organization, the powerful operating system of the social system, and this support is necessary to deal with problems related to control and power.

In line with the barriers of instructional leadership, it is suggested that the mechanical structures in schools and the educational organization reduced as much as possible. Organizational structures move towards the organic structure. The needs of instructional leaders should be identified through regular meetings with them and sufficient financial resources should be allocated to schools, by carefully reviewing the expenses and the number of students in each school.

It is also suggested that managers look at the organization with a holistic view and reduce resistance to change, they should be flexible in the face of change from traditional programs to new methods. The education organization is encouraged to identify and benefit from managers who are eager to help change and eliminate old ways.

It is recommended to avoid continuous and continuous corrections. There should be a clear procedure for actions. The workload of managers should be commensurate with their salaries and benefits, and social pressures on managers should be reduced as much as possible. Community expectations of managers should be reasonable and parents should not expect too much from managers.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S & Hussain.M., (2013). Instructional leadership practices of the excellent school principals in aceh. Indonesia: Managing the Instructional Program.
- AligMielcarek, J. M. (2003). A model of school success: Instructional leadership, academic press, and student achievement (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The .Ohio State University
- Baker, D., & Letendre, G. (2005). National differences, global similarities: World culture and the future of mass schooling. Bibliovault OAI Repository.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1996). Micropolitical strategies used by administrators and teachers in instructional conferences. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 42(4), 34560.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Publication Sales, Allyn and Bacon.
- Boyce, J., & Bowers, A.J. (2018). Toward an evolving conceptualization of instructional leadership as leadership for learning: Metanarrative review of 109 quantitative studies across 25 years. Journal of Educational Administration, 56(2). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA0620160064>.

- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2002). *School leadership: Concepts and evidence*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational management*. London: Sage.
- Cansoy, R. and Parlar, H. (2018). Examining the relationship between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors, teacher self-efficacy, and collective teacher efficacy. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(4), 550-567.
- Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2007). What do we expect of school principals? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(4), 379–399. doi.org/10.1080/13603120701381782.
- Chase, G., & Kane, M. (2003). *The principal as instructional leader: How much more time before we act?* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Chin, R. (2015). Examining teamwork and leadership in the fields of public administration, leadership, and management. *Team Performance Management*. 21(3/4), 199–216. doi:10.1108/TPM0720140037.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Fiore, D. (2004). *Introduction to educational administration: Standards, theories and practices*. Newbury Park: Corwin Press.
- Glickman, C., Gordon, S. P. & Ross, J. (2007). *Supervision and instructional leadership*. Pearson instructional edition.
- Goddard, J. T. (2003). Leadership in the (post) modern era. In N. Bennet & L. Anderson (Eds.), *Rethinking Educational Leadership* (pp. 11–26). London: SAGE Publication.
- Goodwin, R. H., Cunningham, M. L., & Childress, R. (2003). The changing role of the secondary principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 26–42.
- Gross, N., & Herriot, R. E. (1965). *Staff leadership in the public schools: A sociological inquiry*. New York: Wiley.
- Gurley, D. K., AnastMay, L., O'Neal, M., & Dozier, R. (2016). Principal instructional leadership behaviors: Teacher vs. Self-Perceptions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11(1), n1.
- Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behaviors of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247.
- Hallinger, P. (2000). A review of two decades of research on the principalship using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. In annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329–352. doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools Journal*, 4(3), 221–240.
- Hallinger, P. (2009). Leadership for 21st century schools: From instructional leadership to leadership for learning. The Hong Kong Institute of Education. <https://www.ied.edu.hk/.../getfile.php?.file>.
- 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 Administration Quarterly*, 47(2), 271–306. doi.org/10.1177/0013161X10383412.

- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elem Sch Journal*, 86(2), 217-247.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94(3), 328–355.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2012). Running on empty? Finding the time and capacity to lead learning. *NASSP Bulletin*, 97(1), 521.
- Hallinger, P., Adams, D., Harris, A., & Suzette Jones, M. (2018). Review of conceptual models and methodologies in research on principal instructional leadership in Malaysia: A case of knowledge construction in a developing society. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(1), 104126. doi.org/10.1108/JEA0320170025.
- Hallinger, P., Dongyu, L., & Wang, W.C. (2016). Gender differences in instructional leadership: A metaanalytic review of studies using the principal instructional management rating scale. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(4), 567–601. doi.org/10.1177/0013161X16638430.
- Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Leadership: Instructional. *International Encyclopedia of Education Journal*, 3, 1825.
- Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy or possibility? *Nonprofit Manage Leadership Journal*, 23(3), 313324.
- Harris, A. (2009). Successful Leadership in High Poverty schools. *A Quest Journal* 2009, 114.
- Harris, a. (1998). Effective teaching: a review of the literature. *Journal of leadership and management*, 18(2), 169183.
- Hassan, R., Ahmad, J., & Boon, Y. (2019). Instructional leadership practice and professional learning community in the southern zone of Malaysia. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(12A), 4250.
- Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2010). Testing a longitudinal model of distributed leadership effects on school improvement. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(5), 867–885. doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.07.013.
- Huang, T. (2013) Effective School Leadership Competencies: A Psychometric Study of the NASSP 21st Century School Administrator Skills Instrument. Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee of Lehigh University. In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of Doctoral of Education in Educational Leadership.
- Hunt, J. G. (1991). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publisher.
- Ismail, S. N., Don, Y., Husin, F., & Khalid, R. (2018). Instructional leadership and teachers' functional competency across the 21st century learning. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 135152.
- Jackson, D. (2001). The school improvement journey: Perspectives on leadership. *School Leadership and Management Journal*, 20(1), 61–78.
- James, A. J. E., & Balasandran, R. (2013). *Kepimpinan instruksional: Satu panduan praktikal* (2nd Ed.). Kuala Lumpur: PTS Akademia.
- Joyner, S. (2005). What is instructional leadership and why is it so important? Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.
- Karadag, E. (2020). The effect of educational leadership on students' achievement: a crosscultural metaanalysis research on studies between 2008 and 2018. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(1), 4964.

- Karaxha, Z. (2013). The hidden curriculum: Candidate diversity in educational leadership preparation. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 9(1), 36–43.
- Kars, M., & Inandi, Y. (2018). Relationship between school principals' leadership behaviors and teachers' organizational trust. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 74, 145164.
- Kazak, E., & Polat, S. (2018). School administrators' instructional leadership behaviors, intergenerational atmosphere, and intergenerational learning in schools. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 16(4), 441462.
- Koran, Selcuk & Koran, Elvira. (2017). *Principals' Leadership Styles and Strategies Employed to Motivate Teachers in Ronaki Hawler Educational Institutions*.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Role of the school leader: Trends and issues*. Washington, DC.
- Leaf, A.& Odhiambo, G. (2017). The deputy principal instructional leadership role and professional learning: Perceptions of secondary principals, deputies and teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(1), 3348. doi.org/10.1108.
- Leithwood, K. & Montgomery, D. (1982). *The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement*. NY: Academic Press.
- Leithwood, k., harris, a., & hopkins, d. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *Journal of School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 2742.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 671–706. doi.org/10.1177/0013161X10377347.
- Lessem, R. (1991). *Total quality learning*. London: Blackwell.
- Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Principal instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher professional learning in China: Testing a mediated effects model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(4), 501–528. doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18769048.
- Ma, X., & Marion, R. (2019). Exploring how instructional leadership affects teacher efficacy: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. doi.org/10.1177/1741143219888742.
- Mard, S., Zaynabadi, H., Abdollahi, B., ARASTEH, H. (2018). Indicators of a successful educational leader; Findings of a phenomenological study. *JSA*, 5(2), 109128. doi: JSA17071182 (R3).
- Marshall, K. (2003). Recovering from HSPS (hyperactive superficial principal syndrome): A progress report. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(9), 701709.
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership—Improvement through empowerment? An overview of the literature. *Educational Management & Administration*, 31(4), 437448.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In *Advances in educational administration: Changing Perspectives on the School*, 1, 163200.
- Nguyễn, H.T., Hallinger, P. and Chen, C.W. (2018), Assessing and strengthening instructional leadership among primary school principals in Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(3), 396415. doi.org/10.1108/IJEM0220170046.
- Niqab, M., Sharma, S., Mei Wei, L., & Maulod, S. B. A. (2014). Instructional leadership potential among school principals in Pakistan. *International Education Studies*, 7(6), 74–85. doi:10.5539/ies.v7n6p74.
- Pashiardis, P., & Johansson, O. (Eds.). (2016). *Successful school leadership: International perspectives*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Peariso, J. F. (2011). A study of principals` instructional leadership behaviors and beliefs of good pedagogical practice among effective California high schools serving socioeconomically disadvantaged and English learners (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). The Liberty University).
- Pont, B., Nusche D., & Hopkins D. (eds.) (2008). *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Quinn, D.M. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 447467. doi.org/10.1108/09578230210440294
- Ramatseba, L. (2012). An exploration of successful school leadership practices in challenging school context: Case studies of two secondary schools in Soweto. A dissertation submitted to the wits school of education, faculty of humanities, University of the Witwatersrand in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of education.
- Smith, S.C., & Piele, P.K. (1997). *School leadership: Handbook for excellence*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & Management*, 22(1), 7392.
- Thessin, R.A. (2019). Establishing productive principal/principal supervisor partnerships for instructional leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(5), 463483. doi.org/10.1108/JEA0920180184.
- Thien, L. M. (2020). Psychometric analysis of a malay language version of the principal instructional management rating scale. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. doi.org/10.1177/1741143220942514.
- Thomas, M., & Madden, M. (2018). Developing Leader Behaviours among the Students of an Educational Leadership Programme. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 6(1), 6185.
- Weber, J. R. (1996). *Instructional leadership: A composite working model*. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management University of Oregon. <http://eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED287211.pdf>.
- Wei, G., Lu, J., & Qian, H. (2018). Principal instructional leadership: Chinese PIMRS development and validation. *Chinese Education & Society*, 51(5), 337– 358. doi:10.1080/10611932.2018.1510688.
- Whitaker, K. (1998). Principal role changes and influence on principal recruitment and selection: An international perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(1), 3754.
- Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (2004). *Supervision: A guide to practice*. Prentice Hall.
- Wilkey, G.G. (2013). *Research into the Characteristics of Effective High School Principals: A Case Study of Leadership Practices Used in the High School Setting*, A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education (Curriculum and Instruction). Utah: Utah State University Logan.
- Wiseman, F. (2004), A useful example when teaching hypothesis testing. *Teaching Statistics*, 26, 5961. doi:10.1111/j.14679639.2004.00158.x.
- Yada, T., & Jäppinen, A. K. (2019). A systematic narrative review of prosociality in educational leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(6), 9801000.