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Abstract

School reform is a change in learning and other related internal conditions through a systematic and sustained effort to accomplish educational goals more effectively. It aims at raising students’ achievements by focusing on instructional process and improving schools’ capacity for providing better education. From reviews of empirical studies, similar emphases are found among school reform characteristics, basic leadership practices and instructional leadership dimensions. They require the practices of stimulating leadership, challenging expectations and learning climate, and frequent evaluations. The main goal is for a change in the teaching and learning process that is oriented to high expectations of student achievement. The reviews also point out the instructional roles of principals as school leaders in contributing to the growth of student learning and development, through teachers as a mediating variable.

Empirical studies on school reform have indicated the need to explore change process in relation to socio-cultural contexts. The Western framework of change process is seen to have cultural limitations when applied in different contexts. In Eastern contexts, particularly Asian, socio-culture is a major factor in determining the success or failure of the change process. Therefore, it becomes essential to conduct more cross-cultural comparative studies to appreciate local knowledge and practices in initiating changes. This study sought to explore and examine local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. It was driven by the contradiction between reform goals and educational performance in this country. Instructional leadership was used as the lens of the examination because of its ability to develop strategies for leading, teaching, and learning in schools.
This study was guided by a pragmatism worldview that highlights the use of pluralistic approaches to get a complete description of the problems being investigated. An exploratory sequential mixed-methods design was the method used in this study. The qualitative phase focused on concept discovery and development of instructional leadership practices generating from in-depth interviews with principals and teachers from senior secondary schools in Malang Regency, Indonesia. Twenty participants participated in the interviews. The follow-up quantitative phase was intended to complement the qualitative findings to attain more robust research results. Questionnaires were distributed to seventy four senior secondary schools from similar region. Fifty seven principals and 371 teachers returned completed questionnaires.

From the qualitative phase, participants’ accounts revealed a strong focus on instructional improvements. There were four expected areas for the improvements to take place: curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and students’ learning outcomes. The expected improvements were reinforced in the practices of managing, promoting, improving and assessing instruction. Some of the practices were local practices influenced by either Indonesian socio-economic, cultural or educational values, or the combination of such values. The root of these local practices could be linked to referenced instructional leadership models and findings of recent studies on direct effects of school leadership on student achievement. This strengthened the applicability of the practices while at the same time reinforcing the universality of the application. Some mismatches and overlaps of the categories of the identified practices with referenced instructional leadership models might indicate some common characteristics among the categories. This opened up opportunities for future research to compare and contrast the characteristics of the practices in multi-cultural contexts to affirm their categories.
The identified perceptions and practices were further investigated through distribution of a survey in the quantitative phase. The findings suggested that some of the identified perceptions and practices were found to be limited aspirations and not reflected in a larger scale. Although there was a significant awareness of the importance of instructional leadership practices, it did not necessarily lead to increased frequency of the practices and the subsequent perceptions of their influence on instructional improvements. The findings also showed different perceptions between principals and teachers that indicated their different priorities in instructional improvement efforts taking place in their schools.

The findings suggested a change in the existing school culture to amend how principals and teachers positioned instructional responsibilities between them and how each of them could contribute to the improvement process. The findings recommended that more promoting and improving of instructional practices be performed by principals. The findings also implied the need for a constructive mindset towards performance evaluation, particularly in the form of classroom supervision and teaching feedback. This required the presence of a mutual trust between principals and teachers. Since instructional programs were more directed by results from external evaluation, there needed to be an increased confidence in the use of authentic internal evaluations. Broader and more meaningful engagement of parents and communities in instructional programs was also recommended.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This study sought to contribute to the need to explore further on the socio-cultural contexts of school reform, to enrich cross-cultural comparative studies on leadership research. The primary interest was to explore and examine local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. It was driven by the contradiction between reform goals and educational performance in this country. Appreciation of local perceptions would help close the gap. Instructional leadership was used as the lens for the examination because of its ability to develop strategies for leading, teaching, and learning. The emerging perceptions and practices would reveal local knowledge and practices of instructional leadership that could help identify strengths and weaknesses associated with instructional improvement efforts in Indonesian school reform. A deeper awareness of local perceptions of principals and teachers within the local context of Indonesia could act as a catalyst to improve student performance within the culture.

Chapter 1 introduces the role of principals as school leaders in the context of school reform. It highlights how this leadership role has been conceptualised and practised to reform schools. A key challenge is to prove the importance of leadership practices to bring desired improvement on student learning outcomes. It brings out the relevance of instructional leadership in the improvement process. Empirical studies have shown that instructional leadership is able to develop strategies to promote improved academic progress, achieved by schools and students in particular. It makes the practices of instructional leadership relevant to Indonesian school reform as the examination of the reform progress indicates some contradictions between the reform goals and academic performance of the students. It draws attention to the importance of exploring and examining local perceptions and practices of
instructional leadership in Indonesian schools. Finally, the chapter outlines the research aims of this study as well as a brief description of the methodology.

1.1 School Leadership and Student Learning in School Reform

To improve school effectiveness and provide better learning for students, there have been consistent global efforts by educational policy makers to reform schools by increasing their public accountability (Leithwood & Day, 2008; Pont, Nusche, & David, 2008; Robinson, 2010; Sofo, Fitzgerald, & Jawas, 2012). The demand on schools of public accountability, particularly for improved student learning achievements, has brought substantial pressures for principals as school leaders, who are expected and even scrutinised to show the contribution of their work (Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2008; Gurr & Drysdale, 2012; Leithwood & Day, 2008). Effective school leaders are now recognised based on their ability to ensure academic success for every student in their school (Davies, 2005; Donaldson, 2006; Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Johnson, Ragland, & Lein, 1996; Southworth, 2005). These pressures on principals’ capabilities, however, provide the opportunity to prove the importance of school leadership (Leithwood & Day, 2008).

An underlying reason for the increased accountability of school leadership on student learning outcomes is driven by the aspiration of the authorities as the policy makers to minimise the constant gap in learning achievement between various social and ethnic groups and their confidence on the ability of school leaders to achieve this objective (OECD, 2001 cited in Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). The confidence of the public and politicians in the capacity of school leaders to make a substantial difference to student learning outcomes is supported by research examining the impact of leadership on school effectiveness and improvement, that consistently recognises the roles of school leadership in school and
teaching effectiveness (Chapman, 2003; Day, et al., 2008; Hallinger, Bickman & Davis, 1996; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Harris, 2008; Robinson, et al., 2008; McDougall, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2007; Robinson, et al., 2008; Southworth, 2002). The literature also acknowledges the quality of school leadership as a determining key to sustainable school organisational learning and improvement (Datnow, 2005; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Robinson, et al., 2008).

The initiative of school reform in Asia is primarily driven by the proposition that educational reform has to feature a multicultural education format that can transform curricular content and processes (Banks & Banks, 2004; Nieto, 2002; Malakolunthu, 2009). Therefore, in Asian contexts, the various socio-cultures are a major power in determining the success or failure of a change process, since this may influence the nature of educational change (Chen, 2008; Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). While educational reform shares many similarities across west and east, power gaps and value mismatches are two challenges to reform that appear to be unique to the Asian context (Cravens & Hallinger, 2012). Although the reform policies and programs have tried to accommodate the strengths of Western cultures into Asian traditions, some inherent cultural influences are difficult to accommodate in the tensions that emerge from some of the educational policies and programs (Ee & Seng, 2008).

It is problematic that research has shown different findings on the effectiveness of school leadership, particularly on the effects of school leadership on student learning outcomes. While some empirical studies in the U.S., U.K, France and the Netherlands have shown a positive relationship between school leadership and student outcomes (Bush, 2003; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007; Sammons, Hillman, &
Mor
timore, 1995; Southworth, 2005), other empirical studies conducted in the same countries indicate the inconsistency of these two variables in size and direction (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007; Scheerens & Creemers, 1996). Although principals can have measurable effects on student learning outcomes, these effects are more likely to be influenced by other school and classroom factors (Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2010). Research evidence in Australia has also indicated the indirect relationship between school leadership and students’ learning outcomes (Gurr, Drysdale, & Mulford, 2007; Silins & Mulford, 2004).

The contrasting evidence of the direct relationship between leadership and student learning has led to the popularity of the indirect influence of school leadership on student learning in recent leadership literature (Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007). Indirect models have been shown to have a greater impact on student performance compared to direct models (Gurr, et al., 2007; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007; Southworth, 2005). The literature suggests that although principals can have quantifiable effects on student learning performance, these effects are mostly influenced by other aspects of school life which subsequently affect what and how teachers teach in classroom (Supovitz, et al., 2010). Accordingly, more leadership research has been conducted to examine a range of other leadership activities in schools that influence instructional practices.

School climate has been identified as one of the mediating variables between school leadership and student learning outcomes. Teacher-student interaction and professional culture are found to be a contributing factor to improved learning outcomes (Hill & Rowe, 1998). A clear school mission has a positive effect on students’ reading achievement (Hallinger, Bickman, & Davis, 1996). Instructional leadership behaviours of school
principals influence the behaviours of teachers and students’ learning experiences (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). Principals who had a strong academic focus and were committed to support this with resources foster students’ learning achievements (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005). School leadership and student learning outcomes are also mediated by teachers (Gurr, et al., 2007; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Principals indirectly influence student outcomes in reading and mathematics through feedback and evaluation practices that shape teachers’ job satisfaction and achievement orientation (Bosker, De Vos, Witziers, 2000).

Research examining possible direct correlations between school leadership and learning outcomes has thrown up some explanations of the indirect relationship between these two variables. First, the methodologies employed by many of the studies might have significantly underestimated the actual effects (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Second, studies on effective leadership behaviours to improve instructional quality typically observed a limited range of leadership behaviours that restricted comparisons across studies (Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010). Third, studies on school leadership focused not on actual student outcomes but rather on other secondary results of principals’ practices (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Finally, studies have frequently assumed that school leadership has influenced students’ learning because it changed the behaviours of teachers, and neglected leadership practices that could improve classroom teaching and learning activities (Louis, et al., 2010).

Time restrictions on performing instructional roles are also argued as a factor contributing to the gap between school leadership and student learning outcomes. Principals are found to be predominantly occupied with performing their organisational functions, rather than creating and encouraging a vision of education (Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007). The dominance of organisational functions can be linked to the different assumptions about what school
leaders are and what they do (Middlehurst, 2008). School leaders are predominantly influenced by the logic of leading reform that does not much appraise the professionalism and quality located in pedagogic expertise and research (Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2008).

Amidst the existing arguments on the relationship of school leadership and student learning, research to understand the contribution of leadership to school improvement and student learning conducted by scholars in many different school contexts has supported the conclusion that school leadership affects learning by creating structural and socio-cultural processes that develop the capacity of schools for academic improvement (Chen, 2008; Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Ee & Seng, 2008; Fullan, 2007; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000; Robinson, et al., 2008; Southworth, 2002). Successful school leadership is identified by the ability to provide conditions that support effective teaching and learning and the capacity to promote professional learning and change (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Mulford & Silins, 2009; Robinson, et al., 2008). Therefore, school leadership should see instruction as an important dimension of viable leadership practices. This conclusion brings the relevance of instructional leadership practices, as explained in the following section.

1.2 Instructional Leadership and Student Learning

The introduction of instructional leadership to the leadership domain is driven by the inquiry to understand the capacity of school leaders to make substantial contributions to student learning outcomes (Robinson, et al., 2008) and to examine its role in school improvement programs (Datnow, 2005; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Robinson, et al., 2008). However, the concept of instructional leadership is as various and subjective as the number of scholars who proposed it (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005). The existing literature also fails to provide
unambiguous and uniform descriptions of this leadership theory (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999 cited in Bush, 2003). From the diverse concepts of instructional leadership, four central focuses are found that can provide the conceptual framework to understand this type of leadership. Those four focal emphases are students, teachers, teaching and learning activities, and principals. In a simple definition, instructional leadership can be construed as leadership practices that focus on students and teachers as they engage in teaching and learning activities.

In its earlier introduction, the model of instructional leadership is basically defined, based on a set of job descriptions that principals needed to perform. The roles of principals in instructional leadership have been traditionally described as the practices of communicating high expectations for teachers and students, supervising instruction, monitoring assessment and student progress, coordinating curriculum, promoting a climate for learning, and creating a supportive work environment (Bush, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003; Murphy & Hallinger, 1985; Reitzug, West & Angel, 2008). In its more recent description, it is seen from some of the behaviours of principals in executing their roles. A current focus of instructional leadership has added the emphasis on teachers’ growth into the description. This is done through collaborative inquiry with teachers, creating opportunities for reflection, discourse, and professional growth, and the development of professional learning communities (Bush, 2003; Huffman & Hipp, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Murphy, 1990; Reitzug, West, & Angel, 2008; Weber, 1996; Southworth, 2002). It can be concluded that instructional leadership practices are the activities and responsibilities of school principals in relation to classroom instructions (Goldring, et al., 2009; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Robinson, 2010).
Research on instructional leadership has acknowledged its substantial contribution to student learning. The effects of instructional leadership on student outcomes were found to be three to four times as great as the effect of transformational leadership (Robinson et al., 2008). Instructional leadership of school principals was found to be positively related to students’ mathematics and reading achievement (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005). A 10 percentile point increase in student test scores was found from the improvement of leadership abilities, where a key focus was instructional leadership (Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2003). Students in schools where leadership was reported to be more focused on teaching and learning outperformed students in schools where such leadership focus did not get much attention (Robinson et al., 2008). In addition, instructional leadership demonstrated by principals influenced how teachers performed their job (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007). Various instructional leadership practices are found to have positive effects on student outcomes compared to other leadership practices (Robinson et al., 2008). Such instructional leadership practices include promoting and participating in teacher learning and development; establishing goals and expectations; planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and curriculum; strategic resourcing and ensuring an orderly and supportive environment.

The practices of instructional leadership also influence teachers and teaching. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) found that the way principals directly established positive, successful cultures of teaching and learning in schools had very powerful indirect effects on student outcomes. They also found that the influence of school leaders on teachers’ motivation, commitment, and belief about working condition indirectly improved teaching and learning processes. Practices of developing the pedagogical capacities within the school were found to be a key to meeting challenges such as low achievement in particular
curriculum areas or of a specific group of students (Penlington, Kington, & Day, 2008). Effective school leaders were distinguished by their focus on critical instructional areas and personal responsibility for instructional matters (Nettes & Herrington, 2007). Developing teachers’ capacity and creating opportunities for them to plan and work together on instructional issues contributed to a school’s high performance (Nettes & Herrington, 2007; Penlington, et al., 2008).

In addition, a significant amount of research has thrown in increasing evidence that principals do actually have an effect on student learning outcomes (Day, et al., 2008; Leithwood & Day, 2008; Nettes & Herrington, 2007; Penlington, et al., 2008; Louis, et al., 2010; Robinson, 2010; Robinson, et al., 2008). Some research emphasises the principal’s knowledge of curriculum content and instructional materials (Louis, et al., 2010; Stein & Nelson, 2003) and other research highlights the presence of the principal’s support for improved instruction (Leithwood, 2001; Louis, et al., 2010; O’Donnell & White, 2005). Other research has signified that instructional leadership is a core responsibility for principals (Mangin, 2007; Murphy, 1990; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Robinson, 2010). Research has also shown that principals of effective schools have a strong focus on critical instructional areas (Halverson, et al., 2005).

A main conclusion that could be drawn from the empirical findings is that the practices of instructional leadership substantially improve the performance of students, teachers, school principals, and schools in general. Substantial influence on student learning outcomes is dependent upon the focus and practices of instructional leadership (Robinson, et al., 2008). It appears that in the current wave of global school reform and the increasing demand for school accountability for its learning systems, the practice of instructional leadership cannot
be more important than other forms of leadership. School reform requires certain leadership practices that can facilitate mediating variables such as teacher motivation, classroom activities, school culture, and organisational direction to affect teaching and learning and influence student outcomes (Chapman, 2003; Day, et al., 2008; Harris, 2008). This conclusion underpins the discussion on Indonesian school reform as explained in the following section. The discussion focuses on the contradiction between the goals of school reform and the learning performance of the students.

1.3 Goal-Performance Gap in Indonesian School Reform

The enactment of National Education System Law Number 20 in 2003 marked the beginning of educational reform in Indonesia. This law introduces the practice of decentralisation of educational autonomy in this country. Local governments are endowed with the autonomy to manage primary and secondary schools as the effort to accommodate and promote local characteristics and potential (Ministry of National Education, 2004). This practice of decentralised autonomy was triggered by the transition in the governance system. The collapse of the New Order Era in 1998, prompted by the severe national economic crisis and political turbulence, introduced this nation to the new perspective of a decentralised governance system. The endorsement of the Regional Governance Law Number 22 Year 1999 started the decentralisation process. By virtue of the 1945 Constitution, the Indonesia National Constitution, the law grants freedom to regions to organise regional autonomy to uphold the principles of democracy, community participation, equitable distribution and justice, and the regions’ potential and diversity.

The enactment of National Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003 has been seen as the extension of this regional governance law. The law creates a legal framework for major
educational goals, policies and plans. The key targets include expansion and equity, the improvement of quality and relevance, and the implementation of autonomy in higher education. The law seeks to open access to education at all levels and all forms: formal, non-formal, as well as informal, for all the citizens of Indonesia. Its main thrust is to make education relevant to societal needs; to develop further community-based education; and to enhance participation by the community in supporting basic education. It provides the rights and obligations of citizens, parents, communities, and government. The practice of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesian primary and secondary schools is the outcome of this educational autonomy.

The Indonesian Ministry of National Education defines SBM as a management model that grants autonomy to local schools to promote school independence and initiative in managing and empowering the available resources, to encourage school stakeholders’ participation in decision making, to increase school public accountability, and to promote healthy competition among schools for improved quality (2004). SBM implementation aims at the improvement of educational quality at individual local schools through more intense school stakeholder involvement in school programs and activities, that can lead to more transparent, accountable, democratic, and responsive school management (Fadjar, 2003; Irawan, et al., 2004; The Ministry of National Education, 2004). The implementation is acknowledged as an imperative measure to develop Indonesian civil society, improve the quality of social capital, and increase national competitive advantages (Azra, 2002; Tilaar, 2009).

After almost a decade of implementation, it becomes crucial to know how far Indonesian school reform has progressed to achieve its expected educational goals. An examination of the Indonesian profile of various indexes, including the Human Development Index (HDI),
Education Index (EI), Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), and Progress in International Reading and Literacy Study (PIRLS) indicates substandard performances. Compared to its neighbouring countries, Indonesia’s HDI measuring life expectancy, educational attainment, and income have been constantly the lowest for almost three and a half decades (see Table 1-1). The index in 2008 is worth noting as it was lower by 0.002 points than it was in 2005. Although the decline is minor, it is important to take into consideration because 2005 was two years after the introduction of school reform to the school system while 2008 was five years after the implementation.

Table 1-1 Indonesia’s and the Neighbouring Countries’ HDI Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Human Development Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDP, 2009

Indonesia’s 2005 and 2006 Education Index (EI) comprising adult literacy rates (aged 15 and older) and the combined gross enrolment ratio for primary, secondary, and tertiary schooling has also been the smallest among the countries in the region (see Table 1-2). Moreover, the indexes are stagnant at 68.2% for these two consecutive years.
Indonesia’s performance in 2006 and 2009 PISA tests has shown similar under achievement. Using the performance of Thailand as a comparison (see Table 1-3), Thai students outperformed Indonesia in those tests and showed a slight increase in their 2009 PISA scores. Like Indonesia, Thailand also experienced an intense crisis in its national education that led to educational reform in 1997, which promoted the practice of decentralised systems and school-level management (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000; Hallinger & Lee, 2011). The statistics indicate that there has been a gradual increase in Thai students’ performance in numeracy, reading, and scientific literacy as measured in these tests. On the contrary, Indonesia’s 2009 PISA scores in Mathematics and Science were lower by 20 and 10 points respectively than its 2006 PISA scores. In both the 2006 and 2009 PISA tests, Thai students attained higher scores in all domains than Indonesian students. In the 2006 PISA tests, Thai students got 26, 24 and 28 more points respectively for mathematics, reading, and science than Indonesian students. The comparison shows even higher points for Thai students in 2009 PISA mathematics and science domains, where they attained 48 and 42 more points in these respective domains than their Indonesian counterparts.

Table 1-3 Indonesia’s and Thailand’s 2006 and 2009 PISA Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Indonesia 2006 PISA</th>
<th>Indonesia 2009 PISA</th>
<th>Thailand 2006 PISA</th>
<th>Thailand 2009 PISA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD PISA, 2011
Indonesia’s performance in 2007 TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) and 2006 PIRLS (Progress in International Reading and Literacy Study) further demonstrates a poor achievement (see Table 1-4). From the rank of participating countries, Indonesia is at the lower part of the rank. In the 2007 TIMSS, Indonesia ranked 36 from 49 participating countries, while in the 2006 PIRLS, it ranked 37 out of 41 participating countries. As TIMSS provides data on curriculum coverage and implementation as well as teacher preparation, resource availability, and the use of technology, it can be assumed that these aspects of mathematics and science in teaching and learning processes in Indonesian schools are also low. Indonesia’s low rank in PIRLS tests indicates that the Indonesian curriculum for reading and its classroom approaches do not support reading literacy achievements for the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007 TIMSS (8th grade)</th>
<th>2006 PIRLS (4th grade)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average scale score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0-800)</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank from 49 countries</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Timssandpirls, 2009

As TIMSS provides data on curriculum coverage and implementation as well as teacher preparation, resource availability, and the use of technology, it can be assumed that these aspects of mathematics and science in teaching and learning processes in Indonesian schools are also low. Indonesia’s low rank in PIRLS tests indicates that the Indonesian curriculum for reading and its classroom approaches do not support reading literacy achievement for the students.
1.4 Problematic Conditions in Indonesian School Reform

The gap between school reform goals and educational performance as presented in the previous section raises the question of educational accountability, which is one of the highlighted aspects of Indonesian school reform (Sofo, et al., 2012). In questioning the power and efficacy of school reform, a few problematic conditions are identified. Lack of management efficiency both at local government and local school levels is one of them (Sofo, et al., 2012). Local authorities, including principals, have limited expertise and experience in handling the consequences of educational autonomy that calls for public participation and shared decision-making (Bjork, 2005; Chan & Sam, 2007; Nandika, 2007). This condition has prevented many principals from taking any initiatives to make necessary changes, as they continue to rely on directives from their superiors in their school districts (Chan & Sam, 2007; Irawan, et al., 2004; Surakhmad, 2002). Moreover, the insufficiency of the central government’s assistance has made local schools unprepared to execute their authority, thus maintaining the status quo (Bjork, 2003, 2005; Chan & Sam, 2007).

A further shortcoming of management has been the poor direction provided to the teaching staff (Sofo, et al., 2012). The lack of interest in teaching performance has decreased the responsibility to improve the quality of teaching (Azra, 2002; Bjork, 2005; Tilaar, 2009). Moreover, the civil service culture minimises the exercise of intellectual capacity and emphasises obedience to the authority (Bjork, 2005; Chan & Sam, 2007; Kintamani, 2002; Raihani, 2007; Tilaar, 2009).

The second problematic condition is the erratic change of education policies, especially those related to the national curriculum (Sofo, et al., 2012). The frequent curriculum changes due to poor educational leadership have been seen as one of the major impediments to improving
educational quality (Sofo, et al, 2012). The curriculum does not adequately represent students’ characteristics, voices, and interests (Kunandar, 2007; Taruna, 2007). The curriculum is also criticised for its preference for accommodating the needs and interests of the high-achieving students (Drost, 2005; Kunandar, 2007; Taruna, 2007). Only 30 per cent of Indonesian students are believed to achieve the desired benefits from the curriculum (Drost, 2005). The arguments also address the inability of the curriculum to generate the excitement for learning and the freedom to learn (Taruna, 2007). In addition, the practice of content-transfer learning to cope with the heavy load of the curriculum has weakened the relevance of learning (Kunandar, 2007; Taruna, 2007).

These two key problematic conditions apparently indicate some shortcomings in Indonesian school reform particularly in terms of leading, teaching, and learning. The practice of leadership is deprived of the capacity to embrace and execute a system of decentralised authority. Innovation and professionalism in teaching are discouraged by the existing civil service culture among teachers. The aspiration to increase educational quality and opportunities for learning success for all students is hampered by impromptu curriculum policies. These problematic conditions provoke the need to explore the perceptions of improved instructional quality anticipated by the implementation of school reform. The problematic conditions also raise the need to examine instructional practices adopted by local school actors to achieve instructional improvements. The focus of this study is the examination of perceptions related to these issues and this will reveal how instructional leadership is positioned in reform efforts in Indonesia.
1.5 Research Aims

This study seeks to contribute to the need to further explore the socio-cultural contexts of school reform to enrich cross-cultural comparative studies on leadership research. The primary interest is to explore and examine local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. A deeper awareness of local perceptions of principals and teachers within the local context of Indonesia can act as a catalyst to improve student performance within that culture. Gibson defined perception as a cognitive process that requires the ability to process information, apply knowledge, and change preferences and this ability is reflected externally in the form of action (1987). It is a requisite property of conscious action and reciprocal to the action (Gibson, 1987).

The emerging perceptions and practices will reveal local knowledge and practices of instructional leadership that should help identify problems associated with instructional improvement efforts in school reform. To that end, this study addresses issues surrounding the gap between the goals of school reform and Indonesian students’ educational achievements as discussed in sections 1.3 and 1.4. Appreciation of local perceptions will help close the gap. It is expected that this study can encourage local school actors, both principals and teachers, to reflect and think about the practices of instructional leadership in their school reform. Thus, the following research questions are posed in the thesis:

1) What instructional improvements are expected from school reform?

2) What practices of instructional leadership are carried out by principals?

a) What degree of importance of these practices is perceived by principals? What is the current frequency of these practices being performed by them? Is there a relationship between the perceived importance and the frequency of the practices?
b) What degree of importance of these practices is perceived by teachers? What degree of influence on instructional improvements of these practices is perceived by them? Is there a relationship between the perceived importance and influence on instructional improvements of the practices?

To answer these research questions, exploratory sequential mixed method was used. In its initial phase, this study began with in-depth interviews with principals and teachers to explore their perceptions of instructional improvements and instructional leadership practices in their school reform. In the second phase of this study, the identified practices of instructional leadership were measured in terms of their perceived degree of importance, degree of influence on instructional improvements, and current frequency of practices as well as the correlation among them. A distribution of cross-sectional surveys to principals and teachers was the method for this second phase. The aim of this second phase was to complement the findings of the first phase so that more robust research findings could be drawn.

1.6 Chapter 1 Summary

Chapter 1 highlights the contribution of leadership practices in developing school reform capacity for instructional improvement. It underlines the relevance of instructional leadership practices performed by principals to achieve desired goals in student learning outcomes. The examination of problematic conditions in Indonesian school reform and the contradiction between reform goals and the learning performance of the students emphasises the need to explore and examine instructional leadership practices in Indonesian schools. The exploration and examination of local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership can shed light, to understand better the instructional improvement efforts undertaken in the implementation of reform in Indonesian schools.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

School reform is a change in learning and other related internal conditions through a systematic and sustained effort to accomplish educational goals more effectively. It aims at raising students’ achievements by focusing on the teaching and learning process and improving schools’ capacities for providing better education. From the review of the literature, similar emphases are found among school reform characteristics, basic leadership practices and instructional leadership dimensions. They require the practices of stimulating leadership, challenging expectations, a school climate for learning, and frequent evaluation. The main goal is for a change in the teaching and learning process that is oriented to high expectations of student achievement. The reviews also point out the instructional roles of principals as school leaders in contributing to the growth of student learning and development, through teachers as a mediating variable.

Literature on school reform has indicated the need to further explore the change process in relation to socio-cultural contexts. The Western framework is seen to have cultural limitations when applied in different contexts. In Eastern contexts, particularly Asian, socio-culture is a major factor in determining the success or failure of a change process. The discussion on literature on school reform and leadership in an Asian context highlights some implications of socio-culture on reform practices and roles of school leaders. In the Indonesian context, school reform has been driven predominantly by the changes in national politics. Explanations of the important milestones of educational development in Indonesia highlight not only the political forces behind the development, but, more importantly, the implications of the political changes on national education.
Chapter 2 discusses the literature on school reform, school leadership, and instructional leadership to establish the theoretical association among these three key concepts. The focal point is to establish the key argument of this study that practices of instructional leadership can help bring desired improvements in student learning outcomes, as expected from the implementation of school reform. Examination of existing empirical studies reveals some common characteristics among school reform, school leadership, and instructional leadership. Elements and practices of leadership have been identified to be factors contributing to the accomplishment of school reform goals, while literature on school reform has shown strong emphases on reform efforts in teaching and learning improvements. In addition, empirical studies on instructional leadership have highlighted its contribution in leading, teaching, and learning improvements.

The examination of the progress of Indonesia’s school reform has indicated a gap between reform goals and the educational achievements of students (see Section 1.3). Further examination of the problematic conditions in Indonesian school reform (see Section 1.4) has pointed out some shortcomings in Indonesian school reform, particularly in terms of leading, teaching, and learning. Literature review on the practices of instructional leadership has revealed the key emphases on students, teachers, teaching and learning activities, as well as principals. Therefore, the examination of local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian schools becomes relevant because it can help identify strengths and weaknesses associated with leading, teaching, and learning in Indonesian school reform.
2.1 School Reform for Better Learning and Teaching

In order to improve school effectiveness and provide better learning for students, there have been consistent and global efforts by educational policy makers to reform schools, by implementing changes to increase schools’ public accountability (Leithwood & Day, 2008; Pont, Nusche, & David, 2008; Robinson, 2010). In contrast to being the most referenced term in the processes of changes that occur in schools, literature on school reform fails to provide a clear definition of school reform. Terms such as school improvement and school effectiveness or effective schools have been used instead to define the change process. The OECD defines school improvement as a change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions through a systematic, sustained effort to accomplish educational goals more effectively (Velzen, et al., 1985). This definition implies that the improvement qualifies if changes happen at school as a whole and to all aspects such as structures, processes, and climate, which lead to a pedagogical change (Dalin, 2005).

School improvement is described as a strategy to enhance student outcomes and to strengthen the school’s capacity for managing changes (Hopkins, Enskill & West, 1994). This definition means that school improvement is about raising student achievement through focusing on the teaching-learning process and the supporting conditions and improving the schools’ capacity for providing quality education in times of change (Hopkins, 1998; Hopkins, et al., 1994). It perceives educational change as necessary for school improvement (Dalin, 2005). Rowe (2007) describes school effectiveness by the presence of an ethos or culture oriented towards learning and teaching. This requires school leadership practices implemented by the principal to establish agreed goals, increase competence and involvement of staff, and clarify roles and expectations (Rowe, 2007). Effective schools are then characterised by purposeful school leadership, challenging teaching and high expectations of students’ achievement,
teachers’ involvement and consistency, a positive and orderly climate, and frequent evaluation of student progress (Rowe, 2007).

Two key goals are identified from school improvement and school effectiveness, or effective schools, as school reform explained above. First, school reform attempts to make a change in teaching and learning processes that is oriented towards high expectations of student achievement. Second, it focuses on leadership practices that can empower teachers through developing their competence, professionalism, and cohesiveness. To achieve these goals, school reform is carried out through systematic and sustainable school-wide changes that can result in increased internal efficiency, which leads to the accomplishment of the goals. From these goals, it is apparent that school reform aims at improvements in learning and teaching.

To achieve the desired improvements in learning and teaching, many governments around the world have redefined their approaches to reforming schools. In some parts of the world, centralisation of education has re-emerged. Countries such as Australia, previously known for their strong practices of decentralisation, have become more centralised. In other parts of the world, there has been a noticeable resurgence of education decentralisation. Countries which used to be centralised like Indonesia are now implementing policies of decentralisation. These changing approaches to reforming schools have brought significant development in the field of education. The most obvious to notice is the redefinition of authority given to schools, resulting in a balanced and distributed role between central government and local schools in both decentralised and centralised systems (Dalin, 2005). Democratisation of school systems through stronger participation of school stakeholders in school decision-making and the simplification and de-bureaucratisation of school administrations are the tangible proof of the shared role (Dalin, 2005).
Although the literature systematically examining the processes and outcomes of school reform efforts has grown enormously over the past decade, there has been very little direct observational data to document how schools change from being less to more effective in educating their students (McDougall, et al., 2007). The empirical basis for understanding the actual process of school reform is very limited. Few studies have examined the effects of reform models within experimental or quasi-experimental research designs that would provide clear conclusions about the effects of reform models on student learning outcomes. Even fewer studies have looked directly at the process of reform to examine prospectively the dynamics of leading school improvement (McDougall, et al., 2007). Without detailed knowledge of how schools change, the knowledge about why school reform efforts obtain the results they do will remain incomplete (Desimone, 2002; McDougall, et al., 2007).

In addition to the shortage of empirical studies on how schools improve their learning performance and how reform models affect student outcomes, there is also the concern of existing bias in the conclusions of the empirical studies. Most published research has been done in countries where English is a common language and research on schools has been systematically organised in databases for years. Dalin cautions that the presentation of results from the conducted research can be biased and subjective to these contexts (Dalin, 2005). This condition has led to the need to conduct more research on an international scale to get cross-cultural studies on school improvement. Once this is accomplished, further progress to understand school improvement can be done (Dalin, 2005).

Nevertheless, school reform has brought a substantial recognition of effective school leadership practices in managing school change. Effective school leadership has been described as a powerful medium in making reform efforts possible (Leithwood, Harris, &
Hopkins, 2008). It mobilises members to think, believe, and behave in a manner that satisfies emerging organisational needs and the demands of the society (Donaldson, 2006). Accumulating research evidence has shown a growing confidence in the role of effective school leadership in school reform programs (Bush, 2003; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Southworth, 2005). Effective school leadership has been asserted to be a key to both continuous improvement and major system transformation in schools (NCSL, 2001 in Bush, 2003; Sammons, et al., 1995; Southworth, 2005).

2.2 School Leadership for School Improvement

School improvement has been shown to be dependent upon a school’s capacity to initiate, sustain and/or manage change (Spillane, Reiser, Reimer, 2002). Capacity building is defined as ‘developing the collective ability, dispositions and skills, knowledge, motivation and resources to act together to bring about positive change’ (Spillane et al., 2002, p. 4) while improvement capacity refers to school conditions that support teaching and learning and enable the professional learning of the staff, as the means for implementing strategic actions aimed at continuous school improvement (Fullan, 2001; Mulford & Sillins, 2009). As a response to the need to enrich empirical evidence on school change processes, research on the relationship between school improvement and effective school leadership has grown quite significantly. During the last fifteen years, research on school improvement has continuously shown the pivotal role of effective leadership in securing high quality provision and high standards (NCSL, 2001 in Bush, 2003). Both primary and secondary leadership has been shown to be a key factor in almost every single study of school improvement (Sammons, et al., 1995; Southworth, 2005).
School improvement requires the presence of effective school leadership as it facilitates mediating variables such as teacher motivation, classroom activities, school culture and organisational direction, all of which affect teaching and learning and influence student outcomes (Chapman, 2003; Day, et al., 2008; Harris, 2008, 2002). Effective school leadership defines school capacity for improvement through the development of a set of structural and socio-cultural processes (Chen, 2008; Hallinger, et al., 1996; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Robinson, et al., 2008; Southworth, 2002). Reform fails when school leadership is ineffective, unsustainable and not focused on capacity building and empowerment (James, 2010). School improvement also requires strategic leadership practices that focus on setting goals, deciding the timeframe for change, developing school capacity and strengthening parental involvement to manage the emerging conflicts during the implementation phase of improvement programs (Chen, 2008).

School improvement has been described as context-specific (Datnow, Hubbard, & Mehan, 2002; Elmore, 1993; Fullan, 1991; Harris, 2009; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001) and cultural in nature (Dimmock, 2000; James, 2008). Therefore, the focus of school improvement efforts should be derived from contextual factors existing within a given school at a given time (Ainscow & West, 2006; Harris & Chrispeels, 2006). Reforms will not work when the policy for school improvement does not take this context-specific characteristic into account (Datnow, et al, 2002; Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 1991; Harris, 2008; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001). Context-specificity, focus on learning level, capacity development and evaluation of school improvement approaches are critical areas for development for school improvement (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001; Hopkins, 2001; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000).
For improvement efforts, schools should not be treated as a homogeneous group (Chapman, 2005). As each school has its own characteristics, the focus of improvement efforts should relate to the contextual factors existing within the school at a certain time (Harris & Chrispeels, 2006). Although school leadership acts as a catalyst for school improvement, both the nature of leadership and its impacts are shaped by historical and current conditions in the schools (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Effective leadership for school improvement must be responsive to school characteristics (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). The type of leadership exercised during the improvement period must be linked both to the school learning profile and its improvement capacity at a specific time along the process (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). School leaders must be prepared to adjust their strategies to changing conditions at different stages of school improvement (Hallinger, 2003; Jackson, 2000).

Empirical studies have shown that school leaders have an important role in making school improvement happen by creating structural and socio-cultural processes that develop the capacity of schools for improvement (Chen, 2008; Fullan, 2007; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Leithwood, et al., 1999). Their role is of importance, despite current trends toward emergent models of relational leadership such as facilitative and transformative (Blasé & Anderson, 1995; Fullan, 2007b; Leithwood, et al., 1999). Strong, committed and skilled school leaders are required to face the dynamic complexity of school reform and the importance of leadership cannot be reduced by mechanisms such as committees, standardised operating procedures, or participative decision-making (Chen, 2008). As change agents, school leaders develop school capacity to manage change (Fullan, 2007; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000) and empower followers to realise their potentials; thus, they increase organisational productivity and capacity to restructure schools (Chen, 2008).
However, leadership does not work in isolation in school improvement. Leadership is a necessary but not sufficient condition for productive change (McDougall, et al., 2007). Leadership succeeds when it involves setting and sharing goals or standards, utilising indicators or assessment information, establishing and maintaining productive settings, seeking out, and cultivating, assistance and collaboration (McDougall, et al., 2007). Accordingly, educational reforms should focus on making change a collaborative process between the schools and their wider communities (Sergiovanni, 2001; Dalin, et al., 1994). Although the change process requires the need to reform structures, content and processes, these organisational changes require human participation to change (Shakeshaft, 2004). School improvement can fail when stakeholders are not involved, particularly prior to its implementation (Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 1991). The opinions of stakeholders on school improvement and their reactions to it are important to understand the whole change process of school improvement (Fullan, 1991).

For improvement to take place, change is introduced and implemented to all school aspects and incorporates other factors that may determine desired pedagogical improvement (Dalin, 2005). Improvement depends not only on the educational context of a certain effort, but also on wider contexts of political, social, economic, cultural and demographic factors (OECD Report, 1989 cited in Dalin, 2005). Therefore, to initiate school reform, a holistic approach should develop and connect all levels of the internal system to the external system that they interact with (Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 1991; Hopkins, 2001). Reform policies need to cover all systems to achieve the consistency of the reform policy structure and involve them, to synchronise the efforts within the systems, and to create clarity and consistency at both the top and bottom of the system (Hopkins, 2001, 2005).
Yet, restructuring the education sector as a systemic approach to improvement may not necessarily lead to improvements in student achievement, particularly if these focus on wrong variables. Variables that are distant from day-to-day teaching and learning in schools have been argued to have less impact on student outcomes compared to variables related to psychological, instructional, and home environment (Datnow, 2005; Elmore, 2000; Hattie, 2003). Current research on school leadership has been showing growing emphasis on the contribution of instructional leadership in school improvement (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Gurr, et al., 2007). As instructional leadership accentuates students’ learning and teacher empowerment, a focus on this type of leadership can be a strategy for school improvement. Further explanation of instructional leadership can be found in section 2.4 to 2-6 of this chapter.

### 2.3 Basic School Leadership Practices

Along with its rapid recognition in school improvement and reform programs worldwide, school leadership has experienced similarly fast development in its concepts and theories resulting in the introduction of various leadership models. The rich concepts and theories of school leadership have led to the absence of an agreed definition of it (Bush, 2003). However, as Davies writes, ‘leadership can take many forms’ and ‘defining leadership can draw on many sources and be seen from many perspectives’ (2005, p. 2). Despite various concepts and theories of school leadership, the majority of successful school leaders are characterised by similar basic leadership practices (Leithwood, et al., 2008).

The main task for school leaders is to help improve employees’ performance. Since the performance is influenced by employees’ beliefs, values, motivations, skills and knowledge and their working conditions, school leaders will embrace practices helpful in dealing with
factors influencing performance (Leithwood, et al., 2008). Examining research evidence on leadership qualities and practices in schools, Leithwood and others categorise four basic practices of school leadership. The first practice is building vision and setting directions. It is basically about creating shared purpose to stimulate work performance. The basic practices that successful leaders commonly do are building a shared vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals and demonstrating high-performance expectations.

The second practice is understanding and developing people. The objective of this practice is not only to improve teachers’ knowledge and skills required for accomplishing organisational goals, but also to build their characters in terms of commitment, capacity and flexibility to actualise the improved knowledge and skills. The basic practices that successful leaders generally do are providing individualised support and consideration, fostering intellectual stimulation, and modelling appropriate values and behaviours.

The third practice is redesigning the organisation. This is particularly concerned with providing working conditions that allow teachers to make the most of their motivations, commitments and capacities. Teachers’ beliefs about and responses to their working conditions have shown significant variations in school leadership practices. The basic practices that successful leaders usually do are building collaborative cultures, restructuring and re-culturing the organisation, building productive relations with parents and the community, and connecting the school to its wider environment.

The fourth practice is managing teaching and learning programs. This aims at creating productive working conditions for teachers, fostering organisational stability and strengthening school infrastructure. The basic practices that successful leaders do are staffing
the teaching program, providing teaching support, monitoring school activity and protecting staff against distractions from their work.

As leadership is not set in isolation but contingent to the context where it exists (Davies, 2005; Middlehurst, 2008; Southworth, 2005), the application of these basic practices is varied and context-influenced (Leithwood, et al., 2008). Leadership can be contextualised by many factors such as history and culture, particular settings, methodological approaches and perspectives of particular disciplines, the availability of resources, and other factors (Leithwood, 2003; Middlehurst, 2008). Leaders are encouraged to be sensitive and to match and adapt appropriate styles and behaviours to the context that they are dealing with (Davies, 2005, Middlehurst, 2008). Successful leaders are those who are sensitive to context. It is about being aware of patterns and trends outside the schools, understanding the implications they may have on students’ learning needs, and taking appropriate actions accordingly (Davies, 2005). Therefore, the ways in which leaders perform these basic leadership practices are more as responsiveness to the contexts rather than a dictation by the contexts (Leithwood, et al., 2008).

2.4 Instructional Leadership as a Revived Leadership Practice

Over the past fifty years, the existing research to understand the contribution of leadership to school reform and student learning, conducted by scholars in many different school contexts, has supported the conclusion that leadership affects learning by creating structural and socio-cultural processes that develop the capacity of schools for academic improvement (Chen, 2008; Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Findings from empirical research have shown that successful school leadership is characterised by the ability to provide conditions that support effective teaching and learning and by the capacity to
promote professional learning and change (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Mulford & Silins, 2009; Robinson, et al., 2008). Therefore, educational leadership should see instruction as an important dimension of viable leadership practices. This supposition brings to light the importance of instructional leadership.

In addition, scholars have urged that school leadership research needs to be ‘relevant and practical for practitioners’ (Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2008, p. 275). This means that theories of teaching and learning should serve as a foundation for leadership research and engage with the realities faced by students and teachers (Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2008). Current research on school leadership has been showing a growing emphasis on the contribution of instructional leadership in reforming and improving school performance (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Goldring, et al., 2009; Gurr, et al., 2007; Hattie, 2003, 2005; Huffman & Hipp, 2003; Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Monroe, 2003; NAESP, 2001 cited in Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Robinson, 2010; Rowe, 2007). While teachers are held accountable for the improvement of student learning in schools, changing the organisational conditions for improvement across schools remains the central task of school leaders (Halverson, et al., 2005). Instructional leadership shifts the debates between instructional, managerial and transformational practice to a new conception of creating accountable learning systems in schools (Halverson, et al., 2005).

As instructional leadership is responsive to a variety of contexts, the definition of this leadership theory is quite diverse. However, from the review on definitions of instructional leadership, four key emphases are found: students, teachers, teaching and learning activities, and principals. Firstly, from all existing definitions of instructional leadership, the underlined
objective is to provide students with improved learning opportunities that suit with their academic and developmental needs. Secondly, instructional leadership focuses on the behaviour of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students (Leithwood, et al., 1999). It involves conferencing with teachers, promoting teachers’ professional growth, and fostering teacher reflection (Blase & Blase, 1998). It also promotes collaborative inquiry with teachers, opportunities for reflection, discourse, and professional growth, and development of professional learning communities (Huffman & Hipp, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006).

Next, instructional leadership is the provision of quality teaching and learning standards (Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008). It highlights teaching and learning activities, including teacher professional development and student growth (Southworth, 2002 cited in Bush, 2003). It improves teaching and learning through modelling, monitoring, and professional dialogue and discussion (Southworth, 2002). It focuses on teaching strategies that are demonstrably effective in meeting the developmental and learning needs of all students, regardless their intake characteristics and backgrounds (Hattie, 2005; Rowe, 2007).

Lastly, instructional leadership is ingrained in a belief that the distinctive feature of school leaders is their aspiration and responsibility to enhance students’ learning (Southworth, 2005). It is a series of principal behaviours comprised of making suggestions, giving feedback, modelling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching (Blase & Blase, 2000). It involves the communication of high expectations for teachers and students, supervision of instruction, monitor of assessment and student progress, coordination of school curriculum, promotion of a climate for learning, and the creation of a supportive
working environment (Goldring, et al., 2009; Marks & Printy, 2003; Murphy, 1990). It requires principals to guide and encourage an educational environment in which, together with teachers, they diagnose and solve the problems experienced by their schools (NAESP, 2001 cited in Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

2.5 Repertoire of Instructional Leadership Practices

The recognition of instructional leadership has been the result of an increasing emphasis on managing teaching and learning as the core activities of educational institutions (Bush, 2003). In its earlier introduction, instructional leadership was basically defined as based on a set of job descriptions that principals needed to perform. In its recent term, it is seen from the perspective of some of the behaviour of principals in executing their roles. The emphases on the behaviours of principals have evolved from principals as value brokers in the 1920s, principals as scientific managers in the 1930s, principals as bureaucratic executives in the 1960s, principals as humanistic facilitators in the 1970s, to principals as instructional leaders in the 1980s (Reitzug, et al., 2008). Although principals as moral stewards, educators and community builders have been recently added to frame the role of principals (Murphy, 2002), literature analysis of principalship in the 1990s has shown instructional leadership as a continuing dominant behaviour (Monroe, 2003).

The role of principals in instructional leadership has been traditionally described as the practices of communicating high expectations for teachers and students, supervising instruction, monitoring assessment and student progress, coordinating curriculum, promoting a climate for learning, and creating a supportive work environment (Marks & Printy, 2003; Murphy, 1990). A recent focus on instructional leadership has added the emphasis on teachers’ growth into the description. This is done through collaborative inquiry with

Research has confirmed that school leaders are capable of having significant positive effects on student learning and other important outcomes (Robinson, et al., 2008; Silins & Mulford, 2002; Waters, et al., 2003). However, estimates of the size of these effects vary by type of study, modest in the case of large-scale empirical evidence, quite large in the case of qualitative studies of outlier schools (Murphy, 2009) or schools that perform significantly beyond expectation (Mulfors, et al., 2009). Indeed enough evidence is now at hand to justify claims about significant leadership effects on students that the focus of attention for many leadership researchers has moved on to include questions about how those effects occur.

Since the effects of school leadership on students are largely indirect (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Witziers, Bosker & Kruger, 2003) answering these ‘how’ questions means searching for the most powerful mediators of leadership influence on students. Hallinger and Heck (1996) review these mediators as follows: school-goal setting processes and goal consensus, school climate and culture, decision-making processes, programs and instructions, resources, teachers’ expectations, commitment and attitudes toward change, instructional organisation, a sense of community and an orderly environment.

Many empirical studies aimed at identifying significant leadership mediators since the above review have examined only a single or very small numbers of mediators (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy, Tarter & Hoy, 2006), whereas the few more comprehensive accounts of potential mediators (Leithwood, et al., 2004; Silins & Mulford, 2002) are likely too complex to act as
ready guides to practice. Furthermore, the basis on which mediators are selected for attention by researchers often remains unclear; there seems little consensus about which one holds the greatest potential. Such approaches to the identification of powerful leadership mediators provide little guidance to practising leaders who have to decide where best to focus their efforts. These are the limitations.

Despite the limitations discussed in the preceding paragraphs, accumulating studies have recognised consistent roles and practices of instructional leadership. A review done by Nettles and Herrington (2007) found seven practices of school leadership that had direct effects on student achievement.

(1) Creating a safe and orderly environment by setting and communicating behavioural standards, implementing effective processes to ensure that behavioural policies are applied consistently for all students, assuring that discipline is used consistently and fairly, and dispersing the responsibility for discipline throughout the school,

(2) Setting a clear vision and mission to improve the overall culture and organisation of the school,

(3) Involving stakeholders by building the leadership capacity of teachers and staff, encouraging team-learning focused on school-wide goals, using organisational flexibility to enhance effectiveness, and distributing leadership responsibilities throughout the school,

(4) Monitoring school progress by using assessment to inform instruction, communicating information on student data to all stakeholders, constantly evaluating the instructional quality and academic progress of the school, and using school and student data to guide instructional decisions.
(5) Having a focus on critical instructional areas and taking a personal interest and responsibility for instructional matters. Instructional focus is also shown by creating focused school goals and communicating them to stakeholders, managing the instructional environment by frequent monitoring of instructional processes, and promoting an academic learning climate by maintaining high expectations, providing sufficient instructional resources, and ensuring adequate professional development opportunities for teachers.

(6) Having high expectations for student performance. Effective principals expect teachers to understand school conditions before they start work, have high levels of participation in professional development activities, provide high-quality instructional practice, prioritise student achievement, and focus time management towards instructional priorities.

(7) Providing professional development opportunities especially for teachers. Effective principals are those who participate in professional development activities to gain understanding of classroom practices and acquire professional development resources for their school, such as time for training, funding to pay for training, and professional development materials.

These consistent roles and practices of instructional leadership can be found in the practices of Hallinger and Murphy’s instructional leadership model, Murphy’s instructional leadership model, and Weber’s instructional leadership model. These three models are selected as the exemplars of instructional leadership models because the practices highlighted in the models have become common and repeated features of more recent empirical studies on instructional leadership (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Goldring, et al., 2009; Hattie, 2005; Huffman & Hipp, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008;
There are three dimensions of Hallinger and Murphy’s instructional leadership model (1985). The first dimension is defining school mission by framing school goals and communicating the goals to stakeholders. The second dimension is managing instructional programs by supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating school curriculum, and monitoring student progress. The last dimension is promoting school climate by protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, enforcing academic standards, and providing incentives for students. Murphy (1990) further developed the model by adding a dimension of developing a supportive network and environment. This dimension is carried out by creating a safe and orderly learning environment, providing opportunities for meaningful student involvement, developing staff collaboration and cohesion, securing outside resources, and forging links between home and school.

Weber’s instructional leadership (1996) has five dimensions of instructional leadership but with fewer job descriptions compared to the previously explained models. The first dimension is defining school mission by developing goals with stakeholders. The second dimension is managing curriculum and instruction by monitoring classroom practices, providing resources and supporting best practices, and using data to drive instructional practices. The third dimension is promoting a positive learning climate by communicating goals, establishing expectations, and establishing an orderly learning environment. The fourth dimension is observing and improving instruction by observing classrooms and providing
professional development opportunities. The last dimension is assessing instructional programs by planning, designing, administering and analysing curriculum effectiveness.

Table 2-1 Dimensions of Instructional Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallinger &amp; Murphy</td>
<td>Defining school mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1985)</td>
<td>Managing instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting school climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy (1990)</td>
<td>Defining mission &amp; goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing educational production function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting academic learning climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing supportive work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing curriculum &amp; instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting positive learning climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observing &amp; improving instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing instructional programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three models of instructional leadership show a continual development of the instructional roles of school principals (see Table 2-1). The dimensions and job descriptions of the later model are built on those of the previous model while simultaneously offering a new dimension to be performed. This shows interconnectedness among the models and progressive development of the concept. The linkage among the models also illustrates a more elaborate yet closely related development of the concept of instructional leadership and the roles of instructional leaders. More importantly, the practices depicted in these three models of instructional leadership are reinforced by recent empirical studies on instructional leadership (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Goldring, et al., 2009; Gurr, et al., 2007; Hattie, 2003, 2005; Huffman & Hipp, 2003; Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Monroe, 2003; NAESP, 2001 cited in Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Robinson, 2010; Rowe, 2007).

2.6 Instructional Leadership for Learning, Teaching, and Leading

Research on instructional leadership has acknowledged its substantial contribution to student learning. The effects of instructional leadership on student outcomes were found to be three
to four times as great as the effects of transformational leadership (Robinson, et al., 2008). The instructional leadership of school principals was found to be positively related to students’ mathematics and reading achievement (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005). A 10 percentile point increase in student test scores was found from the improvement of leadership abilities, where a key focus was instructional leadership (Waters, et al., 2003). Students in schools where leadership was reported to be more focused on teaching and learning outperformed students in schools where such leadership focus did not get much attention (Robinson, et al., 2008).

In addition, instructional leadership demonstrated by principals influenced how teachers performed their job (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007). Various instructional leadership practices are found to have positive effects on student outcomes compared to other leadership practices (Robinson et al., 2008). Such instructional leadership practices include promoting and participating in teacher learning and development; establishing goals and expectations; planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and curriculum; strategic resourcing and ensuring an orderly and supportive environment.

The practices of instructional leadership also influence teachers and teaching. Leithwood and others (2008) found that the way principals directly established positive, success cultures of teaching and learning in the school had very powerful indirect effects on student outcomes. They also found that the influence of school leaders on teachers’ motivation, commitment, and beliefs about working conditions indirectly improved teaching and learning processes. Practices of developing the pedagogical capacities within the school were found to be a key to meet challenges such as low achievement in particular curriculum areas or of a specific group of students (Penlington, et al., 2008). Effective school leaders were distinguished by
their focus on critical instructional areas and personal responsibility for instructional matters (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Developing teachers’ capacity and creating opportunities for them to plan and work together on instructional issues contributed to a school’s high performance (Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Penlington, et al., 2008).

In addition, a significant amount of research has shown increasing evidence that principals do actually have an effect on student learning outcomes (Day, et al., 2008; Leithwood & Day, 2008; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Penlington, et al., 2008; Louis, et al., 2010; Robinson, 2010; Robinson, et al., 2008). Some research emphasises principals’ knowledge of curriculum content and instructional materials (Louis, et al., 2010; Stein & Nelson, 2003) and other research highlights the presence of principals’ support for improved instruction (Leithwood, 2001; Louis, et al., 2010; O’Donnell & White, 2005). Other research has signified that instructional leadership is a core responsibility for principals (Mangin, 2007; Murphy, 1990; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Robinson, 2010). Research has also shown that principals of effective schools have a strong focus on critical instructional areas (Halverson, et al., 2005).

From the quoted studies explained above, it can be concluded that instructional leadership remains a fundamental leadership practice to improve the performance of students, teachers, school principals, and schools in general. Robinson et al (2008) summarised this powerful impact of instructional leadership in the following statement: ‘the more leaders focus their relationships, their work, and their learning on the core business of teaching and learning, the greater their influence on student outcomes’ (p. 636).
2.7 Association among School Reform, School Leadership, and Instructional Leadership

Figure 2-1 encapsulates the similar emphases among the characteristics of school reform, the basic practices of school leadership, and the dimensions of instructional leadership, as explained in the previous sections of this Chapter. School reform is basically a change in pedagogical approach in teaching and learning that aims to provide improved student learning opportunities and achievement. To achieve this objective, school reform requires leadership practices that are purposeful, supportive, positive and academically stimulating. It involves teachers’ empowerment, competence development, professionalism and cohesiveness. It entails a positive and orderly school climate embedded in high expectations. It also necessitates frequent evaluation of student progress. These characteristics of school reform correspond with basic practices of school leadership that consist of building vision and setting directions, developing teachers’ skills and knowledge, providing supportive working conditions and managing teaching and learning programs.

The characteristics of school reform and basic practices of school leadership are found in the elements of instructional leadership, particularly in Weber’s instructional leadership model. The model consists of five dimensions: developing school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, promoting a positive learning climate, observing and improving instruction and assessing instructional programs. The similar goals and commonality among school reform, school leadership, and instructional leadership build the association among them and the theoretical assumption of this study. This study assumes that exploring and examining practices of instructional leadership performed by principals can bring better understanding of reform efforts applied in the schools.
2.8 School Reform, Culture, and Leaders in Asia

Since the beginning of 2000, there has been an increasing interest in the comparative study of education systems in Western and Asian contexts (Chen, 2008; Cheng, 2000; Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Hallinger, 2010; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000; Sofo, et al., 2012). The main reason for this interest is the tremendous achievement of students from particular Asian countries (Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Sofo, et al., 2012). Results from international studies such as PISA 2009 consistently show China, Hong Kong, Singapore and South Korea outperforming other OECD countries in mathematics, sciences and reading (Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; OECD, 2010). Although there has been a renewed interest in investigating the role of different models of leadership in educational change in the Southeast Asian context, there has been little empirical work in this area and even fewer longitudinal studies (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Sofo, et al., 2012).
In addition, findings from empirical studies have thrown accumulating evidence on the need to explore more on the change process in relation to the socio-cultural contexts where reform is taking place. Most of the published research has been done in countries where English is a common language and research on schools has been systematically organised in databases for years (Dalin, 2005). Therefore, the presentation of results from the conducted research can be biased and subjective to these contexts (Dalin, 2005). The Western framework is seen to have a limitation of cultural validity when applied in different contexts (Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). In non-Western, particularly in Asian contexts, socio-culture is a major power in determining the success or failure of a change process (Chen, 2008; Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). This has led to the urgency of cross-cultural comparative studies to understand indigenous knowledge and culturally-grounded practices on school reform (Chen, 2008; Ee & Seng, 2008; Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000; Malakolunthu, 2009). Once this is accomplished, further progress to understand school reform can be done (Dalin, 2005).

The initiative of school reform in Asia is primarily driven by the proposition that educational reform has to feature a multicultural education format that can transform curricular content and process (Banks & Banks, 2004; Nieto, 2002). The students are expected to be able to surpass ethnic identity, self-concept, and personal viewpoint about life and create attitudes that would make them more tolerant to new experiences and help develop broader perspectives (Nieto, 2002). Empirical studies have confirmed that the ability of school leaders to create socio-cultural processes is crucial to developing school capacity for academic improvement (Fullan, 2007; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999). In Asian contexts, school leaders need to be competent in leading various
polarized students from diverse and culturally ethnocentric societies (Malakolunthu, 2009). For any large scale change or transformation programs, this competence becomes paramount for the achievement of the necessary results (Malakolunthu, 2009).

Cheng (2000) argues for a more holistic understanding of the cultural factors at play in educational reform, suggesting that any framework should specifically account for societal, community, school, and classroom influences (Sofo, et al., 2012). Cultural norms provide those in the leadership level with more significant positions, power and informal authority and the opportunity to catalyse and sustain the change process (Cheng, 2000; Chen, 2008; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). However, the obligation to comply with this culturally-embedded power and authority can create surface politeness and passive resistance among staff (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). Therefore, it becomes important for leaders to transform cultural norms by reducing the power distance between them and their followers to initiate stimulus for change (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000).

While educational reform shares many similarities across west and east, power gaps and value mismatches are two challenges to reform that appear to be unique to the Asian context (Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Hallinger & Heck, 2010;). Large power gaps can serve to accelerate change in some circumstances, through enhanced compliance or take-up of initiatives; but this may not be the case when the reforms are more complex and require a greater degree of autonomy (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). Although the reform policies and programs have tried to accommodate the strengths of West cultures into Asian traditions, some inherent cultural influences are difficult to eliminate from the tensions that emerge from some of the educational policies and introduced programs (Ee
There are four identified tensions that are intrinsic in the Asian education system: diversity versus uniformity in school choice, national syllabi and examinations; autonomy versus control on quality assurance; innovation versus conservation where academic performance remains a measure of success built in a drilling and testing environment; and equity versus elitism in the implementation of meritocracy and absence of affirmative action policies, resulting in ethnic-based preferential treatment both socio-economically and educationally (Tan, 2007). The implications for school leaders will depend on their ability to make judgments on moral issues as education becomes more complex and schools are to work close to the boundaries of established rules and values (Ee & Seng, 2008). As there will be more predicaments and trade-offs in the education system, managing educational reform requires a delicate balancing act (Ee & Seng, 2008). Leaders must be thoughtful in exercising autonomy intelligently to ensure that the educational foundations are firm (Ee & Seng, 2008).

Nevertheless, empirical studies have shown that the dynamic complexity of school reform in Asian contexts signifies the importance of leadership and skilled leaders (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Sofo, et al., 2012). This requirement cannot be reduced by mechanisms such as committees, standardised operating procedures, or participative decision-making (Chen, 2008). Research has suggested that skilled school leaders are more likely to be able to initiate school change and make their reform efforts successful (Chen, 2008). A key conclusion is that understanding the nuances of reform in a non-Western context has much to teach us about the immense influence of culture and the embedded roles of leaders within the culture.
2.9 Educational Development in Indonesia

As the world’s fourth most populous country with around 237,424,363 people (2011 Census) of 300 ethnic groups, spreading over 6,000 out of 17,508 islands, Indonesia by itself has become a spot of attention in the international sphere for its development as a nation. To examine the system of this country and the issues related to its national development phenomena, it is important to have knowledge of the important milestones that have collectively shaped this country as it is, at the present time. The understanding of Indonesia in the present, including its national education system, cannot be achieved without the awareness of Indonesia in the past. The milestones provide the path to link these two stages of Indonesia as a nation. Further, to understand the current state of education in Indonesia, it is necessary to examine the development of the system, especially the impacts that the nation’s social, economic, and political conditions have left on schools (Bjork, 2005).

The first education system in Indonesia can be traced down to the period of Buddhist and Hindu kingdoms, which began in the fifth century (Bjork, 2005). Education during this early-kingdom period mainly focused on teaching religion and learning scriptures and was done by local religious leaders (Bjork, 2005; Rafik & Amin, 1983). In the thirteenth century, the arrival of merchants from the Middle East and Muslim India brought along the teaching of Islam to native Indonesians (Bjork, 2005). Education thrived during this Islamic kingdom period through the establishment of many pondok pesantrens (Islamic boarding schools) (Rafik & Amin, 1983). Pondok pesantrens used a boarding system where students from different cities lived and studied the language, texts and doctrines of Islam together in one place (Rafik & Amin, 1983). Therefore, pondok pesantrens were considered to be Indonesia’s first system of mass education (Rafik & Amin, 1983).
The arrival of the Portuguese, later followed by the British in the fifteenth century started the European influence on Indonesian education. The Portuguese priests came to establish Roman Catholic seminaries and to teach Christianity (Bjork, 2005; Rafik & Amin, 1983). In the sixteenth century, the Dutch came with the Dutch East India Company and began a period of imperialism in Indonesia that lasted for more than 350 years. In the early years of colonisation, native citizens were not allowed access to education, except limited privileges for members of the Javanese aristocracy who worked for the Dutch government (Djojonegoro, 1997; Tilaar, 1995). Education for the aristocratic children was mainly to prepare them to be candidates for administration and civil service positions (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). During the colonial period, education activities in pondok pesantrens were strictly controlled (Rafik & Amin, 1983).

At the end of the eighteenth century, driven by the Dutch Ethical Policy (Etiche Politiek) proposed by Van Deventer, the Dutch government opened access to education for native Indonesians (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). This policy was intended to promote native people through western education and became new political policy for the Dutch government (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). Two decades after the initiation of this policy, the colonial government established schools for the natives (Sekolah Rakyat) (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). However, the system still segregated Dutch and Indonesian students. This education segregation had triggered prominent Indonesian scholars to establish educational institutions for the natives (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). The establishment of Budi Utomo in 1908 initiated this movement and it was regarded as a national awakening (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). This movement was followed by the establishment of Muhammadiyah in 1912 and Taman Siswa in 1922 (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995).
The defeat of the Dutch and their allies against Japan during World War II brought subsequent Japanese occupation in Indonesia from 1942 to 1945. Under the slogan of Greater East Asian Co-prosperity, Japan’s arrival in Indonesia was initially welcomed enthusiastically (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). It was seen as the liberation from Dutch colonial power (Library of Congress, 2012). However, Indonesia suffered a great deal of hardship for the war effort during this occupation (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). Food and other vital necessities were seized by the occupiers, leading to extensive hardship and hunger by the end of the war (Library of Congress, 2012). The forced mobilisation of millions of romusha (manual laborers) to work on economic development and defence construction projects in Java was claimed to be the worst exploitation (Library of Congress, 2012; Tilaar, 1995).

The quality and quantity of education declined sharply during this Japanese occupation (Bjork, 2005; Djojonegoro, 1997; Tilaar, 1995). Private schools were closed down and only government schools were allowed to operate (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). The use of Dutch as a medium of teaching was banned and replaced by Japanese and Bahasa Indonesia (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). Textbooks were translated into Japanese (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). The obedience to the Japanese Emperor and the teaching of Japanese language, culture, and history was regulated (Bjork, 2005; Rafik & Amin, 1983). Young Indonesians were educated, trained and armed for the purpose of supporting Japanese approaching wars against the Dutch and their allies and to be cheap labourers for Japanese projects (Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). The freedom to think and act was greatly suppressed (Rafik & Amin, 1983).
When Indonesia declared its independence as a republic on August 17, 1945, the improvement of the intellectual capacity of the nation was the concern of the nation’s forefathers (Bjork, 2005; Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). The first government made education access for all citizens one of the priorities of this new nation (Bjork, 2005; Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). Education was regarded as an important instrument for eliminating disparities among social classes (Bjork, 2005). The public school system was run based on the principle of national cohesion, resulting in a single model of schooling for all citizens (Bjork, 2005). This equality of education access is regulated in The Introduction of the 1945 National Constitution which was enacted shortly after independence. Chapter XIII Article 31 Clause 2 of this constitution articulates the right of every citizen to get a proper education. This Article also regulates the responsibility of the government to ensure education for all citizens.

However, the lack of human resources and experience to run national education and the rejection of the use of the European (Dutch) system, as well as the massive infrastructure destruction during the Japanese occupation, had made the education mission of this new nation dispiriting and overwhelming (Bjork, 2005; Rafik & Amin, 1983). These incredible challenges did not stultify the people who wanted to be educated and during the first years of independence, national education thrived tremendously (Rafik & Amin, 1983). Unfortunately, burdened by post-war conditions and national political and economic instability, this new nation also had to deal with sporadic attacks led by rebellious armed groups in some parts of Indonesia (Bjork, 2005). The threat of national disunity and the pressure to safeguard its independence became a more important issue for the government and shifted attention away from the education sector (Bjork, 2005). Schools of this period
had to deal with massive challenges without sufficient support from the government, but at the same time experiencing a degree of autonomy (Bjork, 2005).

The enactment of the 1950 Constitution, replacing the 1945 National Constitution, introduced the practice of parliamentary democracy in Indonesia. However, the political and economic instability that occurred during the first two decades after the independence (1945-1959) led to the urgency of building national cohesion and augmenting central authority (Bjork, 2005). The replacement of the 1950 Constitution back to the 1945 National Constitution, as decreed by the President in 1959, ended the parliamentary system. This presidential decree, popularly known as Politics Manifestation (Manifesto Politik), was considered as a state policy and later became a national doctrine (Tilaar, 1995). This took away the mandated power from the House of Representatives to the President (Tilaar, 1995). This political change fundamentally altered the centre-local relations in Indonesia and started the era of a centralised and top-down government system (Bjork, 2005).

During this Old Order Era, centralised government became the image for all public sectors including the education sector (Bjork, 2005; Rafik & Amin, 1983; Tilaar, 1995). Key educational policies, such as on national educational objectives and curriculum, were decided by the central government (Bjork, 2005). To educate the citizens, socialisation programs were developed and mass media was used as a political tool and not as the means for critical thinking (Tilaar, 1995). During this period, education was closely intertwined with politics (Tilaar, 1995). Schools were the place not only for developing academic skills, but also for moulding desired citizens (Bjork, 2005). The government was greatly occupied with the desire for control and political stability and this condition provided teachers with an amount of independence unnoticed in official accounts (Bjork, 2005).
The system of centralised government continued to a greater extent under the ruling of the subsequent New Order government. The failed attempted coup of the Communist Party in 1965 marked the beginning of the New Order regime that lasted for 30 years from 1968 to 1998. Driven by the economic adversity experienced during the era of the previous government, the government of the New Order Era prioritised the rehabilitation of national economics (Tilaar, 1995). National development programs were meticulously planned in what was called a Five Year Development Program (*Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun*) (Tilaar, 1995). During the subsequent three decades of this era, Indonesia experienced substantial economic growth under the strong political control of the government (Bjork, 2005).

Under the New Order regime, the mono-loyalty to central government coloured the working atmosphere in the education sector where teachers were doctrinised to be the agents of central government rather than the representatives of communities (Bjork, 2005). During this period, teachers were rewarded because of their obedience and loyalty to the authorities (Bjork, 2005; Tilaar, 1995). Excellence in teaching and the obligation to improve the quality of learning did not capture the interest of the government (Bjork, 2005). Schools were regarded as an important link to national integration and school communities were expected to respect their ties to the central government (Bjork, 2005; Tilaar, 1995). The government gradually tightened the connection of local schools to the central authority (Bjork, 2005).

Three decades of steady growing economics under the governance of the New Order came to the end when the global wave of financial crisis in the late 1990s found its way to the East Asian region. This monetary crisis hit Indonesia quite badly, shattered its economic stability and brought a massive crisis in many aspects of its national life. The political and social
unrest resulting from this crisis became the major force in the downfall of the New Order government in 1998. The long ruling centralised government was forced to step down and agree with the public demand for decentralisation of authority. This initiated the Reformation Era. The system of Reformation redefined the relationship between the central government and regional and local authorities. Despite the tyrannical power of the previous regime, this new government system emphasised the need to decentralise authority in many public sectors through the empowerment of local governments. Substantial amendments and new regulations in the governance system were made to facilitate this transition of authority.

This decentralisation also affected the education sector especially after the enactment of the Regional Autonomy Law in 1999 and the National Education System Law in 2003. Under the virtue of the 1945 National Constitution, the Regional Governance Law grants autonomy to regional governments to promote the principles of democracy, community participation, equitable distribution and justice, and the regions’ potential and diversity. The later enactment of National Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003 is by far the greatest extension of this regional governance law. The law creates a legal framework for major educational goals, policies and plans. The law seeks to open access to education at all levels and all forms, that is, formal, non-formal, as well as informal for all the citizens of Indonesia. Its main thrust is to make education relevant to societal needs; to develop further community-based education; and to enhance community participation in supporting basic education.

Under the National Education System Law, local governments along with central government are responsible for providing services and facilities, ensuring the implementation of quality education for every school-aged Indonesian citizen. Although central government determines national policies and national standards for assuring the quality of national education, the
local governments are in charge of organising the implementation of education, the development of education personnel, and facilities for education implementation across regions and cities for basic education and secondary education. The organisation of basic education and secondary education at local government level is the means to give importance to local-content based education. This law sees education as a life-long process of inculcating cultural values and the empowerment of learners. Education is conducted based on the principles of modelling, motivation and creativity in the process of learning to develop the culture of reading and writing and arithmetic for all members of the community.

It is very clear that the development of Indonesian education has been driven by the changes in national politics. Politics has been asserted as the driving power in educational policy and decision making (Jalal & Supriadi, 2001; Raihani, 2007). Many educational initiatives have been the products of political changes in the government system (Jalal & Supriadi, 2001; Raihani, 2007). The national education system has been criticised as being substantially determined by political motivations and dictated by political tendencies (Hadiyanto, 2004). The implementation of education decentralisation adds up to this politics-education relationship. This political aspect of education decentralisation has further reinforced the link of education and politics in Indonesia. In Indonesian politics, decentralisation has remained a political imperative and the leading political concern in Indonesia today (Bangay, 2005).

### 2.10 Relevance of Instructional Leadership Practices in Indonesian School Reform

Accumulating empirical evidence has implied the urgency to prioritise the development and welfare of students as the main objectives of educational leadership (Davies, 2005; Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2008; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Southworth, 2005). Current research on school
leadership has been showing growing emphasis on the contribution of instructional leadership in reforming and improving school performance (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Frederick, Blumenfield, & Paris, 2004; Gurr, et al., 2007; Leithwood, et al., 2008; Pennington, et al., 2008; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Robinson, et al., 2008; Waters, et al., 2003). Instructional leadership brings a new conception of creating accountable learning systems in schools (Halverson, et al., 2005). As it accentuates students’ learning and teacher empowerment, a focus on this type of leadership can be the strategy in promoting and sustaining school reform programs (see Section 2.4 and 2.6).

The examination of the progress of Indonesia’s school reform has indicated a gap between reform goals and educational achievements of the students (see Section 1.3). Indonesia’s performance in 2006 and 2009 PISA tests, in 2007 TIMSS, and 2006 PIRLS has shown a substandard achievement (see Table 1-3 and 1-4). As these tests measure reading, mathematics and science achievement of the students, it can be concluded that Indonesia’s school reform has not yet brought significant improvement in these areas. The further examination of problematic conditions in Indonesian school reform (see Section 1.4) has pointed out some shortcomings in Indonesian school reform, particularly in terms of leading, teaching, and learning. This raises the question of the education accountability of Indonesian school reform (Sofo, et al., 2012). Figure 2-2 summarises the challenges faced in implementing reform in Indonesian schools.
Literature on the repertoire of instructional leadership practices emphasises the focal points of instructional leadership on students, teachers, teaching and learning activities, and principals. Research on instructional leadership has acknowledged its substantial contribution to student learning (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Robinson, et al., 2008; Waters, et al., 2003). Instructional leadership demonstrated by principals also influences how teachers perform their job (Leithwood, et al., 2008; Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Penlington, et al., 2008; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007; Robinson, et al., 2008). Research has also signified instructional leadership as a core responsibility for principals (Halverson, et al., 2005; Mangin, 2007; Murphy, 1990; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Robinson, 2010). These empirical findings show that the practices of instructional leadership are basically dealing with learning, teaching, and leading. Instructional leadership offers a new conception of creating accountable learning systems in schools (Halverson, et al., 2005).
A main conclusion that can be drawn from the summarised empirical findings above is that the practices of instructional leadership substantially improve the performance of students, teachers, school principals, and schools in general. Therefore, exploring and examining local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform would reveal local knowledge and practices of instructional leadership that could help identify strengths and weaknesses associated with instructional improvement efforts in Indonesian schools. The findings of this study are expected to present evidence-based school realities and existing challenges faced by those in the front line of Indonesian education reform. This information will be important especially for those in the position of policy and decision making to understand and evaluate ongoing educational reform in Indonesian schools.

2.11 Chapter 2 Summary

Chapter 2 explicates the practices of instructional leadership in school reform as the means to bridge leadership practices and student learning outcomes. School reform strives for improvements in learning and teaching through systematic and sustainable school-wide change that can result in increased internal efficiency to achieve the reform goals. In spite of the concern for validating school reform impacts on student learning outcomes, school reform has brought a substantial recognition of leadership practices in managing school change. Leadership has been the most acknowledged concept in the current literature and empirical studies on school reform, as it plays a significantly determining factor for a successful implementation of school reform. Examining the practices of leadership can be one of the exploratory means to understand how school reform is implemented.

Instructional leadership requires some leadership practices to manage teaching and learning as the core activity of school leadership. The repertoire of the practices emphasises its focal
points on students, teachers, teaching and learning activities, and principals. Therefore, the practices of instructional leadership are basically the practices of principals dealing with learning, teaching, and leading. This study argues that examining the perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian schools might help identify factors contributing to the gap between Indonesian school reform goals and educational achievement of the students. Drawing on the need to understand local knowledge and practices in school reform, this study seeks to explore and examine local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. Detailed explanation of the research method employed to conduct this study is presented in Chapter 3.
Chapter 3: Research Method

This study is guided by a pragmatism worldview that highlights the use of pluralistic approaches to get a complete description of the investigated problems (Creswell, 2008; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Morgan, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). An exploratory sequential mixed-method design is the method used in this study. The qualitative phase focuses on concept discovery and development of local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership, generated from in-depth interviews with principals and teachers from senior secondary schools in Malang Regency, Indonesia. The follow-up quantitative phase was intended to complement the qualitative findings to attain more robust research findings. From the analysis, four main practices of instructional leadership emerged: managing, promoting, improving and assessing instruction. These emerging practices were the basis of a survey distributed to senior secondary school principals and teachers in the same region. Chapter 3 details the approaches taken to answer the research questions introduced in Chapter 1 (see Section 1.5). Detailed explanation of the instruments, data collection techniques, research participant selection, data analysis, validity and reliability of each phase is presented. The outline of research delimitation and ethical and probity standards is also presented in the chapter.

3.1 Research Questions

The key interest of this study was the exploration of local perceptions and identification of local practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. This study considered instructional leadership practices were relevant in examining and understanding Indonesian school reform to help identify factors associated with its poor progress and problematic conditions. As previously established, instructional leadership brings a new conception of
creating accountable learning systems in schools, as it accentuates students’ learning and teacher empowerment. A focus on this type of leadership can be the strategy in promoting and sustaining school reform programs. Specifically, this study asked the following research questions:

1) What instructional improvements are expected from school reform?

2) What practices of instructional leadership are carried out by principals?
   a) What degree of importance of these practices is perceived by principals? What is the current frequency of these practices being performed by them? Is there a relationship between the perceived importance and the frequency of the practices?
   b) What degree of importance of these practices is perceived by teachers? What degree of influence on instructional improvements of these practices is perceived by them? Is there a relationship between the perceived importance and influence on instructional improvements of the practices?

3.2 Research Significance and Objectives

Instructional leadership offers practices that have been proven to bring improvements in learning, teaching, and leading (see Section 2.6). These practices are important in the context of school reform as they can help achieve reform goals (see Section 2.1). As the focus of school reform efforts should be derived from contextual factors existing within a given school at a given time, it is important to understand indigenous knowledge and culturally-grounded instructional leadership practices of school reform. This might help identify factors related to leadership practices which are contributing to the gap between the goals of Indonesian school reform and the educational achievements of the students (see Section 1.3). This study was conducted in the hope that the findings would inform required instructional
leadership practices to bring the improvements anticipated from the implementation of school reform in Indonesian schools. To that end, this study aims to:

1. enrich cross-cultural comparative studies on instructional leadership by exploring and examining local perceptions and practices in Indonesian schools;
2. deepen understanding and discussion on how a socio-cultural context might influence the perceptions and practices of instructional leadership;
3. illuminate the relevance and significance of local perceptions and practices within the general framework of instructional leadership;
4. strengthen the pragmatism of western-framework instructional leadership and the application of the practices in a different cultural context; and
5. advance the practices of instructional leadership to reform schools, particularly Indonesian schools, by contributing to the educational and training agenda to develop principals’ proficiency as instructional leaders.

3.3 Research Design and Methodologies

This study was influenced by pragmatism worldview, which combines constructivism and a post-positivism paradigm. The goal of constructivism research is to understand the views that the participants have of the situation being studied, while the goal of post-positivism is to measure the views statistically so that the reliability of the research findings can be drawn (Creswell, 2008; Scott & Morrison, 2007). Constructivism places emphasis on the way individuals give meanings to their lives where reasons are regarded as legitimate causes of human behaviour and individual perspectives are underlined (Scott & Morrison, 2007). Post-positivism relies on observation and measurement of the reality being investigated to get findings that are objective and free from biases (Scott & Morrison, 2007).
Working from both quantitative and qualitative data, pragmatism provides the best understanding of a research problem (Creswell, 2008; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Morgan, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). It sees the world not as an absolute unity; therefore, different approaches are used to find the answers to the problems (Creswell, 2008). This paradigm becomes the philosophical foundation for a mixed method approach. It highlights the use of pluralistic approaches to derive knowledge about the problems (Creswell, 2008; Morgan, 2007; Patton, 1990; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). It focuses more on applications and solutions rather than on methods to understand the problems (Creswell, 2008). According to Gobo, ‘to systematise an empirical reality in its entirety with all its complexity and innumerable facets’ can only possibly be done by pluralising the approaches (2008, p. 27). Pluralistic approaches or methodological pluralism can facilitate in substantiating data sources reciprocally, so it becomes possible to establish the accurate condition and to get the complete description of the investigated phenomenon (Gobo, 2008). This influences the choice of mixed-methods research design for this study.

The concept of mixing different methods has originated from the recognition of limitations and biases inherent in any single research method that has led to the need for triangulating the data sources (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Creswell, 2008). The purpose is ‘to build on the synergy and strength that exists between quantitative and qualitative research methods to understand a phenomenon more fully than is possible using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone’ (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2009, p. 462). The integration of a qualitative and quantitative approach has then emerged from these mixed methods research practices. In mixed methods research, the mixing process does not only apply to the methodology and research procedures but it also blends the philosophical assumptions and theoretical perspectives (Ary, et al., 2010; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Morgan, 2007).
Although traditionally research methods have been classified distinctively as either qualitative or quantitative, from an epistemological point of view, qualitative and quantitative approaches are not necessarily part of different paradigms (Scott & Morrison, 2007). On both epistemological and technical reasons, it may be reasonable to apply mixed methods within the same study because the distinctions between qualitative methods and quantitative methods are claimed to be inadequate and misleading (Morgan, 2007). However, researchers have been advised of the inevitable consequence of paradigm selection since it will affect every aspect of research design and outcomes (Scott & Morrison, 2007). Although there is still strong disagreement about whether research can accommodate these multi-paradigmatic approaches, it is a matter of fact that more researchers are mixing methods and there has been increased support for the use of mixed methods design to enhance the validity of research findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Scott & Morrison, 2007).

The mixed methods approach supports a pragmatic approach that refuses the strict traditional paradigm distinction between qualitative and quantitative research. Pragmatism rejects the idea that qualitative and quantitative research are paradigmatically incompatible, rather it sees the combination of these two research approaches as an eligible way to answer research questions (Ary, et al., 2010). Therefore, driven by the purpose of the study, a mixed methods approach incorporates and embraces combinations of paradigms, philosophical assumptions and theoretical perspectives (Ary, et al., 2010; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). It strengthens the study by maximising the strengths and minimising the weaknesses of each research approach (Ary, et al., 2010; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). This study weights qualitative and quantitative aspects equally; however, quantitative collection and analysis follows qualitative collection and analysis to provide complementary evidence. Complementarity seeks elaboration or clarification of findings from one method using results from the other.
generate insights (Ary, et al., 2010; Brannen, 2007). This sequence of research processes and its intended purpose is in line with mixed-method sequential design (Ary, et al., 2010; Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006).

This study was carried out in two phases. Qualitative interviews were done in the initial phase of this research. This qualitative phase focused on concept discovery, definition, and development (Lieber, 2009). The emerging instructional leadership practices (concept discovery) from interview analysis were measured for their perceived importance and influence on teaching performance and current frequency of practices as well as the relationship between perceptions and practices, through survey distribution in the second phase. Findings from survey analysis complemented findings from interview analysis to enhance the validity of the findings as well as to provide a comprehensive picture of the perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. Figure 3-1 summarises research methodology, design and method employed in this study.

![Figure 3-1 Research Methodology, Design and Method](image-url)
3.4 Method, Sampling and Analysis used in the Qualitative Phase

Qualitative inquiry shows concern for context and meaning (Ary, et al., 2010). It assumes that human behaviour is context-bound and that human experience takes its meaning from and therefore is inseparable from social, historical, political and cultural influences (Ary, et al., 2010; Maxwell, 2005). Researchers can only make sense of the data if they are also able to understand the data in these broader contexts (Scott & Morrison, 2007). To interpret the observed phenomena, inductive analysis is incorporated to reduce and reconstruct data through coding and categorization processes (Ary, et al., 2010). For the qualitative phase of this study, qualitative interviews were used. Qualitative interviews are designed to seek in-depth understandings about the experiences of a small sample of individuals or groups who are purposively selected with the objective of a de-emphasis of generalisability (Scott & Morrison, 2007).

Qualitative interview allows the interviewer greater flexibility to introduce ‘probes’ for expanding, developing and clarifying informants’ responses. The key issue and purposes for such interviews are requirements for the interviewer to define the interviewee as a person who is actively constructing his/her own world, and to draw upon the interview text to develop insights into such worlds (Scott & Morrison, 2007, pp. 134-135).

The interviews of this study were designed as structured interviews. Structured interviews are guided by a predetermined set of questions that is constructed using the same wording and order of questions as specified in interview schedule (Kumar, 2005). The uniform information generated from the interviews will assure the comparability of data and require fewer interviewing skills (Kumar, 2005).

Purposive sampling is the common sampling technique used in qualitative research (Ary, et al., 2010). Because of the depth and extent of the information sought in qualitative studies, purposive samples are typically small, with the primary criterion of the redundancy of
information (Ary, et al., 2010). Sampling is terminated when no new information is obtained (Ary, et al., 2010). This study used stratified purposeful sampling to ensure that all types of senior secondary schools were represented. Table 3-1 summarises the sample size who participated in the interviews.

Table 3-1 Profile of Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type of Senior Secondary School</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Public Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Public Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Public Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Public Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>Public Vocational</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>Public Vocational</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>Public Vocational</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>Public Vocational</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16</td>
<td>Private Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>Private Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>Private Vocational</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>Private Vocational</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>Private Vocational</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic interpretative studies guided the analysis of interview data in this study. Basic interpretative studies describe and attempt to interpret experience where the data analysis typically involves categorisation and development of themes interpreted by the researcher through a certain disciplinary lens (Ary, et al., 2010). The analysis uses coding and looks for recurring themes (Ary, et al., 2010). Codes develop from being descriptive and or literal data to interpretative and then explanatory and abstract data, moving towards conceptual analysis (Scott & Morrison, 2007). To ease the process of interview analysis, this study used QSR’s NVivo 9 software. The process consisted of importing interview materials, creating nodes to store data about ideas or themes emerging from the analysis, coding to tag content about a specific theme or idea, and making classifications to group interview materials based on common characteristics found.
3.5 Method, Sampling and Analysis used in Quantitative Phase

Quantitative research focuses on patterns, regularities, causes and consequences (Scott & Morrison, 2007). It is driven by the importance of generalisability and replicability of the findings (Creswell, 2008; Lieber, 2009; Scott & Morrison, 2007). Quantitative data collection and analysis are confirmatory in nature (Lieber, 2009). Structured observation and questionnaire surveys are among the commonly used measures of quantitative research in education research (Lichtman, 2010). Surveys provide a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, opinions, beliefs, aptitudes, abilities, or knowledge of a population by studying a sample of that population (Creswell, 2008; Scott & Morrison, 2007). This study used a cross sectional questionnaire survey distributed to principals and teachers in senior secondary schools in Malang Regency. Cross sectional surveys collect data at a point in time from a pre-defined sample population (Mertler & Charles, 2008; Scott & Morrison, 2007).

The questionnaire items were developed using emerging practices identified from interview analysis and constructed in closed-ended questions. Closed-ended questions allow the respondents to select his or her response from a number of options provided by the researcher so that they provide a greater consistency of responses (Mertler & Charles, 2008). The questions were constructed in the form of checklist and Likert-type questions. Checklist questions asked demographic characteristics of the respondents. Likert-type questions measured degree of importance, frequency of occurrence, and degree of influence on teaching performance of identified instructional leadership practices. The questionnaires can be found in the Appendix section.

The population of this study was all school principals and teachers from seventy four senior secondary schools located in Malang Regency. Table 3-2 categorises the schools based on the
types. In general, private schools dominated both in the percentage for each type of school and the total percentage (73 per cent). Suburban schools were selected because it was assumed that the challenges in terms of the change capacity faced by these schools were greater than urban schools due to the geographic condition as well as resource availability and human resource quality.

Table 3-2 Senior Secondary School Demographics in Malang Regency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Senior Secondary Schools</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public vocational</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Islamic/madrasah</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private vocational</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of National Education, 2010

Population refers to all people or items with the characteristics a researcher wants to understand (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Considering the small number of principals (N=74), all principals were the targeted respondents. Random sampling was used for teachers. There were seventy four senior secondary schools in Malang Regency and assuming that every school on average had thirty tenured teachers, it was estimated that there were 2220 tenured teachers in this regency. For this size of population, using random sampling with 5% sampling error with a confidence level of 95%, the suggested teacher sample size was about 327 teachers (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). To get the number of teachers from each school, this sample size was divided by seventy four schools which resulted in approximately five teachers per school. To get a better response rate, ten teacher questionnaires were delivered to each school. This study expected to get at least 60% response rate for each school principal and teacher survey so there would be at least forty five school principals and 196 teachers returning the completed questionnaires.
From the questionnaires distributed to principals, fifty seven completed questionnaires were returned (77 per cent response rate). As illustrated in Table 3-4, there were more principals from private senior secondary schools who participated in the survey (30 per cent). This reflected the demographic characteristics of senior secondary schools in Malang Regency (see Table 3-3). There were also more male (75 per cent) than female principals (25 per cent). There were more principals aged 50-59 years old (61 per cent) than principals aged 40-49 years old (39 per cent). In terms of educational degrees, there were more principals with undergraduate degrees (60 per cent). As each period of principalship lasts for five years, 58 per cent of the principals were in their second or more period of principalship.

Table 3-4 Demographic Characteristics Identified by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Islamic/Madrasah</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Vocational</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Islamic/Madrasah</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Vocational</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years old</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 59 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Degree</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the questionnaires distributed to teachers, 371 completed questionnaires were returned. This number was bigger than the expected sampling size using a sampling error of 5% with a confidence level of 95%. These 371 questionnaires were used for analysis to arrive at the findings for this quantitative phase. As illustrated in Table 3-4 on the demographic characteristics identified by teachers, there were more teachers from private senior secondary schools (59 per cent) than those from public senior secondary schools (41 per cent) who participated in the survey. There were more female teachers (61 per cent) than male teachers (39 per cent). For age groups, there were more teachers aged less than 40 years old (55 per cent) than those aged 40 years and above (45 per cent). In terms of educational degrees, there were more teachers with bachelor’s degrees (87 per cent) than those with master’s degrees (13 per cent). From the length of teaching experience, there were more teachers who had taught for more than 5 years (74 per cent).

Before the distribution, the questionnaires were pilot-tested to measure their validity and reliability. The validity of the questionnaires was established by examining their face and content validity. Face validity deals with the logical link between each question or a scale and the objectives of the study while content validity is judged on the basis of the extent to which statements or questions represent the issue they are supposed to measure as judged by the researcher and the experts in the field (Kumar, 2005). The discussions with the researcher’s supervisors provided expert judgment on questionnaire items so that face and content validity of the instruments were obtained. This study used Cronbach’s coefficient alpha to measure the reliability of the questionnaires in terms of their internal consistency. Internal consistency means that items measuring the same phenomenon should produce similar results (Kumar, 2005).
To measure their reliability, the questionnaires were pilot-tested to independent groups of school principals and teachers. The questionnaires were distributed through the Internet using Qualtrics Survey Software. The groups were contacted through their Internet social network prior to the delivery of the questionnaire to ask for their agreement to participate. The responses were exported to SPSS Statistics 21 software and the reliability of all variables was calculated using Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha. From twenty seven questionnaires sent back by the principals, twenty three were completed questionnaires. The result of Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha for this principal questionnaire was .948. This means that the questionnaire was reliable. From forty one teachers who were sent the questionnaire, thirty three completed questionnaires were obtained. The result of Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha calculation was .979 which shows that the questionnaire was reliable.

Data checking for errors was performed prior to the analysis of questionnaire data. Each variable was checked for scores that were not within the range of possible scores, the minimum and maximum values, outliers and the number of valid and missing cases. Exclude cases, pair wise, was used to check the missing data. This would exclude the case (person) only if they were missing the data required for the specific analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistical calculations were performed next. The descriptive statistics were used to indicate general tendencies in the data (mean and median), and the spread of scores (range, standard deviation, variance, distribution). Inferential statistics was used for correlation analysis. Statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics21 was used to do the statistical analysis.

The output of descriptive statistics showed a skewed and relatively flat distribution of the data set. The differences among the mean ($M$) was also too small to indicate the differences. Therefore, analysis of the median was used. The median is the middle value that separates
the higher half from the lower half of the data set. It was expected that the median would give a more distinctive and accurate answer. Variance analysis to compare the means of each group (practice) of the sampled data was performed to find whether there are statistically significant differences among the practices at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level of significance. Type III Sum of Squares explains the variability explained by the test while \( F \) stands for ratio between variability. Sig. column presents the obtained p-value. Considering the skewed and relatively flat distribution of the data set, a non-parametric correlation test (Spearman’s rho) was used for correlation analysis.

Table 3-5 Research Questions, Sampling, Instruments and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Questions (see Section 3.1)</th>
<th>Sampling Techniques (see Section 3.4 and 3.5)</th>
<th>Instruments (see Section 3.4 and 3.5)</th>
<th>Analysis (see Section 3.4 and 3.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>1. What instructional improvements are expected from reforming schools?</td>
<td>Purposive sampling with redundancy of information is the primary criterion.</td>
<td>2 sets of structured interview guided by Weber’s instructional leadership model (1996) and a research review on instructional leadership by Nettles and Herrington (2007).</td>
<td>Basic interpretative studies using thematic coding technique by QSR’s NVivo 9 software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What practices of instructional leadership are carried out by principals?</td>
<td>Total population survey for principals and random sampling with 5% sampling error with a confidence level of 95% for teachers.</td>
<td>Likert-like questionnaires constructed using the emerging practices from interview analysis.</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics (Minimum, Maximum, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Skewness, Kurtosis) and inferential statistics (p-values) and Spearman’s Rho for non-parametric correlation analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>3. What degree of importance of the practices is perceived by principals? What is the current frequency of these practices being performed by them? Is there a relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of the practices?</td>
<td>Total population survey for principals and random sampling with 5% sampling error with a confidence level of 95% for teachers.</td>
<td>Likert-like questionnaires constructed using the emerging practices from interview analysis.</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics (Minimum, Maximum, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Skewness, Kurtosis) and inferential statistics (p-values) and Spearman’s Rho for non-parametric correlation analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What degree of importance of the practices is perceived by teachers? What degree of influence on instructional improvements of the practices is perceived by them? Is there a relationship between the perceived importance and influence on instructional improvements of the practices?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-5 summarises the explained research method employed in this study. It provides the linkages between the research questions, the sampling techniques, and the instruments for data collection as well as the analysis.
3.6 Research Delimitations

Four key delimitations restrict this study. First, although this study employed quantitative procedure and analysis as one part of its phases, the quantitative findings were not planned to create the generalisability. As quantitative data collection and analysis are confirmatory in nature (Lieber, 2009), findings from the quantitative phase were intended to complement findings from interview analysis to enhance the validity of the findings as well as to provide a comprehensive picture of the perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. The focus was on the complementarity of the findings from both phases.

Second, the key interest of this study was to explore and examine local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. The primary units of analysis were principals and teachers from senior secondary schools. The examination of their perceptions is crucial because, as school reform agents, principals and teachers have the power to make the objectives of their school reform achievable. Research has shown that as change agents, principals have the ability to improve the quality of students’ learning experiences and outcomes by influencing teachers’ behaviour (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007). Empirical studies have also confirmed that instructional leadership demonstrated by school principals influences how teachers perform their job (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007) and what teachers do in classrooms is an important determinant for students’ perceptions and experiences of schooling, their achievement, progress and classroom behaviours (Rowe, 2007).

Although by definition instructional leadership includes the element of student learning, this study did not attempt to examine students’ perceptions nor involve them as research
participants. Their limited exposure and access to leadership style exercised by school principals was the main reason for the elimination of students as research participants in this study. Considering the strict ethics requirements for involving young participants, the exclusion of students in this study would ease the procedure of data collection and at the same time would keep research data at a manageable level.

Third, instructional leadership practices explored in this study were limited and guided by the practices identified in Nettles and Herrington’s review of empirical studies on direct effects of school leadership on student achievement (2007) and Weber’s instructional leadership dimensions (Weber, 1996). Nettles and Herrington (2007) found seven consistent roles of school leadership that had direct effects on student achievement: creating a safe and orderly academic environment, building a shared mission and vision, involving stakeholders, monitoring school progress, focusing on instruction, setting high expectations for student performance and encouraging professional development. These seven instructional leadership practices are simplified in five dimensions of Weber’s instructional leadership model: defining school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, promoting a positive learning climate, observing and improving instruction, and assessing instructional programmes (1996).

Fourth, as this study began with a qualitative phase, it is important to acknowledge the inherent limitation of qualitative analysis. While the uniqueness of in-depth exploration is the appeal of qualitative research, the interpretation and analysis of qualitative data are susceptible to the researcher’s presence in writing about the participants’ actions and perspectives, leading to the occurrence of researcher’s biases (Scott & Morrison, 2007). Although steps were taken to minimise researcher’s bias, it was impossible for the researcher
to be entirely neutral. Therefore, the researcher’s subjective influence in interpreting the data was acknowledged.

### 3.7 Research Ethics and Probity

Ethical approaches are required in conducting research that involves human participants. This study was conducted under the guidance of the ethical standards required by the Australian National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. Prior to its application in the field to collect data, this study was approved by the Committees for Ethics in Human Research of the University of Canberra on August 4, 2010 under project number 10-88. The copy of this ethics approval is attached in the Appendix section. In addition, organisational consent from the Office of National Education in Malang Municipality and Malang Regency and each participating school were obtained before the commencement of data collection.

To ensure that this study was done in accordance with research ethics and probity, the following were some of the steps taken prior to and after data collection:

1. The researcher discussed the appropriateness of the research methodology with research supervisors. The discussions provided some insights into the selected methodology and eliminating unintentional flaws affecting research participants;

2. The participants were provided with necessary information about the nature and purpose of the research and the value of their contribution to the research (see participant information letter in the Appendix section). They were made aware of their rights to participate in and withdraw at any stage of the data collection process;
The identity and the information provided by individual participants were kept confidential and anonymous. The collected data were kept securely and only the researcher had access to the data;

For the need of data identification and analysis, the researcher developed coding methods to make sure the data would only reveal the characteristics needed in data analysis and not the identity of individual participants; and

All electronic equipment, data files and physical support materials including handwritten notes and diagrams were secured and would be destroyed five years from the date of the thesis submission for examination.

3.8 Chapter 3 Summary

Chapter 3 has laid out research methods as well as the procedure and analysis used in this study. This chapter explains how the sampled principals and teachers perceive instructional leadership, leading to the identification of the existing local practices of instructional leadership. It also explicates how pragmatism frames the overall design and directs the research process to explore and examine local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform.

Designed in the form of a sequential mixed methods study, this chapter explains how the sampling technique and the research instruments as well as the data analysis of each phase of this study are done with the purpose of concept discovery and development as well as the complementarity of the findings. Ethical considerations are explained to guide the process of data collection and analysis. In Chapter 4 and 5, the findings of this research are represented and discussed. Chapter 4 presents the qualitative findings from the analysis of the interviews with principals and teachers. Chapter 5 presents the quantitative findings from the analysis of
the questionnaires distributed to principals and teachers. The structure of the presentation is in accordance with the sequence of research questions and research phases. Visual display is provided necessarily to support the explanations.
Chapter 4: Qualitative Findings

The qualitative phase of this study focused on concept discovery of the local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership generated from in-depth interviews with principals and teachers from senior secondary schools in Malang Regency, Indonesia. The interviews of this study were designed as structured interviews guided by a predetermined set of questions to assure the comparability of data. Basic interpretative studies guided the analysis of the data. The analysis involved categorisation and development of themes interpreted by the researcher. The researcher used Weber’s instructional leadership model and Nettles and Herrington’s review of empirical studies on practices of school leadership that had direct effects on student achievement as the lens of the analysis. To ease the process of the analysis, QSR’s NVivo 9 software was used.

Chapter 4 details the results of data analysis on what instructional improvements were expected in school reform and what instructional leadership practices were carried out by principals (see Section 3.1). The profile of the participants can be found in Table 3-1 in Section 3.4 of Chapter 3. The perceptions and practices were scrutinised to indicate important issues and outline the scope of the study. The key concepts progressively emerged through basic interpretative studies by way of a thematic coding technique assisted by QSR’s NVivo 9 software. The emerging practices of instructional leadership were classified into four key practices: managing instruction, promoting instruction, improving instruction, and assessing instruction. These identified practices outlined the scope of the study and provided the basis for constructing questionnaire items in the subsequent quantitative phase of the study (see Section 3.3). The empirical and theoretical discussions of the findings will be presented in Chapter 6.
4.1 Expected Instructional Improvements in School Reform

This section documents the perceptions of participants of instructional improvements in school reform. It details what improvements were expected in instructional areas. Improvements in four areas were identified: curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and learning achievement. The improvements were linked to the increasing accountability on instructional processes and outcomes.

4.1.1 Curriculum

Improvements in curriculum was greatly emphasised by the participants. The improvements were done primarily by revising the content of the curriculum to form distinct characteristics for the schools. Interestingly, the names given to the improved curriculum were quite different among the schools. The terms varied from sandwich curriculum in one school, to adaptive curriculum or balanced curriculum in other schools. Co-designing the curriculum content with partner industries, particularly for productive (job-related) subjects was quite a common approach in vocational senior secondary schools. It was intended to match curriculum content with competencies required by job markets. In other school types, the revision of the curriculum was either to align it with schools’ characteristics or to create a new image for the schools.

P9’s description of the partnership between his school and some international and national heavy machinery and automotive industries in co-designing the content of the curriculum illustrated an exemplar of strong school-industry collaborations. The partner industries were given more privileges “not only in co-designing the curriculum for heavy machinery and automotive majors, but they are also in charge of student recruitment and grade evaluation”. Determined by industrial standards, “student performance is evaluated either pass or failed”.

The industries also became “the place for job experience”, which is compulsory for final year students. The industries would directly employ high performance apprentices. P9 saw this as “a mutual benefit” between his school and the partner industries and further strengthened the bond between them.

A similar approach of collaboration with industries in improving the curriculum also happened in P18’s school. Different from P9’s school, the partner industries were only involved in identifying “required competencies from the perspectives of real practitioners”. For P18, the representation of the competencies in her school’s curriculum enhanced its relevance because “the students are trained to have the skills that are really needed in real jobs”. It was important for her school because “our students are prepared for immediate employment after graduation”. She noted the “increasing employment rate” of the graduates was the tangible benefit of this collaboration. As experienced by P9’s school, the partner industries of P18’s school also become its partner employers for student apprenticeships. P4 regarded it as “an added benefit from the collaboration”.

P16 also highlighted collaboration as the practice to improve the curriculum of his school. As an Islamic/madrasah senior secondary school, the collaboration was done with local pesantren (Islamic boarding schools). The school was “surrounded by seven pesantren” and this available resource in the community captured the attention of the school. As “curriculum for a madrasah school is different from curriculum in other schools” particularly in the number of subject students have to learn, the collaboration was intended to reduce the learning load of the students. “As our students study Islam and its practices in these local pesantren during off-school hours, it provides us with more time to concentrate on other subjects”. This practice of collaboration was based on trust that local pesantren could provide
“better Islamic learning for the students”. Quite differently, curriculum improvement in P6’s school was expected to change the stereotype attached to madrasah schools. “People still consider that madrasah are very conservative where students only learn things about Islam”. Therefore, the composition of the curriculum was designed to “encourage students to identify and express their academic and non-academic potentials”. The focus on diversity of potentials would erase “the image of a madrasah school of being traditional and old-fashioned”.

In P1’s schools, curriculum improvement was done “to act in accordance with the enactment of National Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003” which promotes the practice of school-based curriculum. P13 regarded the authority given to a school to design its own curriculum as “one of the important aspects of school reform”. Although schools were required to comply with national standards set by the government, P13 praised that “this new curriculum gives the freedom to us to align the national standards with the unique characteristics of our school”. The representation of school characteristics in improved curriculum was also underlined by P1. For him, school-based curriculum meant that “the curriculum is derived from distinct characteristics of the school”. However, he acknowledged that accommodating school characteristics in the curriculum “will be really challenging considering the lack of expertise in our school”.

In spite of different approaches taken to improve curriculum, there was a noticeably common purpose of this practice across the senior secondary school types. Curriculum improvement was expected to bring desired improvements in teaching and learning activities. The main criterion when defining the expected improvements was also quite uniform among the schools. It was all emphasised on what instructional activities were offered to and
experienced by students. However, the focus of the instructional activities was varied. P6 accentuated uplifting students’ positivism towards learning. He wanted the result that the “curriculum offers learning experiences that are student-centred, innovative, creative and enjoyable so students feel positively towards their learning”. He believed that the “positive feeling students have towards their learning will psychologically reduce their study load”.

Similar attention to students was expressed by P14. He wanted the curriculum to be able to “develop students’ potentials, not only in their cognitive abilities, but also in their affective, psychomotor and character domains”. The development of students’ affective and character domains got more attention from P20. For him, together with the emphasis on the cognitive development “character-building and value-based learning produces excellent students”. P2 underlined tailored teaching and learning activities to suit the needs of the students. He believed that instructional activities that were “well-planned; various in terms of the techniques used, and, more importantly, designed to meet the needs of the students [will] improve their mastery and comprehension”.

P15 prioritised the increased relevance of learning. She wanted the curriculum to offer “instructional activities that link what students learn in class with what they have to deal with in real life.” This connection was imperative for her because “when students do not see this connection, it will be difficult for them to see the meaning of their learning”. Therefore, for her, curriculum improvement was required to promote “the connection between classroom learning and its application in a real life setting”. Quite differently, P4 drew attention to a presence of shared commitment among school members. In her opinion, “to make students successful both as a student and as a person is not an easy job”. The accomplishment of this
goal could only be achieved if all school members “share similar enthusiasm and motivation
to make it happen”.

From the quotations, it was obvious that improvements in curriculum was an emphasis for the
participants in the effort to reform their school. As they came from different types of schools,
the improvements were done by revising the curriculum content to reflect the distinct
characteristics of the school. Working together with stakeholders in synchronising the
curriculum content with competencies required by job markets was a preferred approach in
vocational senior secondary schools. In other school types, the curriculum was revised either
to align it with schools’ characteristics or to create a new image for the schools.

4.1.2 Teachers’ Professionalism

School reform was expected to bring improved professionalism among teachers. The
definitions of professional teachers were quite similar among the participants and not
distinctly different across the senior secondary school types. Professional teachers were
measured from their increased competencies acquired either from professional development
programs or higher education and from the roles they played in classroom teaching and
learning activities. However, the latter emphasis was more profoundly expressed by
participants who were teachers. More importantly, increased teachers’ professionalism was
seen as the means to improve the quality of human resources, which was argued to be
imperative for suburban schools. It was also related to the enactment of the Law on Teachers
and Lecturers in 2005. Seen as the extension of National Education System Law Number 20
Year 2003, it was praised as a recognition and appreciation of the important roles of teachers
in school reform.
The importance of teachers’ professionalism in school reform could be seen from the following statements. P9 declared that “teachers are the backbone of school reform efforts going on in his school.” For him, professional teachers “never stop increasing their knowledge and skills and apply these new acquired knowledge and skills into their teaching and learning activities”. He believed that “the accomplishment of his school reform goals is dependent upon the professionalism of the teachers”. Similar emphasis was expressed by P7. In his opinion, “teachers are the spearhead of any improvement expected to take place in schools”. He saw increased professionalism of teachers as promoted through the enactment of the Law on Teachers and Lecturers over-due recognition towards teachers, where all this time teachers were treated “as unsung heroes”. Sharing a similar idea, P19 believed that the “Law on Teachers and Lecturers gives the opportunity for us to be professional in our work”. Since school reform comes with higher expectations which “means harder jobs for teachers”, she urged that “now is the time to pay due respect to the teachers”.

When participants were asked to define professional teachers, different foci surfaced. P13 highlighted the ability of teachers to create an enjoyment of learning among their students in his definition of professional teachers. He believed that “when students enjoy their learning, it can be expected that they will put their best efforts to learn”. P3 added that to be able to offer interesting and enjoyable learning experiences to their students, teachers needed to be “well-prepared with their teaching materials meaning they know what they are going to teach, have sufficient knowledge of it and can be the resource for their students during class activities”. This description of professional teachers coincided with what P18 termed as facilitators of learning. According to her, “as facilitators, teachers need to keep up-dated with the development in education and subjects they teach so they can become a reliable source of information to their students”.
The description of professional teachers as resourceful was further added by P19. For her, “competent, resourceful and creative teachers can create learning activities that are stimulating and interesting”. She thought that to achieve this description “it is necessary for teachers to broaden their perspectives especially on the subjects that they teach and update their knowledge and skills”. The emphasis on information literacy as one of the characteristics of professional teachers brought out the description of professional teachers as technology literate. There was awareness among the participants of the powerful impacts of the advancement of technology in classroom activities. P17 even claimed that “now we live in an era that is dictated by the supremacy of technology”. Similarly, P5 saw technology development as “a major power of change” especially in terms of “how information is shared in classroom activities”. For her, the ease of accessing information meant “teachers are no longer the only source of information”. She highlighted this as a challenge that required teachers “to be one step ahead” in having the information to be discussed in the class.

For P17, information accessibility prompted by the advancement in technology provided teachers with “abundant resources for teaching and learning”. He added that these resources “not only make[s] teaching becomes more stimulating, but more importantly it shortens the gap between what is going on in class and what is happening out there”. Therefore, he strongly believed that if “teachers want to succeed in teaching, they need to embrace technology and incorporate it into classroom activities”. A similar idea was expressed by P2. He regarded technology as “an important tool for teachers”. Technology gave teachers “more options for how the lesson is to be delivered, more choices for what teaching techniques and learning materials are to be used”. He concluded that “having the ability to incorporate technology into classroom teaching and learning activities is an advantage for teachers”.
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Another description of professional teachers focused on the psychological capacity of the teachers to cope with the heterogeneity of their students. For P3, “mental readiness is crucial because in class we are dealing with students with different characters and backgrounds”. She advised that “when teachers are not ready, it is easy to get emotionally affected and it can disrupt teaching and learning activities”. The need to be mentally ready was even more important for teachers who taught big classes. Based on his experience, P8 found that teaching big classes “around 40 to 45 students per class” could be “very intimidating”. He said that “when teachers are not confident, it will make them lose track and not be focused in teaching”. He continued that “it is even worse if your students can sense that you are not ready for them”. The age of the students was also another factor that required mental readiness from the teachers. P20 found that teaching teenagers in senior secondary school could be “very intimidating”. In his opinion, “students in this age group hate structure and people who enforce the structure”. He cautioned that “when teachers are not ready, they will easily lose their temper and tend to exploit their power as a teacher”. He added that “when it happens, they fail as a teacher”.

Professional teachers were next described as those who could cultivate good characters in their students. P19 argued that “character building should get similar attention as the cognitive aspects”. P5 gave quite a strong statement. According to her, “affective aspects should gain main priority because without strong foundation in characters, education will have no meaning at all”. Another strong statement was given by P12. In her opinion, “high cognitive is not linear with life success”. She believed that good characters would make students able to “adapt themselves in any circumstances” and for her “this adaptability determines their life success”. P11 saw character building as the means to prepare students for the future. He was concerned with “how things have been developing at a very alarming
rate where the future becomes something vulnerable and scary at a certain point”. He was certain that “having good characters helps students survive in the future”.

When asked what character traits are to be cultivated in students, the answers were quite varied. P19 referred to them as the “right mentality to face challenges in life”. She defined this as “the ability to not easily give in when dealing with difficulties and hardships”. P16 focused on “strong faith in their religion, devotion to their country, and deep compassion towards others and humanity”. Similar attention to traits related to faith, nationalism and humanity was expressed by P4, P5, P8, and P17. P6 and P11 also shared a similar focus; however, cultivating religious values and practices captured more of their attention. P12 underlined the acquisition of soft skills such as being “critical, analytical, disciplined, responsible and a team player”. Similar emphasis on soft skills was given by P1 and P7.

The next description of professional teachers focused on the connection of learning activities with real life. P15 considered it “important because students can see the value of what they are studying”. P4 agreed with this statement. She found it to be “a wasting experience if learning activities fail to make students understand and see the significance of what they learn”. For vocational schools, the connection with real job conditions was highlighted. As mentioned by P12, “to produce students who are self-dependent in work place, self-driven to increase personal knowledge and skills, and self-sufficient in solving problems requires the connection between what they are studying now and what they are going to experience later on in their work”. To build this connection, P12 said that “whenever I teach and whatever material I have to teach, I have to break it down to practical and realistic pieces”. Using a similar approach, P15 said that it would “encourage students to apply what they have learnt”.

For P7, the opportunity for this direct application could “strengthen the connection and make learning become more meaningful”.

The last description of professional teachers portrayed them as role models in learning for the students. The criteria for being role models were dissimilar among the participants. In P2’s opinion, becoming “learning partners for their students and not as class authorities that students have to be afraid of” was important. For him, this kind of teacher-student relation could promote “a culture of learning that is based on respect and collaboration”. P10 thought that being learning partners meant that teachers “learn along with students and everyone in class is accountable for learning”. P17 characterised the role as “learning enthusiasts” where teachers were responsible for “making students share similar learning enthusiasm”. Quite similarly, P7 defined the role as “learning motivators”. He explained that learning role models “radiate motivation to learn to their students and encourage them to share similar motivation”. For P1, being role models in learning made “students respect their teachers and include them as important figures in their life”.

From the quotations, the improvements in teachers' professionalism were thought to be essential in school reform. The participants believed that professional teachers determined the successful implementation of school reform efforts. The descriptions of professional teachers given by the participants emphasised on their increased competencies acquired either from professional development programs or higher education and from the roles they played in classroom teaching and learning activities. In addition, increased teachers’ professionalism was seen to be crucial to improve the quality of human resources particularly in suburban schools.
4.1.3 Learning Facilities

The expected improvements in learning facilities were mainly driven by the impacts they had on teaching and learning activities. There was a strong preference among the participants to make the facilities more technology-friendly. In addition, the focus of improvement was not restricted to classrooms and laboratories where actual learning took place. Attention was also given to facilities outside those buildings. Improvements in facilities were also done to bring out the characteristics of the schools. This was found particularly in madrasahs and vocational senior secondary schools.

The influence of technology in improving learning facilities was acknowledged by P18. Her school building and classrooms were refurbished to be “equipped with internet access and multimedia so that instructions in our school are technology-driven”. Similarly, P6 underlined technology as the factor in facility improvements in his school. He said that “internet access and multimedia are our primary attention in upgrading the facilities in our laboratories and classrooms”. He expected that these facilities “will help our teachers not only in presenting the subject but also in enriching and updating their teaching materials”. P17 added the benefits of these technology-friendly facilities. In his experience, “internet connection and multimedia facilities give me more options on what I teach and how I teach”. The choices for teaching material selections and presentations were also highlighted by P7, P10, and P11. They found internet connection and multimedia facilities made them teach more effectively because they could “use different features to highlight important aspects and to draw students’ attention”.

Improvements in facilities outside classrooms were intended to create an atmosphere of learning. As mentioned by P1 and P18, providing out-of-class learning facilities “encourages
out of class learning”. P11 and P13 also shared similar viewpoints. In P11’s school, “external spaces are designed to be conducive for learning”. He expected that it would reinforce learning as “it is not restricted in classrooms only”. In P13’s opinion, out-of-class learning facilities could be in the forms of “motivational posters and signs placed throughout school buildings”. He related this with the characteristics of teenagers who “like colours and pictures” and believed that it was “a simple yet attractive way to initiate learning”.

The representation of school characteristics in improving the facilities was another highlight. This approach was taken particularly in madrasahs and vocational senior secondary schools. P6 proudly explained the refurbishment of his school’s musholla (praying room). He said that, “Musholla is the centre of a madrasah school like ours and it is our main characteristic”. To strengthen the presence of the musholla in his school, some of the learning activities were scheduled in the musholla to make the students “see it as part of their learning”. In P18’s school, the musholla was also used for instructional activities. As her school was an Islam-affiliated vocational school, she believed that it would “substantiate the characteristic”. Slightly different from P6’s and P18’s school, P16’s school was able to have its own mosque. As this mosque was a big one, it was open to the public. P16 believed that public use of this school facility would “strengthen the image of his school as a madrasah in the community”. The characteristic of being a vocational school was accentuated in P9’s school facilities. The improvements in workshops including the required tools and machinery would “provide students with the opportunities for hands-on experiences”.

From the quotations, the expected improvements in learning facilities were mainly aimed to improve teaching and learning activities. The improvements were made to be more technology-friendly and not limited to facilities where actual teaching and learning activities
occurred. Attention was also given to facilities outside classrooms and laboratories particularly in madrasahs and vocational senior secondary schools to bring out the characteristics of the schools.

4.1.4 Learning Outcomes

With improvements in curriculum, teachers’ professionalism and learning facilities, better student learning outcomes were the final improvement from the implementation of school reform. In general, improved learning outcomes of the students were considered as the way to prove the accountability of the implementation of school reform. In addition, the importance given to improved student learning outcomes was also driven by the influence this had on school profiles in the society. It was believed that improved learning outcomes could increase a school’s competitiveness in attracting prospective parents and students. Although cognitive accomplishments were not the only criteria in measuring learning outcomes, scores from the national exit examination were the preferred parameter of student learning outcomes.

Improved learning outcomes as the proof of being accountable were highlighted more by participants from public schools. P1 thought that the autonomy given to his school demanded “more responsibility” and improved learning outcomes measured primarily from “his school’s performance in the national exit examination” could demonstrate that his school was “responsibly carrying out the mandate”. A similar opinion was expressed by P6. For him, improved student learning outcomes confirmed that his school did “what we are expected to be doing”. He also referred to student performance in the national exit examination in judging his school’s accountability. As the results of this examination were announced publicly, the “government and public” could judge whether the school was being “accountable or not”. P9 also gave a similar opinion. He said that improved student learning outcomes determined “his
school’s accountability”. He continued that proving the accountability was “the main focus of the reform programs” in his school.

It was also believed that student learning outcomes influenced school profiles in the community. For P1, “learning outcomes of students are the easy way to judge a school”. He added that the “quality of a school” was mainly assessed by the public from “how many students succeed and fail in the national examination”. He thought that it was “very realistic to be aware of and to fulfil” this public assessment as it would “create the image of the school in the society”. The association between learning outcomes and school image received more emphasis from participants from private schools. P16 claimed that learning outcomes of the students became “the selling point” for his school to “attract prospective students”. P13 and P18 also shared a similar opinion. Moreover, they were aware of “enrolment competition” their schools had with their “private and public” school counterparts. They expected that “improvement in students’ learning” would “increase the enrolment” in their school. P13 and P18 added that increased student enrolment would determine the “survival of private schools” like theirs.

Student scores in the national exit examination were the preferred measurement of the improvement in student learning outcomes. The majority of the participants relied upon the scores students got from this examination in evaluating whether desired improvements had taken place or not in their schools. As mentioned by P1 and P4, the scores would indicate the “learning progress” of their students and identify required “reinforcement programs” to prepare students for the “upcoming examination”. In vocational schools, students’ skills and competencies were another indication of learning improvements. P9, P10, P18, and P19 said that these qualifications would “ensure immediate jobs” for the students after graduation. In
their opinion, the “higher job rate” of their graduates indicated “better learning outcomes” for their schools. Although it seemed to be of less importance, accomplishment in other learning domains was also acknowledged. Learning improvements could be seen from “students’ characters” and other “affective aspects” such as independence, motivation, discipline, and curiosity in addition to their improved intellectual accomplishments.

From the quotations, better student learning outcomes were seen as the way to prove the accountability of the implementation of school reform. Improved student learning outcomes were thought to have an important influence on school profiles in the society since they could increase school’s competitiveness in attracting prospective parents and students. Although cognitive accomplishments were not the only criteria given in measuring learning outcomes, scores from the national exit examination were the favoured parameter of student learning achievement.

Summary of Expected Instructional Improvements in School Reform
The findings suggest a strong focus on instructional improvements in school reform. The participants expected improvements in four areas: curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and students’ learning outcomes. The improvement in curriculum was done by aligning the content with the distinct characteristics of the schools. A better image of the schools was expected to emerge from the improved curriculum. The improved curriculum was also expected bring some improvements in teaching and learning activities.

The improvement in teacher professionalism was measured from teachers’ increased competencies, acquired either from professional development programs or higher education and from the roles they played in classroom teaching and learning activities. Increased
teacher professionalism was seen as the means to improve the quality of human resources, which was argued to be imperative for suburban schools. Improvements in learning facilities were mainly related to their impacts on teaching and learning activities. The improvements were made to bring out the characteristics of the schools. There was a strong preference among the participants to make the facilities more technology-friendly. The focus of improvement was not restricted to classrooms and laboratories where actual learning took place.

Better student learning outcomes were the final improvements from the implementation of school reform. Although cognitive accomplishments were not the only criteria in measuring learning outcomes, scores from the national exit examination were the preferred parameter in assessing student learning outcomes. Improved learning outcomes of the students were considered as the way to prove the accountability of the implementation of school reform and to strengthen the profiles of schools in the society. It was believed that improved learning outcomes could increase a school’s competitiveness in attracting prospective parents and students.

4.2 Instructional Leadership Practices performed by Principals

This section documents practices of instructional leadership performed by principals as part of the reform programs taking place in their school. It details how principals as school leaders executed their instructional roles to improve their schools’ instruction. Figure 4-1 encapsulates the identified practices. The practices were grouped into four key categories: managing instruction, promoting instruction, improving instruction, and assessing instruction. Some of the practices matched with the practices of Weber’s instructional leadership model.
and Nettles and Herrington’s review of empirical studies on instructional leadership while others were local practices (those in black boxes).

**Figure 4-1 Emerging Practices of Instructional Leadership**

### 4.2.1 Managing Instruction

This section records emerging practices of managing instruction. Five practices were identified: monitoring learning hours, communicating instructional matters, providing learning resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of the teachers. Some local practices of improving instruction were found. The practices of monitoring learning hours and improving the welfare of the teachers were local practices influenced by Indonesian cultural and socio-economic factors. Three other practices (communicating instructional matters, providing learning resources and facilities, and building partnerships with stakeholders) reemphasised the practices of managing instruction suggested by Weber’s instructional leadership model and related empirical studies reviewed by Nettles and Herrington.
Monitoring Learning Hours

There were two different perceptions of this first practice of managing instruction. The majority of the participants regarded this practice more as time management. Only a few of the participants saw it as a practice of “classroom supervision” aiming at “evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the supervised teachers”. This practice of classroom supervision matched with the original definitions of monitoring classroom hours offered by Weber and other scholars. P1, P2, and P3 reported “regular practices of classroom supervision” in their school. Classroom supervisions were done “at least once every semester”. They said that the “feedback from these classroom supervisions” would “encourage teachers to review their teaching performance” and “inform what required actions are needed to improve teaching and learning activities”.

The majority of the participants emphasised monitoring learning hours as the practice of “managing instructional time in their schools”. This practice was seen as the way to “manage a big number of students, teachers and classes”. There were more than 500 students in the participants’ schools. Making sure instructional processes took place on time in large schools like theirs was quite challenging. As acknowledged by P6 and P16, making sure a large number of “parallel classes and students” were “on time” for instructional activities was not “easy”. The challenging experience of managing a large number of teachers and students was also expressed by P9, P13, and P18. They imagined “a big disorder” in their schools if classes did not “begin or end at the scheduled time”. Other participants associated the practice of monitoring learning hours with a “lack of discipline” and a “high occurrence of tardiness” in their schools. P1, P4, P5, P10, P12, P14, and P20 believed that this practice would “discourage students and teachers” to “come late” to class.
From the quotations, the majority of the participants regarded practice of managing instruction more as time management to ensure that learning activities began and finished on time. Only a few of the participants saw it as a practice of classroom supervision aiming at evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the supervised teachers. This practice of classroom supervision was actually the original definition of monitoring classroom hours offered by Weber and other scholars.

**Communicating Instructional Matters**

Principals communicated instructional matters with all teachers in formal meetings conducted regularly in schools. Principal-to-teacher communication was also done person-to-person. This practice of individual communication was usually a follow-up from the formal meetings. The issues communicated were generally those related to instructional programs for an ongoing semester. The participants believed that principal-teacher communication would create a culture of collegiality between them. P1 described the communication between principal and teachers in his school as aiming to “shorten the distance” between them. P16 emphasised this practice as reinforcing “equity and respect” between principal and teachers. P18 saw that the exchange of reciprocal ideas in principal-teacher communication could lead to “collaboration” and “acceptability” of any “decision taken”. For P9, good communication between principal and teachers would “synchronise their thoughts and actions”.

P9’s school was chosen as the exemplar of principal-to-teacher communication on instructional matters. Currently his school was revising its curriculum to incorporate components of character building in its content. Regular meetings were held between principal and teachers to discuss the desired format of this revised curriculum. In this meeting, intense communication between principal and teachers was built. P9 believed that
the “more intense” the communication was, the more “common ground” they could have between them. In his opinion, it would lead to “better decision making and results”. To increase efficiency, task groups were formed where teachers were divided into groups to work on a certain task. Communication then happened among teachers in and between groups. P9 termed this as a “dynamic interaction”. He thought “teacher-to-teacher communication” was “as important as principal-to-teacher communication”.

Teacher-to-teacher communication on instructional matters was also reported by other participants. In P1, P4 and P8’s school, teachers who taught similar subjects were grouped together to “work” on some “instructional programs”. P1 said that this collaboration boosted their “confidence” in the “decisions” made and increased their “motivation” for improvements. P4 considered the exchange of ideas and resources in the groups offered opportunities to “learn from fellow teachers about best practices” to teach certain lessons. As a fresh graduate teacher, P8 found the collaboration with more experienced teachers to be advantageous for a junior teacher like him. The best practices he learnt from other teachers made him more prepared and confident in teaching. In P14’s school, although the communication among teachers happened more casually, she said that it still gave her things to learn from other teachers to improve her teaching.

Participants indicated an implicit preference for teacher-to-teacher communication. Teacher-to-teacher communication was felt to be less intimidating than principal-to-teacher communication. The positional power of the principal contributed to P8’s reluctance to have conversations with the principal. The feeling of shyness and lack of confidence made it difficult for him to speak with his principal. P19 said the position of the principal as the “superior” created “a barrier” that discouraged her to have communication with the principal.
P15 also reported similar feelings. She felt an invisible distance between her and the principal that blocked the communication between them. P19 felt “freer and more relaxed” to have conversations with other teachers. Both P8 and P15 found it to be “easier and more comfortable” to communicate certain instructional issues with their “fellow teachers”.

P20 noticed the presence of “commonality among teachers” made them “more open to communicate”. P19 added that the “lack of gap” between teachers meant the communication “naturally happened”. P3 felt “team spirit” existed between her and her fellow teachers. She said this spirit unified them and made the “relationship” even “closer”. In her opinion, the “closer the relationship is, the more possible for the communication to take place” and the “more intense the conversations turn out to be”. High frequency of meeting and close proximity between teachers was another reason for the occurrence of communication between them. All participants shared an office with their fellow teachers. P12 said that he communicated more with his fellow teachers simply because “they share an office and meet more frequently”. P17 and P20 gave a similar reason.

From the quotations, instructional matters were communicated regularly in formal meetings between principals and teachers in addition to person-to-person communication as a follow-up. The issues communicated were generally about on-going instructional programs. The participants believed that a culture of collegiality would emerge from the communications between principal and teachers.

Providing Learning Resources and Facilities

The availability of learning resources and facilities was expected to bring improvements in the quality of instruction. It could also stimulate creativity and innovation in teaching and
learning activities. The use of technology and multi-media received a very strong emphasis in the provision of learning resources and facilities. As it involved high cost to provide such school resources and facilities, in addition to government grants, external financial support from parents and communities was sought. The financial support obtained was also seen as a trust given to schools and made this practice have an attached accountability, especially to the benefactors. The process involved in providing the resources and facilities was made to be transparent and accountable. Responsible use of the resources and facilities was also enforced.

P19 said that “sufficient” learning resources and facilities made her teaching “more resourceful and creative”. She could “choose” what “main and supporting teaching materials” to use in the class activities. She could also “differentiate her techniques in presenting the materials”. She added that the “variability” made the lessons “more attractive and understandable to her students”. Similar comments were given by P3, P4, P5, and P11. P3 noticed that “the use of various learning materials and delivery improves the clarity of the lessons” she taught. P11 was aware of the impact on the “comprehension” of her students. She found that her students found it “easier to grasp and understand the lessons they learn”. P4 and P5 expressed similar learning experiences of their students. They noticed their students’ “increased mastery” of the lessons they taught.

Participants thought that the “compatibility” to “information technology” was “important and necessary” in providing learning resources and facilities. The resources and facilities were refurbished to be “equipped with internet access and multi-media”. P18 focused on the “easy, fast and convenient features” of such resources and facilities. She said that to use these resources and facilities only needed some “clicks” away. P9 contrasted the ease with the
“abundance of information and ideas to be gained”. He even described the capacity as “limitless”. Similar advantages of featuring Internet access and multi-media in learning resources and facilities were acknowledged by P3, P4, P5, P10, P11, P17, and P19. They were impressed with the “accessibility, speed, and variety of potential learning materials through the use of the Internet”. They also found that “the use of multi-media makes the presentation and delivery of their learning materials to be more sophisticated and ‘smart’”. It increased their “confidence and enthusiasm” in teaching.

Participants were well aware of the “high cost” involved in providing technology-friendly learning resources and facilities. Their schools needed to seek for “additional financial supports”. The “funding” that their schools received from “government” was added with “contributions from parents and communities”. The participants were also aware of the embedded “accountability” from the external “financial assistance” their schools received. P16’s school was chosen to be the first exemplar of accountable practices in providing learning resources and facilities. Currently, the school was building more classes equipped with better facilities. Being a private school, his school “relies much on financial contributions from parents and communities”. P16 associated “trust with the money his school receives from the external stakeholders”. To ensure that his school was “trustworthy”, “accountability and honesty” became “the main principles”. The process taken was made to be “transparent” and the progress was “regularly communicated” to parents and communities. “The use of the facilities is also regularly reported to the external stakeholders”. P16 said that “continued support from external stakeholders” depended on how “trustworthy and accountable” his school was in the eyes of these stakeholders.
P9’s school was chosen to be the second exemplar of responsible practices in providing learning resources and facilities. As a public vocational school, his school was a recipient of government funding for resource and facility improvements. The funding was usually a large amount. For P9 the “more money” his school got meant the “more accountability” it needed to prove. Similar to the approach taken by P16’s school, the “transparency” of the whole process starting from bidding and financial transactions, and the procurement of resources and facilities became the key “principle”. In his school, everyone had “access to evaluate” the process. To avoid the concentration of authority in certain individuals, “task forces” consisting of “teachers” and “representatives from the school committee” were formed. The “responsibility” was delegated to these task forces and they were required “to provide regular reports and updates of the project”. P9 noticed the “improvement” in his school’s “project management” from these practices of “transparency and delegation”.

From the quotations, the participants thought that availability of learning resources and facilities could bring improvements in the quality of instruction and stimulate creativity and innovation in teaching and learning activities. Since the use of technology and multi-media was the key approach, external financial support from parents and communities was requested to help with the high cost. The financial support received was seen as a trust from the stakeholders and required accountable practices in the process of procurement as well as the use of such resources and facilities.

**Building Partnerships with Stakeholders**

Parents and communities were considered to be important school stakeholders. Partnership with them was expected to encourage their meaningful involvement, to make schooling a successful experience for the students. Communities provided expertise and resources that
were needed for school instructional improvements. Some approaches were taken by the schools to build partnerships with their stakeholders. Co-designing curriculum with partner industries and local institutions was the highlight of school-community partnerships. The need to involve parents was mainly driven by the need to share the responsibility between school and parents in educating the children. The increasing pressure to pass the national exit examination also required parental involvement in preparing students for the examination. The findings of this section reinforced some findings explained in Section 4.1 under the sub-heading of “Improvements in curriculum and learning outcomes”.

The availability of human, expertise and financial resources in the communities was both seen as an opportunity and a challenge for schools to build partnerships with their communities to get the benefits of these ready resources. For P18 to be able to have a “successful partnership with communities” depended on how her school could “sell its vision and mission to its communities”. She highlighted both the “quantity and quality of communication” as the means to make the communities “believe in” her school’s vision and mission and “share similar enthusiasm”. She added that “trustworthiness and respect” were the essence of the communication. In her experiences, “frequent, clear, polite and honest communication” could easily win support from communities. For private schools like hers, winning support from communities determined the “continued existence” of the schools. Using communication to build partnerships with stakeholders was also expressed by P1. In his opinion, “open and genuine” communication could make the “relationship” between a school and its stakeholders “closer and stronger”. Once a school had a “close and strong relationship” with its stakeholders, it would be “easy” to get their “support in school programs”.
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Building partnerships with communities was also reported by P13. In his opinion, a “strong school-community partnership” depended on the “mutual benefits” that both sides could get from the established relationship. According to him, when “mutual contributions” became the foundation, it strengthened the “significance of the relationship”. In his experience, the contributions could vary from “simple, such as sincere gratitude, to substantial, like involvement in decision-making”. He underlined the importance of making the contributions “recognised and appreciated”. In P16’s school, “appreciation” of the community’s contributions was strongly “acknowledged”. P16 praised “the substantial contributions of local pesantren” (Islamic boarding schools) in the Islamic learning of the students”. To “balance”, his school tried to “accommodate” the “interests and needs” of the local pesantren. His school “facilities are open to use” and the “teachers and students are ready to help, if needed by the local pesantren”. The “use of school facilities by the public” was also the approach to build a school-community partnership in P6’s school. As a madrasah school, the “musholla” (prayer room) in his school was “open to the public”. It was done as “an initial step to encourage the community's involvement in his school”. P6 thought that the “interaction that happened in the musholla can break down the barriers” between his school and its community.

In P9’s school, building partnerships with stakeholders was mainly done by “involving” some “partner industries in revising curriculum for heavy machinery and automotive departments”. The partner industries were involved in “co-designing the content of the curriculum, recruiting students, evaluating learning progress, and providing job experiences”. His school contributed to the industries by providing a “qualified workforce of high performing students”. Collaboration with stakeholders in improving the curriculum also happened in P18’s and P16’s school. In P18’s school, partner industries were involved in identifying
“required competencies from the perspectives of real practitioners” to enhance the “relevance” of the curriculum. The partner industries also became the “employers for student apprenticeships”. P18 regarded it as “an added benefit from the collaboration.” In P16’s school, the collaboration was done with local pesantren (Islamic boarding schools). The collaboration was intended to reduce the learning load of the students since the “students study Islam and its practices in these local pesantren during off-school hours”.

Building partnerships with parents also gained the attention of the participants. P13 and P1 believed that “educating children has to be a joint effort between schools and parents”. A similar emphasis on “shared responsibility between school and parents” in students’ learning was given by P4, P12, P18, and P19. They thought that “together with the school’s efforts, parents’ active involvement in their children’s learning can help the children to succeed in their study”. P1, P2, P5, and P20 wanted the parents to have “a genuine interest in their children learning” and be “aware of the progress achieved”. They believed when “parents actively engage in their children’s education”, it could “motivate their children to put their best effort into their study”. The role of parents in their children’s learning was added by P4, P6, P9, P18, and P19. In their opinion, “parental control and supportive home environment can determine the successful learning experiences of the students”. As “students spend longer hours at home than at school”, they believed that “parents and home environment have more substantial impacts on students’ learning”.

The need to involve parents also resulted from the increasing pressure of the national exit examination. This examination taken by students in the final year of their study determined whether the students could graduate and continue to a higher level. The participants were fully aware of the “pressures to pass the examination on schools and parents” as well. As
mentioned by P1, P3, P6, P7, P9, P13, P16, P18, and P19, the pressure to pass the examination not only added “challenges to schools to achieve high graduation rates” but also put the “strain on parents to make sure their children perform well in the examination”. Therefore, involving parents became the option to “share the responsibility for preparing students for the examination”. P1, P3, P6, P9, P10, P13, P15, P17, P18, and P20 thought that “family environment and parental control” were the “external factors” determining “successful performance in the examination”. As parents had “more power” in exercising these external factors, schools needed to “include and involve” them in preparing the students for the examination. P1, P6, P9, P13, and P18 said that “communications and interactions with parents are intensified during this preparation time”.

From the quotations, a partnership with parents and communities was expected to encourage their meaningful involvement in school programs to make schooling a successful experience for the students. Communities provided expertise and resources that were needed for school instructional improvements. Co-designing curriculum with partner industries and local institutions was the highlight of school-community partnerships. The need to involve parents was mainly intended to share the responsibility between school and parents in educating the children and to get parents involved particularly in preparing their children for the national exit examination.

**Improving the Welfare of Teachers**

The attention given to the welfare of the teachers was because of the low salary they receive from this profession. The participants were aware of the economic burden experienced by teachers, especially by non-tenured teachers whose employment was contract-based. They believed that this economic burden could become an impediment for teachers to concentrate
on their job and to give their best efforts. They were aware of its possible impact on the improvement process in their school. Although not all schools were financially capable, they tried to allocate some financial incentives and allowances to their teachers to lessen this financial burden. The participants were enthusiastic about the teacher certification program and found this government initiative could help their school in improving the welfare of their teachers.

Strong awareness of financial difficulties experienced by teachers could be seen from the statement of P9. Reflecting on his former experiences as a teacher, he realised that it was “quite challenging for teachers to meet their daily needs from the salary they get”. He found the “slow process of wage increases for teachers adds to their financial difficulties”. He then contrasted it with the “high cost of living and its increasing speed”. He pointed at the popularity of “moonlighting practices” after school-hours among teachers as efforts to solve their financial problems. In his opinion, “working for long hours” would “drain teachers of their energy and concentration” to do their main job. He added that it would be difficult to expect “quality teaching from exhausted teachers”. He warned of the “detrimental effects on the efforts to improve a school’s instructional quality”. Similar awareness of the impacts of teachers’ financial problems on their teaching performance was expressed by P1 and P16. They added that the “financial strain” would lead to “psychological pressure”. When teachers were in that situation, it would “degrade the quality of their teaching”. For schools that were in their “journey of instructional improvements”, it would be something “to be avoided”.

To help teachers have a decent income, P9’s school offered “additional teaching incentives” particularly for “non-tenured teachers”. The money allocated for this financial assistance was
generated from the “surplus in project management of government funding” received by the school. The amount of money generated made his school “quite financially capable” to run these teaching incentives. However, not all schools had strong financial capacity to offer substantial teaching incentives. As mentioned by P1, P13, P16, and P18, it required them to be “skilful and thorough in managing the school budget to allocate extra money to fund the incentives”. Although the amount of money given was “not much”, they believed that teachers would “still appreciate” the efforts taken.

The teacher certification program run by the government was seen as an “alternative” to increase teachers’ incomes. Although this program was applied to teachers who were civil servants, the participants still considered it as “important external source for the welfare of their teachers”. In P1 and P16’s school, to help their teachers get the financial grant attached to this certification program, “administrative assistance” was provided. Teachers who already succeeded in getting the certification were encouraged to be the “mentors” for teachers who failed or who were preparing to submit their application. The objective was to make every teacher in their school have a “similar opportunity to experience a financial reward from teaching”. P1 and P16 expected that when “welfare is enjoyed by all teachers, it will have a collective impact on instructional improvements” in their school.

From the quotations, the attention given to the welfare of the teachers was because of the awareness of the economic burden experienced by teachers. The participants believed that this economic burden could become an impediment for teachers to concentrate on their job and affect the improvement process in their school. Some financial incentives and allowances were allocated to lessen this financial burden. The government initiative of teacher certification program was also regarded as an effort to help improve the welfare of teachers.
Summary of Managing Instruction

The findings revealed five practices of managing instruction. The first practice was monitoring learning hours. The majority of the participants regarded this practice more as time management to ensure that classes were started and finished on time. A few of the participants saw it as a practice of supervising teaching performance to provide feedback to the supervised teachers.

The second practice was communicating instructional matters. The communication occurred between principal and teachers as well as among teachers themselves. The participants believed that principal-teacher communication would create a culture of collegiality between them. In addition, the exchange of ideas in the communication process would lead to collaboration and acceptability of decisions taken.

The third practice was providing learning resources and facilities. The availability of learning resources and facilities was expected to bring improvements in the quality of instruction. It could also stimulate creativity and innovation in teaching and learning activities. The use of technology and multi-media got a very strong emphasis in the provision of learning resources and facilities. As it involved high cost to provide such school resources and facilities, external financial support from parents and communities was sought. The financial support obtained was also seen as a trust given to schools and made this practice have an attached accountability especially to the benefactors.

The fourth practice was building partnerships with stakeholders. Parents and communities were considered to be important school partners. Partnership with them was expected to encourage their meaningful involvement to make schooling a successful experience for the
students. Communities provided expertise and resources that were needed for schools’ instructional improvements.

The last practice was improving the welfare of the teachers. The attention given to the welfare of the teachers was because of the low salary they received from this profession. The participants were aware of the economic burden experienced by teachers especially by non-tenured teachers whose employment was contract-based. They believed that this economic burden could become an impediment for teachers to concentrate in their job and to give their best efforts. Although not all schools were financially capable, they tried to allocate some financial incentives and allowances to their teachers to lessen this financial burden.

In general, the identified practices reemphasised the practices of managing instruction suggested by Weber’s instructional leadership model and related empirical studies reviewed by Nettles and Herrington. Practices of monitoring learning hours and ensuring the welfare of the teachers were local practices influenced by Indonesian cultural and socio-economic factors.

4.2.2 Promoting Instruction

This section documents emerging practices for promoting instruction. Five practices were identified: setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, creating a climate for learning, encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs, and involving parents. Similar to the identified practices of managing instruction, some local practices of improving instruction were found. Two of the practices (setting high expectations for students and creating a learning climate) reemphasised the practices suggested by Weber’s instructional leadership model and related empirical studies reviewed
by Nettles and Herrington. Three others practices (focusing on character building, promoting extracurricular programs, and engaging parents) were local practices influenced by Indonesian educational values.

**Setting High Expectations for Students**

High expectations were measured by some desirable traits expected from the students. The traits mainly consisted of cognitive and affective competencies. The participants believed that setting high expectations for their students would focus their attention on their study and push them to work harder. Although high cognitive accomplishments dominated the attention of the participants, there was an increased emphasis given to affective competencies. It was due to the fact that these affective competencies were reinforced by the national curriculum and included in components of students’ summative learning evaluations reported to parents. Parents were expected to take part in fostering the competencies at home. The home environment was considered a more effective place to instil the competencies.

High expectations for cognitive accomplishments were measured from students’ performance in both formative and summative tests. For P7 and P14, “test scores will provide them with information on how much effort his students have put into their learning to meet the expectation required”. P20 associated the “scores his students get in the tests” with the “expectation” he had for them. For him “higher expectation means higher scores in the tests”. P2, P3, P8, P10, P11, and P12 expressed a similar preference. They also communicated this expectation to their students. In their opinion, “it is important to let the students know what they are expected to accomplish in the tests”. P1, P6, P9, P16, and P18 agreed that making students “know the standards” set for them would become an “encouragement and motivation” for the students “to perform well in the tests”. They believed that
“communicating the expectations” would make students aware of “the seriousness given to their performance in the tests” and it would push them to “work harder for the tests”.

Religious quality was included in the affective competencies expected from students. High expectations of this religious quality were not limited to madrasah schools only. Participants from other school types also expressed similar expectations of having students with a high religious quality. The participants related this religious quality to its influence on students’ characters. P4, P12, P17, and P20 said that “religious values that are embedded will shape students’ characters”. They added that the “moulded characters will determine students’ behaviour in learning and working with their teachers and friends”. P2, P5, and P19 also highlighted the association between religious values and character qualities. In their opinion, “good characters can be formed through fostering religious values in students”. They continued that to “promote religious quality” in students and “encourage the application of religious values”, there had to be “clear expectations set for this quality”. P1 and P16 thought that “school-wide implementation will also strengthen the expectations for this religious quality”.

High expectations were also set for other character qualities in the students. Competencies such as responsibility, curiosity, and independence were emphasised by the participants. The following were the exemplars of high expectations set for these competencies. For P12 and P20, “responsibility” would guide the students in making “right decisions and choices”. They added that this ability would “help” the students not only in “their study” but also in “their life” later on. Therefore, they expected “high responsibility” from their students and focused on “cultivating” this trait “in teaching and learning activities”. P10 emphasised curiosity to learn. In her opinion, “high curiosity” promoted “critical thinking” which she thought a
fundamental learning quality. The “lack of curiosity” among her students prompted her to “focus on this trait”. P9 and P19 added “independence” to the character qualities they expected from their students. P9 defined independence as “reliance on one’s ability included in making, carrying out plans, and evaluating the results”. According to him, high independence in these aspects was necessary to “prepare the students to compete in the job market” after their graduation.

Affective competencies of the students were evaluated qualitatively at the end of every semester and reported to parents. The participants like P1, P4, P5, P6, P10, P12, and P15 said that the “evaluation of these affective competencies strengthens the importance of these competencies and reinforces the expectations”. P4 said that it was “an accomplishment” for her as a teacher if she could “produce students with high affective competencies” in addition to their cognitive achievements. She added that as a teacher her “duty” was not only to “transfer knowledge” but also to “form decent characters in her students”. Other participants such as P1, P5, P12, P15, P17 and P20 also shared similar descriptions. They wanted to “educate” their students to be people with “good characters” and “high intelligence”. However, they were aware of the “time limitation” they had with their students. In their opinion, “parents have more opportunities to instil these competencies”. They also believed that the “home environment is the best place to expose these competencies and enforce their application”.

From the quotations, high expectations for the students were measured mainly by their cognitive and affective competencies. The participants believed that setting high expectations for their students would focus their attention on their study and push them to work harder. Although high cognitive accomplishments dominated the attention of the participants, there
was an increased emphasis given to affective competencies as they were included into the components of students’ summative learning evaluations reported to parents. Parents were expected to take part in fostering the competencies at home since home environment was thought a more effective place to instil the competencies.

**Focusing on Student Character Building**

The practice of focusing on student character building is closely related to the previous practice of setting high expectations for students. Although these two practices seemed to overlap each other, student character building was listed separately because of the importance given to this practice. During the interviews, character building or character education were the most repeatedly mentioned words by almost all of the participants. Character building was highlighted as well in school curriculum improvements. It was also reinforced by the national curriculum and assessed in students’ summative reports. The values adopted to build the characters of the students were basically taken from universal principles, out of religious and cultural practices. The universality of the values was expected to bridge the heterogeneous backgrounds and different religious beliefs of the students.

The practice in P9’s school could be taken as the exemplar of a practice of adopting universal values for student character building. In addition to “religious and cultural values, Stephen R. Covey’s “The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People” was used as the “main reference” for “composing the values promoted” in student character building in his school. He believed that this approach would make the adopted character values reflect “local characteristics” of his school while at the same time they were “aligned with modern and universal values”. He added that the “combination of local and universal values” would make the students not only aware of “local wisdoms” but also responsive to “global values”. He said that the characters
molded by these “combined values” would “help the students adjust themselves faster and perform better in their job later on”.

In P1’s school, the values adopted for student character building were intended to promote good learning habits among the students. P1 explained that “learning success” was supported by “productive habits such as punctuality, discipline, hard work, honesty, respect and independence”. Therefore, the “values to form such habits” were given “a strong emphasis”. To “reinforce the expected characters”, “teachers and staff” in his school were “obliged to be the role models” for the students. In P1’s opinion, “modeling the desired characters is the best way” to encourage students to “acquire and carry out similar characters”. P1 added when “everybody” in his school “believes in similar values and behaves accordingly, it will fasten the process needed to instil these characters” in the school. He wanted the “characters of his students” to become the “image of his school” in the community.

For P16, focusing on the “characters of the students” was more “imperative in a madrasah school” like his school. He said that “different from other schools, a madrasah is scrutinized by the community based on the characters of the students”. When the “students behave badly”, this would create “a bad record for the madrasah in the community”. Therefore, producing “students with good characters” became “one of the school’s goals”. Similar awareness of community’s scrutiny of the characters of the students was acknowledged by P6. He said that for a madrasah school, there was “a stronger expectation from the community of the characters of the students”. He added that people associated a madrasah school as “a place for students to learn and acquire decent characters”. When the students behaved differently from these expectations, people would “judge it as a failure” of the
school. As it would “affect the image of the madrasah” in the community, he believed that “focusing on the characters of the students is very important”.

The focus on students’ affective competencies actualised through students’ characters was reinforced by the national curriculum. The curriculum necessitated these affective competencies to be included into components of student learning and evaluation. Character building was also a consideration in school curriculum improvements. In P14’s school, the improvement in curriculum was done “to develop students’ potential, not only in their cognitive abilities, but also in their affective, psychomotor and character domains.” In P9’s school, the curriculum was revised to incorporate components of character building in its content. The importance of students’ character competencies could also be seen from their inclusion in summative evaluations held at the end of every semester. P1, P4, P5, P6, P10, P12, and P15 said that “the evaluation of these affective competencies strengthens the importance of these competencies” in their schools. The role of parents and the home environment in student character building was also acknowledged. The participants believed that “parents can become the best role models” in promoting desired characters to the students. They also believed that the “home environment is the best place to build the characters”.

From the quotations, character building or character education was repeatedly mentioned by almost all of the participants. The emphasis on student character building was highlighted as it was reinforced by the national curriculum and assessed in students’ summative reports. The values adopted to build the characters of the students were basically taken from universal principles, out of religious and cultural practices. The universality of the values was expected
to accommodate the heterogeneous backgrounds and different religious beliefs of the students.

**Creating a Climate for Learning**

The main objective of this practice was to set up school conditions that could stimulate and promote learning. From the interviews, a stimulating academic climate was created in quite different ways. In one school, visual stimulation was used, while in other schools, class blocks/moving classes, school exterior conditions and layouts and interpersonal relationships were used to create a learning climate. Good interpersonal relationships were not only established between teachers and students, but were also encouraged to thrive among all school members, including principal-to-teacher, principal-to-student, teacher-to-teacher, student-to-student, and student-to-school administrative staff.

Uniquely, P13’s school used visual stimulations in the form of posters and signs to create a learning climate. P13 said that “visual stimulations are the easy way to attract the attention of the students and to communicate the messages from school”. He added that “the use of different colours and shapes can accentuate the meanings”. He believed that the use of pictures and signs was “a simple yet attractive way to initiate learning”. He hoped these “catchy visual stimulations will emit enjoyment for learning” for the students. In contrast to P13’s school, P9’s school used class blocks/moving classes to create a climate conducive for learning and elevate students’ spirits in learning. P9 said “class blocks can make learning activities enjoyable and fresh for the students and teachers”. Class blocks were done by “moving students to a different classroom for a certain subject”. He believed that “moving to another classroom can refresh students’ minds, eliminate their boredom and provide a little time for them to stretch their tired body from sitting all day long”.
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In P1’s school, a serious attention was given to school exterior conditions and layouts. As the school was relatively new, there were “opportunities to outline and plan the development and expansion of school buildings and facilities”. In P1’s opinion, a “shady, green and fresh exterior” can revive tired minds and reenergize the spirit to learn”. P1 was proud of the “big number of trees” that his school had planted to create the desired exterior. Location of classes and learning facilities were given attention in the school. School laboratories and libraries were built near to classes. P1 said that the “proximity will give easy and quick access to the students to use the facilities”. He expected that the “access and exposure to such facilities will stimulate learning in his school”.

P18 used a different way to create learning climate in her school. She believed that a “learning climate can be promoted by establishing good interpersonal relationships among school members”. Interpersonal relationships in her school were built on “a motto called 5 S (Salam = greet, Sapa = talk, Santun = courteous, Sholat = pray, and Senyum = smile)”. This motto was the “core principle” of the relationships among school members. She believed that “harmonious relationships among school members will benefit teaching and learning activities and create a supporting climate for learning”. Interpersonal relationships also caught the attention of P13. He focused on relationships between teachers and students. He explained that although “respect for teachers is a must for the students” in his school, he did not want it to “create a gap between them”. He wanted to “change the assumptions among the students that their teachers are fearsome”. To establish a good relationship between teachers and students, his school regularly held “congregational prayers attended by teachers and students”. He expected the activity would provide “an opportunity for teachers and students to get to know each other better and bring their relationship closer”.
In P16’s school, a good relationship was not only established between teachers and students, but it was also encouraged to thrive among all school members. P16 claimed that his school had a “very supporting and approachable learning climate”. He said that the “relationships between students and teachers are built on mutual respect”. “Communications between students and teachers” especially about learning problems were “encouraged”. Teacher-to-teacher relationships were intended to build “collaboration among teachers to work together in solving issues related to teaching and learning activities”. His school also tried to eliminate possible “gaps between superiors and subordinates”. P16 wanted the “working and learning ethos” in his school was based on “equity, trust and respect”.

Quite similar to P16, P1 highlighted collegial working relationships between principal and teachers in his school. Since his school was a new school, practically everybody in this school “started working at the school roughly at the same time”. He saw it as “an advantage” because there was “no senior or junior label for anybody”. It also fostered “collegiality and collaboration between principal and teachers”. He added that this “climate of collegiality and collaboration” was “important to build collective commitments and actions” especially in the efforts “to improve instructional quality” in his school. Collegial working relationships between principal and teachers and among teachers themselves also coloured the working climate in P9’s school. “Intense communication and interactions” based on “trust and respect” were established. P9 believed the “exchange of ideas and suggestions” between principal and teachers and among teachers would “improve the quality of the decisions made”.

From the quotation, creating a climate for learning was intended to set up school conditions that could stimulate and promote learning. There were different ways taken to create a
stimulating academic climate. In one school, visual stimulation was used, while in other schools, class blocks/moving classes, school exterior conditions and layouts and interpersonal relationships were implemented. Good interpersonal relationships were established and encouraged to thrive among all school members.

**Encouraging Student Participation in Extracurricular Programs**

This practice was primarily intended to balance students’ school life and to invigorate their learning enthusiasm. Students were encouraged to participate in extracurricular programs for several reasons. Physical activities offered by the programs were considered important to improve learning concentration and maintain good mental health. These programs could be a way to develop students’ characters. Students could also showcase their talents and abilities to be recognised by their schools and wider communities. Extracurricular programs could bring some benefits to the school as well. The programs gave opportunities to collaborate with community leaders and other community institutions. The competitions held for extracurricular programs gave schools the time to celebrate and appreciate the diverse potentials of their students. In addition, students’ achievements in such competitions could be a promotional opportunity and helped create a favourable school profile in the community.

P9 highlighted the benefits of extracurricular programs, especially sports programs, to improve students’ learning concentration. He explained that when “students do some “sports, they release the tension they have in their study”. He added that sports could “freshen up students’ minds”. He thought that a “fresh mind can boost better learning concentration”. Driven by the motto of “Mens sana in corpora sano”, he wanted the students in his school to be “mentally healthy” by “improving their physical health” through extracurricular programs. For P13, values such as “sportsmanship, fairness, honesty, discipline, hard work and team
work can be fostered in the sports programs”. The “exposure and application of these values” could help “develop the characters of the students”. Sports programs could also provide the opportunity to collaborate with institutions in the community. P9’s school had “a strong partnership with local sport clubs for student sports programs”. P9 thought that clubs were “the best place for students to learn some sports”. In addition, clubs offered the “opportunities to participate in competitive tournaments and become professional sportsmen”. He expected that this could “motivate the students to seriously participate in the programs”.

P16 was proud of his school’s extracurricular program on movie production. P16 admitted that the program was “quite a contradiction for a madrasah school” like his school. He expected that this movie production program could “change the opinion that madrasah schools only focus on the teaching of religion”. He wanted to cultivate “creativity and imagination” in his school and provide “the opportunity for the students to express their potentials”. The students were provided with “necessary equipment and software” for the movie production program. His school also held an “annual indie movie festival” for the students “to showcase their acting and movie-making talents and abilities”. “The winning movies will be played in the school auditorium and the tickets are sold to public”. He said that “the money raised is used to support this extracurricular program”. He declared that “movie production has been the most favourite extracurricular program for the students”.

In P6’s school, journalism was the main focus of the extracurricular programs. In P6’s opinion, “journalism is more about how the students react to current issues that happen in real life and how they express and argue for their ideas constructively”. He added that journalism would “sharpen the ability of the students to think critically and to be sensitive towards issues in the community”. The students had won “several journalism competitions both at district
and provincial levels”. He said that “the achievements have improved the image of the school in the community”. These achievements also gave “added points for his school’s accreditation”. P16 added that “students’ achievements in extracurricular competitions can promote the school to the public”. He believed that “schools with high achievements are more attractive for prospective students”. For a private school like his school, it is “essential to make use of this promotional opportunity”.

From the quotations, students’ participation in extracurricular programs was primarily aimed to balance students’ school life and to invigorate their learning enthusiasm. The programs provided the opportunities for students to showcase their talents and abilities to be recognised by their schools and wider communities. The programs also gave the opportunities for schools to collaborate with community leaders and other community institutions and, therefore, created a favourable school profile in the community.

**Involving Parents**

The practice of involving parents seemed to overlap with the practice of building partnerships with school stakeholders, as explained in the previous section on managing instruction. This practice was listed separately to accentuate the efforts made by the school and the challenges they experienced in getting the parents involved in their children’s learning. Parents and the family environment were considered as influential as schools in making learning a successful experience for the students. Although the educational backgrounds of the parents could make it challenging for schools to have them involved in their children’s learning, their support was still recognised to be essential, particularly for their children’s learning at home. Parental participation in school programs was acknowledged to be more challenging for schools located in suburban and rural areas where the majority of parents were uneducated and from
lower socio-economic classes. Economic pressures were another inhibiting factor for parental involvement.

Parental involvement in their children’s learning was emphasised by P1. He found it “difficult and somehow unfair to trust all the responsibilities of learning to school alone”. He calculated that “students only spend approximately one third of their daily time at school”. As “students spend more time at home”, he felt that “parents have more opportunities to get involved in their children’s learning”. P4, P6, P9, P18, and P19 also argued for a similar approach. Since students spend “longer hours at home than at school”, they believe that “parents and home environment have more substantial impacts on students’ learning”. P1 also stated a similar idea. In his opinion, “parents and family environment are important factors for students’ learning success”.

A similar emphasis on “shared responsibility between school and parents” in students’ learning was given by P4, P12, P18, and P19. They thought that “together with the school’s efforts, parents’ active involvement in their children’s learning can help the children to succeed in their study”. P1, P2, P5, and P20 believed when “parents actively engage in their children’s education, it can motivate their children to put the best effort into their study”. They wanted the parents to have “a genuine interest in their children’s learning and be aware of their learning progress”. The role of parents in their children’s learning was added by P4, P6, P9, P18, and P19. In their opinion, “parents’ control and supportive home environment can determine successful learning experiences for the students”.

As explained in the previous section on managing instruction, the need to involve parents in their children’s learning also resulted from the increasing pressure of the national exit
examination. The result of this examination determined whether final year students could graduate and continue to a higher level. The majority of the participants felt the pressure to pass the examination. They also knew that “parents feel a similar tension to ensure their children perform well in the examination”. Therefore, involving parents became the option to “share the responsibility for preparing students for the examination”. P1, P3, P6, P9, P10, P13, P15, P17, P18, and P20 thought that “family environment and parental control are the external factors determining successful performance in the examination”. As “parents have more power in exercising these external factors, schools need to “include and involve them in preparing the students for the examination”.

To get parents involved in their children’s learning, schools tried to have regular communications with parents on their children’s learning progress. As explained by P1, “parent-teacher meetings at every semester report give opportunities to get the parents involved in their children’s learning”. In these meetings, “learning problems experienced by the students are raised and discussed with parents”. Parents were encouraged to “monitor their children’s learning at home”. P6, P9, P13, and P16 also reported a similar activity. As schools had “limited opportunities” to have parents come to schools, they considered this parent-teacher meeting to be “essential”. Teachers tried to make “the communication in the meeting to be reciprocal” and parents were urged to “express any concerns related to their children’s learning”.

P16 found the educational background of the parents could make it challenging to have them involved in their children’s learning. He realised that “limited educational backgrounds of the parents can prevent their active involvement in their children’s learning progress”. P6 gave similar attention to parents’ educational backgrounds. He found it to be a challenge for
schools located in suburban and rural areas where the majority of parents came from lower socio-economic and lower educated classes. In P16’s opinion, the least thing that parents could do was “to exercise control over their children”. Since schools had limitations in controlling students’ learning, especially after school hours, P16 believed that “parental control is quite important”. In his opinion, “parental control is one of the ways to encourage parental involvement”.

P6 added economic pressures as another inhibiting factor for parental involvement. His school was located in an area where the economy was still an issue. Most of the students came from families who were struggling economically. P6 was aware that “economic pressure can take away the attention of parents on their children’s learning”. To eliminate the impact of these economic pressures, his school tried to be “more persuasive to the parents, to get their attention”. Parents were “regularly invited to school where the progress of their children’s learning is shared”. Parents were also “informed what challenges are faced by the school and how they can contribute to help”. P6 believed this approach could become the way to “get the parents involved not only in their children’s learning but also in other school programs”.

From the quotations, involving parents accentuated the efforts made by the school to get parents involved in their children’s learning. Parents and the family environment were considered as influential as school in making learning a successful experience for the students. Parental support was recognised to be essential, particularly for their children’s learning at home. However, parental participation in school programs was acknowledged to be more challenging for suburban and rural schools where the majority of parents were uneducated and came from low socio-economic background.
Summary of Promoting Instruction

The findings revealed five practices of promoting instruction. The first practice was setting high expectations for students. High expectations were measured by some desirable traits expected from the students. The traits mainly consisted of cognitive and affective competencies. The home environment was considered a more effective place to instil the competencies.

The second practice was focusing on student character building. The values adopted to build the characters of the students were basically taken from universal principles and religious and cultural practices. The universality of the values was expected to bridge the heterogeneous backgrounds and different religious beliefs of the students.

The third practice was creating a climate for learning. The main objective of this practice was to set up school conditions that could stimulate and promote learning. From the interviews, a stimulating academic climate was created in quite different ways. In one school, visual stimulation was used while in other schools class blocks/moving classes, school exterior conditions and layouts and interpersonal relationships were used to create a learning climate.

The fourth practice was encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs. This practice was primarily intended to balance students’ school life and to invigorate their learning enthusiasm. The programs could become the place to develop students’ characters, improve their learning concentration and maintain good mental health. The programs gave opportunities to schools to collaborate with community leaders and other community institutions. In addition, students’ achievements in such programs could be a promotional opportunity and help create a favourable school profile in the community.
The last practice was involving parents. Parents and family environment were considered as influential as schools in making learning a successful experience for the students. Although the educational background of the parents could make it challenging for schools to have them involved in their children’s learning, their support was still recognised to be essential, particularly for their children’s learning at home.

Similar to managing instruction practices, some of the identified practices of promoting instruction reemphasised the practices suggested by the empirical findings of instructional leadership practices in a broader international context. Focusing on student character building, encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs, and involving parents were local practices influenced by Indonesian educational and cultural values.

### 4.2.3 Improving Instruction

This section documents the emerging practices for promoting instruction. Five practices were identified: providing regular teaching feedback, increasing teachers’ qualifications, facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards. Similar to the identified practices of managing and promoting instruction, some local practices of improving instruction were found. The practice of increasing teachers’ qualifications and increasing standards were local practices influenced by Indonesian educational values. Three other practices (providing regular teaching feedback, facilitating professional development programs for teachers, and improving curriculum) reemphasised the practices suggested by Weber’s instructional leadership model and related empirical studies reviewed by Nettles and Herrington.
Providing Regular Teaching Feedback

There were different ideas among the participants on the sources of information that were used in giving feedback. Test scores, particularly national exit examination scores were used more predominantly than direct observations on the teaching and learning process in classrooms. Only a few of the participants directly observed teaching and learning activities to provide feedback to teachers. Referring to the practices suggested by Weber’s instructional leadership model and related empirical studies reviewed by Nettles and Herrington, using test scores from national exit examinations to provide the feedback was categorised into the practice of assessing instruction rather than a practice of improving instruction. The explanation of this practice will be discussed in the following section on assessing instruction.

Regular teaching feedback from the observations on teaching and learning activities were reported by P1. Collaborations between teachers and principal coloured this practice from its initial process of setting the criteria used in the observation to its final process of evaluating the performance. Teachers were involved in deciding and composing the evaluation criteria for the observations. P1 thought that “teachers’ involvement will increase the validity of the evaluation and the acceptance of the results as well as the feedback given”. The evaluation of the performance was done both by the principal and the observed teacher. P1 expected that a “teacher’s individual evaluation on his or her performance will encourage his or her self-evaluation and self-reflection”. P1 added that “this co-evaluation practice will also create a collegial relationship between the principal and teachers”. The results of the evaluation and the feedback were discussed together “to synchronise their ideas on the required actions for improvements”. P1 said that the results of the evaluation were also used in “planning professional development programs for the teachers”.
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P3 found regular teaching feedback from classroom observations important for her. She said that being a fresh-graduate teacher with limited teaching experience, “the feedback she got from the observations will give her valuable information” on her teaching performance. She considered the observations more as “in-service trainings”. She liked the way classroom observations were organised in her school. Teachers were “given similar rights as the principal to evaluate the teaching performance”. This evaluation practice made her feel that her “opinions are respected and valued”. She added that her involvement in the evaluation encouraged her to “self-assess” her performance. The classroom observations were followed by meetings with her principal to discuss the feedback. These follow-up discussions provided them with the opportunities to “work together in identifying areas for improvements”. She felt her principal acted more as “a mentor” than as her superior.

P2 also felt the importance of regular teaching feedback from classroom observations. He said that senior teachers like him tended “to become fossilised in their teaching techniques”. In his experience, he found it “more comfortable to do similar routine things than to apply new creative ways” in his teaching. He was aware that he needed “to vary the way” he taught “to make the lessons more attractive to the students”. Therefore, he found “classroom observations important” for him. The feedback would help him “identify things” that had missed his attention. He said that the “presence of his principal in his class” could give him “the motivation to better perform in teaching”. His “principal’s feedback” on his teaching performance could “stimulate” him to explore and apply more variations in his teaching.

Different from P2 and P3, P12 never had the experience of being observed by her principal and given feedback on her teaching performance. P12 wished that her principal would “spare some of his time” to come to her class and see the real things that happened in her class.
Other participants like P4, P7, P12, P19 and P20 also expressed similar wishes. The absence of classroom observations and feedback made them “feel neglected and not appreciated”. P12 thought classroom observations could make her principal “appreciate more the hard work” she had put into her teaching. P7 added that it was “not easy to teach big classes with heterogeneous backgrounds of the students”. Similar to P12, P7 said that the challenges he experienced and his teaching commitment “will not be recognised and valued without the observations”. P12 added that classroom observations would give the principal “first-hand information” on the difficulties he had in his teaching. He said that classroom observations would be the way “to share these difficulties between teachers and principal”. For P19 and P20, classroom observations and teaching feedback would make them feel that their principal was “serious and committed to improve teaching and learning activities” in their school.

From the quotations, the participants had different ideas on the sources of information for teaching feedbacks. Test scores, particularly national exit examination scores were used more predominantly than direct observations on the teaching and learning process in classrooms. Only a few of the participants directly observed teaching and learning activities to provide feedback to their teachers. Using test scores from national exit examinations to provide the feedback was actually a practice of assessing instruction rather than a practice of improving instruction.

**Increasing Teachers’ Qualifications**

Teachers’ qualifications were mainly measured by their educational degree. Pursuing a higher educational degree was the way to increase their qualifications. However, the participants commented on the lack of financial support for higher degree study and the heavy teaching load has been the impediment for increasing the qualifications of teachers. In addition, for
public servant teachers, to get approval for their study could be a lengthy procedure. To encourage teachers to take higher degree study, schools tried to simplify the administrative bureaucracy involved in the process. Teachers were also given flexibility in their teaching schedule to match with their university study.

Although he was fully aware of the “high cost for a higher university degree”, P13 believed that “the quality of instruction depends on the qualifications of the teachers”. As his school could not provide financial support for teachers, the administrative procedure was “simplified”. P13 said that the administrative bureaucracy could turn out to be “quite cumbersome and time consuming”. He did not want it “to discourage the teachers from going back to university to study”. As the teachers were still required to teach while they studied, the school rearranged their teaching schedules so that they would not clash with the study timetable. P13 expected that a flexible teaching schedule could become a “motivational support for the teachers”.

A similar practice was also reported by P16. He believed that “highly qualified teachers can bring out the best in their students”. He added that “high qualifications can be achieved by pursuing a higher degree”. To encourage the teachers to study for a higher degree, the administrative requirements were “simplified”. He said that being a private school, his school was “able to cut down lengthy procedures for the teachers to get approval for their study”. The convenience of shortening the administrative process was also experienced by P18. Since her school was a private school, “the process can be adjusted to speed up the process”. Similar to the previous participants, P16 and P18 said that their school rearranged the teaching schedule so “it will not interfere with the study”.
For P1, “the quality of teachers determines the quality of instruction”. Similar to P13 and P16, he supported teachers in his school pursuing a higher degree. He knew that “for public servant teachers, the administrative process is very bureaucratic and long”. He was afraid that teachers could “get discouraged from increasing their education degree”. He found it “the responsibility of the school to help teachers meet the administrative requirements”. Teachers who had the experience in getting the approval to study were encouraged “to become the mentors”. P1 thought that “the support they get from their colleagues can encourage and strengthen their motivation to pursue their study”. He added that “the teaching slot for the teachers is readjusted to minimise unnecessary distractions to their study”.

Administrative support for teachers who decided to pursue a higher degree was also the focus of P9. At the time of the interview, his school had eight teachers studying for a master’s degree”. He was proud that four of the teachers were on scholarships. He was aware of the “hard work involved to pursue a higher degree”. He knew that “the teachers not only need to focus on their study, but they also have classes to teach”. He added that “it takes strong determination and discipline to manage study and teaching responsibilities”. To ease the pressure, his school tried to “eliminate any administrative difficulties and allocate a teaching schedule that works best for the teachers”.

From the quotations, pursuing a higher educational degree was the preferred way to increase teachers’ qualifications. The lack of financial support for higher degree study and the heavy teaching load has been the impediment for increasing the qualifications of teachers. In addition, for public servant teachers, approval to study from the government might entail a lengthy procedure. To encourage teachers to take higher degree study, schools tried to
simplify the administrative bureaucracy involved in the process. Teachers were also given flexibility in their teaching schedule to accommodate their learning responsibilities.

Facilitating Professional Development Programs for Teachers

There was a strong emphasis given to professional development programs for teachers. The programs were believed to be necessary to improve teaching and learning activities. The programs became the forum for teachers to acquire up-to-date information and knowledge in their subject area. Using this information and knowledge in teaching activities, teachers could make their teaching activities more current and relevant. The exchange of ideas in professional development programs could make teachers more creative, selective, and confident in their teaching activities. The interaction with teachers from different schools in professional development programs provided the opportunity to build networking among them. It was believed that this networking among teachers could eliminate the feeling of isolation.

P13 considered education as a very dynamic field. According to him, “professional development programs help teachers to update their knowledge and skills in accordance with the dynamic developments in their subject area”. The dynamic developments in education also captured the attention of P4. In her opinion, education constantly develops, as seen from “the emergence of new theories of teaching and the application of new teaching approaches and techniques”. She believes that “teacher professional development programs become unquestionably important to help teachers keep up with these developments”. A similar idea was also expressed by P11. She said that “education develops very fast and there are so many new things entering and affecting this field”. She believes that “teacher professional development programs are the way to stay well-informed, with these changes”.

Similarly, P14 believed that “keeping up with the latest information is very important especially to bridge what is going on in classrooms with what is happening in the outside world”. He thought that, “teachers’ attendance and active participation on professional development programs can improve their understanding of current information in their field”. P13 added that “teachers’ understanding of current information in their field can help them improve the relevance of their teaching activities”. P13 added that “being well-informed will make teachers more confident in teaching”. Increased confidence was also underlined by P9. He saw professional development programs as the means “to empower our teachers to be more prepared, competent and confident in teaching”.

P18 highlighted the exchange of ideas and best practices in professional development programs. She said that it could “make teachers more creative, selective, resourceful and knowledgeable in their instructional activities”. She has noticed these impacts on teachers in her school. Similar emphasis was given by P6. He said that from these programs, teachers could “learn lots of valuable ideas and skills to help them become more competent, creative, and resourceful in teaching”. P4 substantiated the statement. She said that “I have picked up lots of new ideas from attending these programs and they have given me fresh ideas to make my teaching activities more creative and interesting”. P13 and P18 commented that “innovative and creative teachers” could help their school improve its instructional quality.

As professional development programs were organised at a district level, P2 and P18 found that “the interaction with teachers from different schools provides the opportunities to build networking among teachers”. They believed that “networking is a good way to share ideas among teachers”. A similar idea was given by P1. He added that “networking among teachers can eliminate the feeling of loneliness”. He found teaching to be “a very solitary profession
where teachers do the job alone, confined in a classroom for quite a long time”. Therefore, he believed that “participating in professional development programs can be the way for teachers to get reconnected with the outside world and recharge their teaching enthusiasm”. The importance of networking was highlighted by P4, P5, P12, P14, P15, P19, and P20. The statement of P12 was selected to be the exemplar. He explained that as an Islamic education teacher, the subject that he taught was “conceptual and abstract in nature”. It became a challenge for him to make his “students understand religious concepts”. He found that the networking he had with other Islamic education teachers from other schools is helpful because they provided him with best practices and valuable resources to help him succeed in his teaching activities.

For P7, professional development programs could help teachers to increase their professionalism. He found that society still considered “teaching as a second-class job”. In his opinion, to change this perception, teachers had to prove that “they deserve to be recognised as professionals”. He suggested that teachers should actively participate in professional development programs to increase their professionalism. A similar recommendation was given by P5. She thought that “professional development programs are essential for any teacher who wants to be professional”. On the other hand, P19 found that “the materials of professional development programs sometimes do not really touch the real problems faced by teachers in the classroom”. She suggested the implementation of “needs assessment for professional development programs to meet the needs of the teachers. Similar to P5 and P7, she believed that teachers could learn a lot from professional development programs to help them increase their teaching professionalism.
From the quotations, there was a strong emphasis given to professional development programs for teachers. The programs were believed to be necessary to improve teaching and learning activities. The programs were the forum for teachers to acquire up-to-date information and knowledge in their subject area so that their teaching activities became more current and relevant. The exchange of ideas in professional development programs could make teachers more creative, selective, and confident in their teaching activities. The interaction with teachers from different schools in professional development programs provided the opportunity to build networking among them.

**Improving Curriculum**

This practice could be related to improvement in curriculum as one of the expected instructional improvements in school reform, as explained at the beginning of this chapter. As they share similar ideas, the explanation of this section was a repetition of section 4.1.1. The practice of improving curriculum was done primarily by revising the content of the curriculum to match the distinct characteristics of the schools. Co-designing the curriculum content with partner industries, particularly for productive (job-related) subjects, was quite a common approach in vocational senior secondary schools. It was intended to match curriculum content with competencies required by job markets. In other school types, the revision of the curriculum was either to align it with school characteristics or to create a new image for the school.

Curriculum improvement for heavy machinery and automotive departments was an emphasis in P9’s school. The content of the curriculum was co-designed with partner industries. The partner industries were in charge of “student recruitment and grade evaluation”. Determined by industrial standards, “student performance is evaluated either pass or failed”. The
industries also became “the place for job experience”, compulsory for final year students. The industries would directly employ high performing apprentices. A similar approach of collaboration with industries also happened in P18’s school. The partner industries were involved in identifying “required competencies from the perspectives of real practitioners”. For P18, the representation of the competencies in her school’s curriculum enhanced its relevance because “the students are trained to have the skills that are really needed in real jobs”. As experienced by P9’s school, the partner industries of P18’s school also become its partner employers for student apprenticeships.

P16 also highlighted collaboration as the practice to improve the curriculum of his school. As an Islamic/madrasah senior secondary school, the collaboration was done with local pesantren (Islamic boarding schools). As the “curriculum for a madrasah school is different from curriculum in other schools” particularly in the number of subject students have to learn, the collaboration was intended to reduce the learning load of the students. “As our students study Islam and its practices in these local pesantren during off-school hours, it provides us with more time to concentrate on other subjects”. This practice of collaboration was based on trust that local pesantren could provide “better Islamic learning for the students”. Curriculum improvement in P16’s school was expected to change the stereotype attached to madrasah schools. “People still consider that madrasah are very conservative where students only learn things about Islam”. Therefore, the composition of the curriculum was designed to “encourage students to identify and express their academic and non-academic potentials”. The focus on diversity of potentials would erase “the image of a madrasah school of being traditional and old-fashioned”.

In P1’s school, curriculum improvement was done “to act in accordance with the enactment of National Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003” which promotes the practice of school-based curriculum. P13 regarded the authority given to a school to design its own curriculum as “one of the important aspects of school reform”. Although schools were required to comply with national standards set by the government, P13 praised that “this new curriculum gives the freedom to us to align the national standards with the unique characteristics of our school”. The representation of school characteristics in an improved curriculum was also underlined by P1. For him, school-based curriculum meant that “the curriculum is derived from the distinct characteristics of the school”. However, he acknowledged that accommodating school characteristics in the curriculum “will be really challenging considering the lack of expertise in our school”.

In spite of different approaches taken to improve curriculum, there was a noticeably common purpose of this practice across the senior secondary school types. Curriculum improvement was expected to bring desired improvements in teaching and learning activities. The main criterion when defining the expected improvements was also quite uniform among the schools. It all emphasised what instructional activities were offered to and experienced by students. However, the focus of the instructional activities was varied. P6 accentuated uplifting students’ positivism towards learning. He wanted that the “curriculum offers learning experiences that are student-centred, innovative, creative and enjoyable so students feel positively towards their learning”. He believed that “positive feelings students have towards their learning will psychologically reduce their study load”.

Similar attention to students was expressed by P14. He wanted the curriculum to be able to “develop students’ potentials, not only in their cognitive abilities, but also in their affective,
psychomotor and character domains”. The development of students’ affective and character domains received more attention from P20. For him, together with the emphasis on cognitive development, “character-building and value-based learning produces excellent students”. P2 underlined tailored teaching and learning activities to suit the needs of the students. He believed that instructional activities that were “well-planned; various in terms of the techniques used, and, more importantly, designed to meet the needs of the students improve their mastery and comprehension”.

P15 prioritised the increased relevance of learning. She wanted the curriculum to offer “instructional activities that link what students learn in class with what they have to deal with in real life.” This connection was imperative for her because “when students do not see this connection, it will be difficult for them to see the meaning of their learning”. Therefore, for her, curriculum improvement was required to promote “the connection between classroom learning and its application in real life settings”. Quite differently, P4 drew attention to the presence of shared commitment among school members. In her opinion, “to make students successful both as a student and as a person is not an easy job”. The accomplishment of this goal could only be achieved if all school members “share similar enthusiasm and motivation to make it happen”.

This practice of improving curriculum could be related to improvement in curriculum in school reform explained at section 4.1.1 of this chapter. As they share similar ideas, the explanation of this section very much repeated the ideas of section 4.1.1.

**Increasing Standards**

Increased standards were applied from different aspects. For some schools, the increased
standards were applied to school management while other schools increased the standards for school facilities. However, almost all participants expressed similar emphasis on increased standards for student learning. For vocational schools, student apprenticeship was considered as the means to expose students to the increased standard in their learning. For other school types, increased standards for student learning were measured by increasing minimum passing scores both in formative and summative school tests as well as in the national exit examination. In the opinion of the participants, increasing minimum passing scores in school tests and the national exit examination would encourage students to accomplish more in their learning.

Increased managerial standards could be found in P9’s school. In his school, the standards were increased by adopting industrial standards. P9 explained that his school was managed using “basic standards of industrial management”. He explained that industrial management standards required “management service that is accurate, reliable, quick, and equal for any school stakeholders”. He expected that “the adoption of these industrial standards can improve quality of service” in his school. He further said that using industrial approaches in daily school management can be “a good exposure for the students to how industries are managed”. This could be “a way to prepare the students to enter the industrial market later on”.

In P16’s school, there were four management approaches used to increase school managerial standards. First, quality management was intended to make quality the fundamental part of school management. P16 expected that quality became the standard for managerial practices in his school. He wanted quality to become the first impression the stakeholders had about the school. Second, independent management was expected to strengthen the school’s
independence in planning its future development. Third, collective management was to encourage shared decision making practices, especially with the teachers when dealing with academic matters. Last, transparent management was to ensure the school’s accountability to the stakeholders, especially when dealing with school financial and program management. He wanted the relationship with the stakeholders to be built on trust and confidence.

Increased standards for learning facilities caught the attention of P18. Her school was undergoing a major transformation in its facilities to make it a modern school. In P18’s opinion, “a modern school requires the facilities to be technology-driven and operating to international standards”. This concept of a modern school also affected instructional activities in her school. The school aimed at providing “technopreneurship that combines technology literacy and entrepreneurship skills in its instructional activities”. She expected that “the improved facilities surely will help achieve this instructional goal”. She was proud that “almost all of the classrooms in the school are now equipped with internet access and multimedia facilities”.

Providing local and overseas apprenticeship programs for the students was done to increase the standards for student learning experiences. This practice was reported by P18. As her school was specialised in the hospitality industry, she believed that “it is not sufficient to mainly rely on classroom instructions to give the real hospitality experience to our students”. The compulsory apprenticeship programs with local, national, and international industries for final year students were thought to be “the way to set increased standards” in their students’ learning. P18 added that the experiences the students got from these apprenticeship programs would provide them with “authentic knowledge of standards required by the industry and use it to improve their skills”. A similar idea was expressed by P10. He said that the
apprenticeship programs with some leading companies in automotive and heavy machinery would give the students an exposure to industrial standards. He expected that the industrial standards would add to the learning standards used in his school.

In P1’s school, increased standards for student learning were done by “increasing the minimum passing scores of both formative and summative school tests”. He believed that increasing the minimum passing scores in the tests would “motivate the students to study harder”. Other participants such as P2, P7, P8, P14, and P17 also believed that setting minimum passing scores would encourage their students to “achieve more in their learning”. They said that it was important for teachers to “gradually increase the standards” they wanted their students to achieve in the tests. They added that students needed “to be continuously challenged” to make them “highly motivated in their learning”. Using the government’s standards for minimum passing scores in the national exit examination was also used in P1, P6, P13, P16, and P18’s school to increase the standards of their students’ learning. The participants said that equating their school’s standards with government standards would “support the standards” they set for the performance of their “students in the national exit examination”. As the government increased the standards for minimum passing scores annually, the participants found it “an increased challenge for the school and the students as well”.

From the quotations, increased standards were applied from different aspects such as standards for student learning, standards for school management, or standards for school facilities. Increased standards for student learning caught more attention from the participants. For vocational schools, student apprenticeship was considered as the means to expose students to the increased standard in their learning. For other school types, increased
standards for student learning were measured by increasing minimum passing scores both in formative and summative school tests as well as in the national exit examination.

**Summary of Improving Instruction**

The findings revealed five practices of improving instruction. The first practice was providing regular teaching feedback. There were different ideas among the participants on sources of information used in giving the feedback. Test scores, particularly national exit examination scores were used more predominantly than direct observations on the teaching and learning process in classrooms. Only a few of the participants directly observed teaching and learning activities to provide feedback to teachers.

The second practice was increasing teachers’ qualifications. Pursuing a higher educational degree was the way to increase the qualifications. However, the participants commented on the lack of financial support for higher degree study and the heavy teaching load that has been the impediment for increasing the qualifications of teachers. In addition, for public servant teachers, to get approval for their study could be a lengthy procedure. To encourage teachers to take higher degree studies, schools tried to simplify the administrative bureaucracy involved in the process. Teachers were also given flexibility in their teaching schedule to match their university study.

The third practice was facilitating professional development programs for teachers. The programs were believed to be necessary to improve teaching and learning activities. The programs became the forum for teachers to acquire up-to-date information and knowledge in their subject area. Using this information and knowledge in teaching activities, teachers could make their teaching activities more current and relevant. The exchange of ideas in
professional development programs could make teachers more creative, selective, and confident in their teaching activities. The interaction with teachers from different schools in professional development programs provided the opportunity to build networking among them.

The fourth practice was improving curriculum. The practice of improving curriculum was done primarily by revising the content of the curriculum to match the distinct characteristics of the schools. Co-designing the curriculum content with partner industries particularly for productive (job-related) subjects was quite a common approach in vocational senior secondary schools. It was intended to match curriculum content with competencies required by job markets. In other school types, the revision of the curriculum was either to align it with school characteristics or to create a new image for the school.

The last practice was increasing standards in school management, facilities, and student learning. The increased standards were applied to different aspects. For some schools, the increased standards were applied to school management while other schools increased the standards for school facilities. However, almost all participants expressed similar emphasis on increased standards for student learning. For vocational schools, student apprenticeship was considered as the means to expose students to increased standards in their learning. For other school types, increased standards for student learning were measured by increasing minimum passing scores both in formative and summative school tests as well as in the national exit examination. In the opinion of the participants, increasing minimum passing scores in school tests and the national exit examination would encourage students to accomplish more in their learning.
Similar to managing and promoting instruction practices, some of the identified practices of improving instruction reemphasised the practices suggested by empirical findings on instructional leadership practices in a broader international context. Increasing teachers’ qualifications, improving curriculum, and increasing standards were local practices influenced by Indonesian educational values.

4.2.4 Assessing Instruction

This section documents emerging practices of assessing instruction. Three practices were identified: benchmarking on national examination results, using data from teacher-made tests, and communicating the implications of national examinations with parents. Similar to the identified practices of managing, promoting, and improving instruction, some local practices of assessing instruction were found. The practice of benchmarking on national examination results and communicating the implications of national examinations with parents were local practices influenced by Indonesian educational values. The other practice (using data from teacher-made tests) reemphasised the practices suggested by Weber’s instructional leadership model and related empirical studies reviewed by Nettles and Herrington.

**Benchmarking on National Examination Results**

This practice could be related to improvement in learning outcomes as one of the expected instructional improvements in school reform, as explained in section 4.1.4 of this chapter. Reliance on national examination results to assess instruction was quite strong in all schools. It was believed that students’ performance in national examinations influenced a school’s profile in the community. The link between school achievements in the national examination and the desirable public profile of a school increased the pressure for successful performance in the examination. The pressure was even stronger for private schools. An examination
preparation program became a common approach taken by the schools to help their students succeed in the examination.

The majority of the participants signified the scores students attained from the national examination in assessing whether desired instructional improvements had taken place or not in their schools. P1 said that data from the national examination were his school’s “main reference in assessing instructional improvement”. Similar statements were given by P6, P9, P13, P16, and P18. P6’s school assessed instructional performance based on the “school profile in the national examination”. P9 said that data from the national examination were used as “the indicator” in assessing instructional improvement in his school. For P16’s school, national examination scores are “the main parameter in assessing instructional programs”. For private schools like P13 and P18’s school, data from the national examination were used not only to “assess the instruction” but also to “establish the school profile” in the community.

School achievements in the national examination were thought to have an impact on a school’s public profile. P18 said that “better achievements in the national examination” would increase a “school’s attractiveness to the community”. She added that “parents of prospective students will enrol their children in a school based on the school’s profile in this national examination”. Similarly, P13 and P16 believed that high scores that their students attained in the examination would influence the “enrolment decision of the prospective parents and students”. For P13 and P18, increased student enrolment would determine the “survival” of private schools like theirs. In P9’s opinion, the school’s graduation rate would “shape the reputation of the school and increase the school’s enrolment competitiveness”. He added that it would enable the school to have a better selection of prospective students.
Data on students’ scores in previous national examinations were used to analyse what subject matter needed to be strengthened to prepare students for future examinations. For P16, the scores would assist his school to “identify the strengths and weaknesses of current instruction, such as what topics students are still struggling to understand and what materials teachers need to provide more explanations and exercises”. He added that once his school could identify the problems, they could decide what “appropriate actions” were required “to help the students perform well in the examination”. P13 said that the scores would reveal “what subjects and topics need to be given more emphasis”. Subjects that were found to be “difficult for the students” would get “more reinforcement”. P1, P6, and P9 gave similar comments. They said that the analysis of scores of previous national examinations would “reveal in what subjects” that their school did “not perform quite well”. They added that “reinforcement programs” in their school were “planned based on the results of the analysis”.

In addition to reinforcement programs, a preparation program for the national examination was offered to the students to help them succeed in the examination. In P1’s school, the program was “compulsory”. During the programs, students were “intensely drilled with tests”. P1 thought that the programs would help students to be “ready and prepared for the upcoming examination”. He believed that an increasing rate of students who passed the examination was the result of the program. Similar preparation programs for the national examination were reported by P6, P9, P13, P16 and P18. To avoid disturbing learning hours, the programs were done “after school and intensified approaching the examination date”. They expected that the programs would increase both “the number of students who pass in the examination” and their “school’s graduation rate”.
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From the quotations, the practice of benchmarking on national examination results could be related to improvement in learning outcomes in school reform explained at section 4.1.4 of this chapter. Reliance on national examination results to assess instruction was quite strong in all schools. The link between school achievements in the national examination and the desirable public profile of a school increased the pressure for successful performance in the examination. The pressure was even stronger for private schools.

**Using Data from Teacher-made Tests**

Teacher-made tests were formative and summative tests. The results of the tests would inform learning progress achieved by the students during the on-going semester. The results facilitated teachers to identify learning problems and difficulties experienced by the students and to plan necessary remedial programs. This diagnostic ability meant the tests were perceived to be appropriate to assess instruction. Using data from teacher-made tests gave the opportunity to teachers to exercise a greater role in planning, executing, evaluating, and improving their instructional practices. It also helped them develop their evaluation skills and improve their teaching effectiveness. Data from teacher-made tests were thought to be authentic and factual. Using such data in assessing instruction would reveal a more accurate description.

For P1, data from teacher-made tests would assist his school “to know how far the students have progressed in their learning and how much they have mastered the lessons”. Similar comments were given by P6, P9, P13, P16 and P18. They said that the results of teacher-made tests would “inform the learning progress” of their students. Teachers could also use the results to identify learning problems that required “immediate actions for improvement”. P2, P3, P5, P8, P10 and P19 gave similar comments. P3 said that the tests she administered to
her students provided her with the “data to help improve instructional activities”. From the obtained scores, she did “item analysis to identify what part of the lesson the students still have trouble to understand”. She then planned “required remedial programs”. Similar practices were reported by P2, P5, P8, P10 and P19. For them, the results of the tests would help them identify their students’ learning problems and plan remedial programs.

Using data from teacher-made tests was thought to be the way to give the opportunity to teachers to exercise a greater role in planning, administering, and analysing tests as well as interpreting the results. P1, P3, P4, P9, P16 and P18 believed that “using tests made and administered by teachers” could “develop teachers’ skills” in evaluating their “teaching practices”. P18 added that these evaluation skills were “important to increase teaching effectiveness”. In her opinion, successful teachers were “those who can plan, design, administer, assess tests and then interpret the results for teaching and learning improvement”. She expected that using data from teacher-made tests could help the teachers in her school fulfil this description of “successful teachers”. For P16, data from teacher-made tests were “authentic”. He said that the test items were “constructed based on actual teaching and learning activities”. He believed that data from teacher-made tests provided “reliable data to assess instruction”. Similarly, P4 said that the results of teacher-made tests gave “factual data on the progress of teaching and learning”. Compared to other tests, P4 believed that using factual data from teacher-made tests in assessing instruction would “give a more accurate description of the achieved progress”.

From the quotations, teacher-made tests were used to inform learning progress achieved by the students during the on-going semester. The diagnostic ability of the tests facilitated teachers to identify learning problems and difficulties experienced by the students and to plan
necessary remedial programs. The participants believed that teacher-made tests gave the opportunity to teachers to exercise a greater role in planning, executing, evaluating, and improving their instructional practices. Data from teacher-made tests were thought to be authentic and factual and revealed a more accurate description of students' learning progress.

**Communicating the implications of National Examinations with Parents**

This practice could be related to the practice of involving parents explained in section 4.3.2 and the practice of building partnerships with school stakeholders explained in section 4.3.1. This practice was listed separately to emphasise parents’ important role to assist schools in making sure the students succeed in the national examination. The purpose of the practice was to involve parents in preparing the students for the examination. A low graduation rate had substantial implications not only for students but also for schools. Schools were perceived as under-performing if many of the students failed in the examination. This would severely influence the profile of the school in the community and school attractiveness to parents of prospective students. The pressure to have a high graduation rate in national examinations had initiated the need to communicate the implications of national examinations with parents.

Similar to the practice of involving parents, explained in section 4.3.2, communicating the implications of the national examination with parents was intended to “share the responsibility for preparing students for the examination”. P1 explained that his school wanted “all of Year 12 students to pass the examination”. He realised that to achieve this goal, his school needed “the support from the parents”. He believed that “parental control on their children’s learning and a supportive home environment can help the students do well in the examination”. P3, P6, P9, P10, P13, P15, P17, P18, and P20 had similar thoughts. They
said that “family environment and parental control” were the external factors “determining successful performance in the examination”. They added that as “parents have more power in exercising these external factors, schools needed to “include and involve them in preparing the students for the examination”.

To share the responsibilities and encourage parents to engage in their children’s preparation for the examination, P18 communicated “the results of previous national examinations to the parents”. She said it was not only to make them “aware of the challenges” that the school faced but also to make them “recognise their important role to help us and their children succeed in the upcoming examination”. Similar practices were reported by P1, P6, P9, P13, and P16. They said that it was “important” to make the “parents know the graduation rate profile” of the school. They added that “parents’ knowledge” about the profile would make it “easier for the school” to get “parental involvement” in their children’s “examination preparation”. They further added that knowing the “results of previous national examinations” would make the parents have “similar views to the school” of what needed “to be done” to help the students succeed in the examination.

For P16, preparing the students to “successfully perform in the national examination” was “not an easy job”. It required “collaboration between school and parents”. He explained that “schools cannot do anything once the students go home”. He thought that it had to be “a priority of a school to engage parents” in their children’s “preparation for the approaching examination”. To do this, his school invited parents to school and communicated with them what they could do to help the school and their children. “Parental control is highlighted and encouraged in the communication”. P6 said that when students knew that “their parents
seriously pay attention to their study”, it could “motivate them to put their best effort into preparing for the examination”.

As explained in the practice of benchmarking on national examination results to assess instruction, school achievements in the national examination were thought to “have an impact on a school’s public profile”. For P1, P6, P9, and P18, “better achievements in the national examination” would increase their “school’s attractiveness to the community”. They added that “parents of prospective students will enrol their children in a school based on the school’s profile in this national examination”. Similarly, P13 and P16 believed that high scores that their students attained in the examination would influence the “enrolment decision of the prospective parents and students”. For P13 and P18, increased student enrolment would determine the “survival” of private schools like theirs. In P9’s opinion, a school’s graduation rate would “shape the reputation of the school and increase the school’s enrolment competitiveness”. He added that it would enable the school to have a better selection of prospective students. P13, P16 and P18 expected that “the communication” their school had with the parents would “make the parents understand these implications” of this national examination.

This practice of communicating the implications of national examinations with parents could be related to the practice of involving parents explained in section 4.3.2 and the practice of building partnerships with school stakeholders explained in section 4.3.1. The purpose of the practice was to involve parents in preparing the students for the examination. The pressure to have a high graduation rate in national examinations had initiated the need for schools to communicate the implications of national examinations with parents.
Summary of Assessing Instruction

The findings revealed three practices of assessing instruction. The first practice was benchmarking on national examination results. Reliance on national examination results to assess instruction was quite strong in all schools. It was believed that student performance in national examinations influenced a school’s profile in the community.

The second practice was using data from teacher-made tests. The diagnostic ability meant the tests were perceived to be appropriate to assess instruction. Using data from teacher-made tests gave the opportunity to teachers to exercise a greater role in planning, executing, evaluating, and improving their instructional practices. Data from teacher-made tests were thought to be authentic and factual. Using such data in assessing instruction would reveal a more accurate description.

The last practice was communicating the implications of the national examination with parents. The purpose of the practice was to involve parents in preparing the students for the examination. Schools were perceived as under-performing if many of the students failed in the exam. This would severely influence the profile of the schools in the community and school attractiveness to parents of prospective students. The pressure to have high graduation rates in national examinations had initiated the need to communicate the implications of national examinations with parents.

Similar to managing, promoting, improving instruction practices, benchmarking on national examination results and communicating the implications of national examinations with parents were local practices influenced by Indonesian educational values. The practice of
using data from teacher-made tests reemphasised the practice suggested by the empirical findings on instructional leadership practices in a broader international context.

4.3 Chapter 4 Summary

This study explored and examined local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. The perceptions and practices were scrutinised to indicate important issues and outline the scope of the study. The key concepts progressively emerged through basic interpretative studies by way of a thematic coding technique. The findings suggest a strong focus on instructional improvements in Indonesian school reform. The participants expected improvements in four areas: curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and students’ learning outcomes. The expected improvements were reinforced in the identified practices of instructional leadership.

In general, the expected improvements could be linked to the practices of improving instruction. The expected improvement in curriculum was supported by the practice of improving curriculum. The expected improvement in teachers’ professionalism was promoted by the practice of providing regular teaching feedback, increasing teachers’ qualifications, and facilitating teachers’ professional development programs. The expected improvement in learning facilities was sustained by the practice of increasing standards in addition to the practice of providing resources and facilities in managing instruction and the practice of creating a climate for learning. The expected improvement in student learning outcomes was supported by the practice of increasing standards as well as the practice of setting high expectations for students in promoting instruction and all practices of assessing instruction.
Some of the identified practices of instructional leadership were local practices influenced by either Indonesian socio-economic, cultural or educational values, or the combination of such values. The practice of monitoring learning hours and improving the welfare of the teachers were local practices of managing instruction influenced by Indonesian cultural and socio-economic factors. Focusing on student character building, encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs and involving parents are local practices of promoting instruction influenced by Indonesian educational and cultural values. Increasing teachers’ qualifications, improving curriculum, and increasing standards are local practices of improving instruction influenced by Indonesian educational values. Benchmarking on national examination results and communicating the implications of national examinations with parents are local practices of assessing instruction influenced by Indonesian educational values. Other identified practices reemphasised the practices suggested by the empirical findings on instructional leadership practices in a broader international context.
Chapter 5: Quantitative Findings

The quantitative phase was intended to complement the qualitative findings to enhance the validity of the findings as well as to provide a comprehensive picture of the local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. The practices identified from interview analysis were the basis of a cross sectional questionnaire survey distributed to principals and teachers. Before the distribution, the questionnaires were pilot-tested to measure their validity and reliability. The returned completed questionnaires were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical calculations. The descriptive statistics were used to indicate general tendencies in the data (mean and median), and the spread of scores (range, standard deviation, variance, distribution). Non-parametric inferential statistics was used for the correlation analysis.

Chapter 5 presents the quantitative findings of this study. The identified practices arising from the preceding qualitative phase structure the questions and the investigated aspects for this quantitative phase. This chapter starts with the findings on the perceptions of the principals on the importance of the identified practices of instructional leadership and the frequency in their current practices as well as the relationship between the perceived importance and the current frequency of the practices. The chapter then continues with the findings on the perceptions of the teachers on the importance and influence on teaching performance of the practices as well as the relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance of the practices. The discussions of the findings will be presented in Chapter 6.
5.1 Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of the Identified Practices of Instructional Leadership

This section presents the findings on the perceptions of the principals on the importance and current frequency of the identified practices of managing, promoting, improving, and assessing instruction. The output of descriptive statistics on the practices showed a skewed and relatively flat distribution of the data set. The differences among the mean (M) of each practice was also too small to indicate the degree of importance and current frequency of the practices. Therefore, analysis of the median was used. The median is the middle value that separates the higher half from the lower half of the data set. It was expected that the median would give a more distinctive and accurate answer. Variance analysis to compare the means of each group (practice) of the sampled data was performed to find whether there were statistically significant differences among the practices at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. Type III Sum of Squares explains the variability, explained by the test, while F stands for ratio between variability. Sig. column presents the obtained p-value.

5.1.1 Practices of Managing Instruction

There were five practices (variables) of managing instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were monitoring classroom hours (Managing 1), communicating instructional matters (Managing 2), providing teaching resources and facilities (Managing 3), building partnerships with stakeholders (Managing 4), and improving the welfare of teachers (Managing 5).

Perceived Importance of Practices of Managing Instruction

Table 5-1 shows the statistics output for the perceived importance of the practices of managing instruction. In general the degree of importance ranges from 5.00 (important) to
The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of managing instruction, Managing 1 and Managing 2 have the median of 6.00. It could be concluded that practices of monitoring classroom hours and communicating instructional matters were perceived by the principals to be more important than the practice of providing teaching resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of teachers.

**Current Frequency of Practices of Managing Instruction**

Table 5-2 shows the statistics output for the current frequency of practices of managing instruction. In general, the frequency of practices ranges from 4.00 (sometimes) to 6.00 (always). The exception is for Managing 4 where it ranges from 5.00 (almost always) to 6.00 (always). The mean \( (M) \) ranges from 5.18 to 5.60 and standard deviation ranges from .48 to .88. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.
The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of managing instruction, only Managing 1 has the median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practice of monitoring classroom hours was more frequently performed by the principals than the practices of communicating instructional matters, providing teaching resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of teachers.

**Relationship between the Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Managing Instruction**

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-3 suggests a strong relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of all practices of managing instruction. The strongest relationship is found in building partnerships with stakeholders followed by monitoring classroom hours, providing teaching resources and facilities, improving the welfare of teachers, and communicating instructional matters. It means that the more important the practices are perceived to be, the more frequently they are performed.
Table 5-3 Correlation between Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Managing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managing 1</th>
<th>Managing 2</th>
<th>Managing 3</th>
<th>Managing 4</th>
<th>Managing 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5.1.2 Practices of Promoting Instruction

There were five practices (variables) of promoting instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were setting high expectations for students (Promoting 1), focusing on student character building (Promoting 2), involving parents (Promoting 3), encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs (Promoting 4), and creating a climate for learning (Promoting 5).

Perceived Importance of Practices of Promoting Instruction

Table 5-4 shows the statistics output for the importance of practices of promoting instruction. In general, the degree of importance ranges from 5.00 (important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The exception is for Promoting 3 and Promoting 4 where it ranges from 4.00 (somewhat important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The mean (M) ranges from 5.16 to 5.79 and the standard deviation ranges from .41 to .70. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-4 Statistics of the Perceived Importance of Practices of Promoting Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1910.53</td>
<td>11293.33</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>1762.97</td>
<td>7034.23</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1405.07</td>
<td>6595.57</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>1516.42</td>
<td>3079.15</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>1632.02</td>
<td>7039.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at α = 0.05 level
The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of managing instruction, Promoting 1 and Promoting 2 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that practices of setting high expectations for students and focusing on student character building were perceived by the principals to be more important than the practices of involving parents, encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs, and creating a climate for learning.

**Current Frequency of Practices of Promoting Instruction**

Table 5-5 shows the statistics output for the current frequency of practices of promoting instruction. The frequency of practices ranges from 5.00 (almost always) to 6.00 (always) for Promoting 1, 2, and 5. For Promoting 3 and 4, the frequency of practices ranges from 4.00 (sometimes) to 6.00 (always). The mean \((M)\) ranges from 5.00 to 5.79 and the standard deviation ranges from .41 to .78. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-5 Statistics of Current Frequency of Practices of Promoting Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1910.53</td>
<td>11293.33</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>1830.33</td>
<td>8092.00</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>1425.00</td>
<td>2850.00</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>1526.75</td>
<td>2496.62</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>1875.95</td>
<td>9504.80</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of promoting instruction, Promoting 1, Promoting 2 and Promoting 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practices of setting high expectations for
students, focusing on student character building, and creating a climate for learning were more frequently performed by the principals than the practices of involving parents and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs.

Relationship between the Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Promoting Instruction

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-6 suggests a weak to moderate relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of practices of promoting instruction. A weak relationship means that the degree of importance given to the practices is not supported by their current frequency of practice. The weakest relationship is found in encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs followed by focusing on student character building and involving parents. A moderate relationship means that the current frequency of the practice is not as high as the degree of importance given to it. A moderate relationship is found in setting high expectations for students and creating a climate for learning.

Table 5-6 Correlation between Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Promoting Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Promoting 1</th>
<th>Promoting 2</th>
<th>Promoting 3</th>
<th>Promoting 4</th>
<th>Promoting 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.275*</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.439**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

5.1.3 Practices of Improving Instruction

There were five practices (variables) of improving instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were providing regular teaching feedback (Improving 1), increasing teachers’
qualification (Improving 2), facilitating professional development programs for teachers (Improving 3), improving curriculum (Improving 4), and increasing standards (Improving 5).

**Perceived Importance of Practices of Improving Instruction**

Table 5-7 shows the statistics output for the importance of practices of improving instruction. In general the degree of importance ranges from 5.00 (important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The exception is for Improving 1 and Improving 2 where the range is from 4.00 (somewhat important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The mean ($M$) ranges from 4.60 to 5.78 and standard deviation ranges from .42 to .50. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improving Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>1204.28</td>
<td>4915.68</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>1204.28</td>
<td>4915.68</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>1819.02</td>
<td>7846.36</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>1898.97</td>
<td>10597.02</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1864.49</td>
<td>9072.34</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of promoting instruction, Improving 3, Improving 4 and Improving 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practices of facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards were perceived by the principals to be more important than the practices of providing regular teaching feedback and increasing teachers’ qualifications.
Current Frequency of Practices of Improving Instruction

Table 5-8 shows the statistics output for the current frequency of practices of improving instruction. The frequency of practices ranges from 2.00 (hardly ever) to 4.00 (sometimes) for Improving 1 and Improving 2. Improving 3 has the range of 4.00 (sometimes) to 6.00 (always). The range of Improving 4 and Improving 5 is 5.00 (almost always) to 6.00 (always). The mean (M) ranges from 3.07 to 5.65 and standard deviation ranges from .48 to .79. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-8 Statistics of Current Frequency of Practices of Improving Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improving Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>537.28</td>
<td>1012.40</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>581.12</td>
<td>933.07</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>1718.75</td>
<td>3667.29</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>1819.02</td>
<td>7846.36</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>1762.97</td>
<td>7034.23</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at α = 0.05 level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at α = 0.05 level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of improving instruction, Improving 3, Improving 4 and Improving 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practices of facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards were more frequently performed by the principals than the practice of providing regular teaching feedback and increasing teachers’ qualifications.
Relationship between the Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Improving Instruction

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-9 suggests a very weak relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of practices of improving instruction. It means that the degree of importance given to these practices is not supported by their current frequency of practice. The weakest relationship is found in the practice of facilitating professional development programs for teachers followed by providing regular teaching feedback, increasing standards, improving curriculum, and increasing teachers’ qualifications.

Table 5-9 Correlation between Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Improving Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improving 1</th>
<th>Improving 2</th>
<th>Improving 3</th>
<th>Improving 4</th>
<th>Improving 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4 Practices of Assessing Instruction

There were three practices (variables) of assessing instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were benchmarking on national examination results (Assessing 1), using data from teacher-made tests (Assessing 2), and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents (Assessing 3).

Perceived Importance of Practices of Assessing Instruction

Table 5-10 shows the statistics output for the importance of practices of assessing instruction. In general the degree of importance ranges from 5.00 (important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The exception is for Assessing 3 where the range is from 4.00 (somewhat important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The mean (M) ranges from 5.04 to 5.88 and the
standard deviation ranges from .33 to .53. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-10 Statistics of the Perceived Importance of Practices of Assessing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>1968.86</td>
<td>17956.00</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1685.97</td>
<td>6727.00</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1445.07</td>
<td>5080.03</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at α = 0.05 level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at α = 0.05 level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of assessing instruction, Assessing 1 has the median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practice of benchmarking on national examination results was perceived by the principals to be more important than the practices of using data from teacher-made tests and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents.

**Current Frequency of Practices of Assessing Instruction**

Table 5-11 shows the statistics output for the current frequency of practices of assessing instruction. The frequency of practices ranges from 5.00 (almost always) to 6.00 (always) for Assessing 1 and Assessing 2. The range for Assessing 3 is from 4.00 (sometimes) to 6.00 (always). The mean (M) ranges from 5.05 to 5.90 and standard deviation ranges from .31 to .69. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.
Table 5-11 Statistics of Current Frequency of Practices of Assessing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1980.63</td>
<td>20660.71</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>1557.97</td>
<td>8694.10</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>1455.16</td>
<td>3035.86</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at α = 0.05 level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at α = 0.05 level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of assessing instruction, Assessing 1 has a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practice of benchmarking on national examination results was more frequently performed by the principals than the practices of using data from teacher-made tests and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents.

**Relationship between the Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Assessing Instruction**

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-12 suggests a moderate to strong relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of practices of assessing instruction. A moderate relationship means that the current frequency of the practice is not as high as the importance given to it. A moderate relationship is found in communicating the implications of the national examination with parents. A strong relationship means that the more important the practices are perceived to be, the more frequently the practices are performed. A strong relationship is found in benchmarking on national examination results and using data from teacher-made tests.
Table 5-12 Correlation between the Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of Practices of Assessing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Assessing 1</th>
<th>Assessing 2</th>
<th>Assessing 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.743**</td>
<td>.615**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5.2. Summary of Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of the Identified Practices of Instructional Leadership

The findings showed that the perceived degree of importance of the practices ranged from being somewhat important to strongly important (see Table 5-1, 5-4, 5-7, and 5-10) except for practices of Improving 1 and Improving 2 (see Table 5-7). The current frequency of the practices ranged from being “sometimes” to “always” (see Table 5-2, 5-5, 5-8, and 5-11) except for practices of Improving 1 and Improving 2 (see Table 5-14). The relationship between the perceived importance and the current frequency of the practices was quite different among the practices (see Table 5-3, 5-6, 5-9, and 5-12). The relationship varied from being very weak to strong.

From the investigated instructional practices, the relationship was found to be quite strong for five practices of managing instruction (monitoring classroom hours, communicating instructional matters, providing resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of teachers). A strong relationship was also found in two practices of assessing instruction (benchmarking on national examination results and using data from teacher-made tests). A moderate relationship was found in the two practices of promoting instruction (setting high expectations for students and creating a climate for learning) and one practice of assessing instruction (communicating the implications of the national examination with parents). A weak relationship was found for all practices of
improving instruction (providing regular teaching feedback, increasing teachers’ qualifications, facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards) and three practices of promoting instruction (focusing on student character building, involving parents, and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs). From the findings, it could be concluded that in general the principal respondents ($N=57$) gave more attention to the practices of managing instruction and assessing instruction. The current frequency of the practices of improving and promoting instruction was not as high as the degree of importance given to the practices.

### 5.3 Perceived Importance and Influence on Teaching Performance of the Identified Practices of Instructional Leadership

This section presents the findings on the perceptions of the teachers on the importance and influence on teaching performance of the identified practices of managing, promoting, improving, and assessing instruction. The output of descriptive statistics on the practices showed a skewed and relatively flat distribution of the data set. The differences among the mean ($M$) of each practice was also too small to indicate the degree of importance and current frequency of the practices. Therefore, analysis of the median was used. The median is the middle value that separates the higher half from the lower half of the data set. It was expected that the median would give a more distinctive and accurate answer. Variance analysis to compare the means of each group (practice) of the sampled data was performed to find whether there were statistically significant differences among the practices at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. Type III Sum of Squares explains the variability explained by the test while $F$ stands for ratio between variability. Sig. column presents the obtained $p$-value.
5.3.1 Practices of Managing Instruction

There were five practices (variables) of managing instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were monitoring classroom hours by the principal (Managing 1), communicating instructional matters with the principal (Managing 2), having access to teaching resources and facilities (Managing 3), having good partnerships with stakeholders (Managing 4), and having improved welfare (Managing 5).

Perceived Importance of Practices of Managing Instruction

Table 5-13 shows the statistics output for the importance of practices of managing instruction. The degree of importance ranges from 5.00 (important) to 6.00 (strongly important) for Managing 3 and Managing 5. For Managing 1, Managing 2, and Managing 4, it ranges from 4.00 (somewhat important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The mean (M) ranges from 5.02 to 5.69 and the standard deviation ranges from .46 to .72. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-13 Statistics of the Perceived Importance of Practices of Managing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing 1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>9648.69</td>
<td>21085.68</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>9998.59</td>
<td>19327.26</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>11527.29</td>
<td>47018.21</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 4</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>9345.13</td>
<td>18908.18</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 5</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>12023.03</td>
<td>56331.53</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at α = 0.05 level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at α = 0.05 level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of managing instruction, Managing 3 and Managing 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practices of having access to teaching resources and facilities and
having improved welfare were perceived by the teachers to be more important than the practices of monitoring classroom hours by the principal, communicating instructional matters with the principal, and having good partnerships with stakeholders.

**Perceived Influence on Teaching Performance of Practices of Managing Instruction**

Table 5-14 shows the output of descriptive statistics for the perceived influence of practices of managing instruction. The perceived influence for Managing 1, Managing 2, and Managing 4 ranges from 4.00 (somewhat influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential). For Managing 3 and Managing 5, it ranges from 5.00 (influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential). The mean (\(M\)) ranges from 5.00 to 5.78 and standard deviation ranges from .42 to .77. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing 1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>9607.94</td>
<td>16302.21</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>10040.16</td>
<td>18164.74</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>12390.12</td>
<td>71769.65</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 4</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>9285.00</td>
<td>17800.51</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing 5</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>11416.08</td>
<td>45950.17</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at \(\alpha = 0.05\) level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \(\alpha = 0.05\) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of managing instruction, Managing 3 and Managing 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practices of having access to teaching resources and facilities and having improved welfare were perceived by the teachers to be more influential on teaching performance than the practices of monitoring classroom hours by the principal,
communicating instructional issues with the principal, and having good partnerships with stakeholders.

**Relationship between Perceived Importance and Influence on Teaching Performance of Practices of Managing Instruction**

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-15 suggests a weak to strong relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance of practices of managing instruction. A weak relationship means that, although the practice is perceived to be important, it is not perceived to be quite influential. A weak relationship is found in monitoring classroom hours by the principal and having good partnerships with stakeholders. A moderate relationship means that the perceived influence on teaching performance of the practice is not as high as the perceived importance given to it. A moderate relationship is found in communicating instructional matters with the principal. A strong relationship means that the more important the practice is perceived, the more influential on the teaching performance it is also perceived to be. A strong relationship is found in having access to teaching resources and facilities and having improved welfare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managing 1</th>
<th>Managing 2</th>
<th>Managing 3</th>
<th>Managing 4</th>
<th>Managing 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.606**</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.732**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 5.3.2 Practices of Promoting Instruction

There were five practices (variables) of promoting instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were setting high expectations for students (Promoting 1), focusing on student character building (Promoting 2), involving parents (Promoting 3), encouraging student
participation in extracurricular programs (Promoting 4), and creating a climate for learning (Promoting 5).

**Perceived Importance of Practices of Promoting Instruction**

Table 5-16 shows the statistics output for the importance of practices of promoting instruction. For Promoting 1, Promoting 2, and Promoting 5 the degree of importance ranges from 5.00 (important) to 6.00 (strongly important). For Promoting 3 and Promoting 4, it ranges from 4.00 (somewhat important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The mean \((M)\) ranges from 5.05 to 5.66 and standard deviation ranges from .48 to .77. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>11875.47</td>
<td>52605.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>11796.40</td>
<td>50988.47</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>9658.89</td>
<td>16385.43</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 4</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>9445.78</td>
<td>21025.85</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting 5</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>11616.65</td>
<td>48103.08</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at \(\alpha = 0.05\) level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \(\alpha = 0.05\) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of promoting instruction, Promoting 1, Promoting 2, and Promoting 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that practices of setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, and creating a climate for learning were perceived by the teachers to be more important than the practices of involving parents and encouraging students’ participation in extracurricular programs.
Table 5-17 shows the output of descriptive statistics for the perceived influence of practices of promoting instruction. The perceived influence of practices ranges from 5.00 (influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential) for Promoting 1, Promoting 2, and Promoting 5. For Promoting 3 and Promoting 4, the perceived influence of practices ranges from 4.00 (somewhat influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential). The mean (\(M\)) ranges from 5.19 to 5.53 and the standard deviation ranges from .50 to .72. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \(\alpha = 0.05\) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of promoting instruction, Promoting 1, Promoting 2 and Promoting 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practices of setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, and creating a climate for learning were perceived to be more influential by the teachers than the practices of involving parents and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs.
Relationship between Perceived Importance and Influence on Teaching Performance of Practices of Promoting Instruction

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-18 suggests a weak and strong relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance of promoting practices. A weak relationship means that although the practice is perceived to be important, it is not perceived to be influential. A weak relationship is found in involving parents and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs. A strong relationship means that the more the practice is perceived to be important, the more influential on teaching performance it is also perceived to be. A strong relationship is found in setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, and creating a climate for learning.

Table 5-18 Correlation between Perceived Importance and Influence of Practices of Promoting Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting 1</th>
<th>Promoting 2</th>
<th>Promoting 3</th>
<th>Promoting 4</th>
<th>Promoting 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.764**</td>
<td>.691**</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.216**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5.3.3 Practices of Improving Instruction

There were five practices (variables) of improving instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were getting regular teaching feedback from the principal (Improving 1), having increased qualifications (Improving 2), attending professional development programs (Improving 3), having improved curriculum (Improving 4), and increasing standards (Improving 5).
Perceived Importance of Practices of Improving Instruction

Table 5-19 shows the statistics output for the importance of practices of improving instruction. The degree of importance ranges from 4.00 (somewhat important) to 6.00 (strongly important) for Improving 1, Improving 2, and Improving 3. For Improving 4 and Improving 5, the range is from 5.00 (important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The mean ($M$) ranges from 5.02 to 5.67 and standard deviation ranges from .47 to .77. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-19 Statistics of the Perceived Importance of Practices of Improving Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improving Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving 1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>9335.10</td>
<td>24002.19</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>9750.95</td>
<td>18497.46</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>10029.76</td>
<td>16773.70</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 4</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>11830.26</td>
<td>51652.01</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 5</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>11932.12</td>
<td>53918.03</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of improving instruction, Improving 4 and Improving 5 have a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practices of improving curriculum and increasing standards were perceived by the teachers to be more important than the practices of getting regular teaching feedback from the principal, having increased qualifications, and attending professional development programs.

Perceived Influence on Teaching Performance of Practices of Improving Instruction

Table 5-20 shows the statistics output for the perceived influence on teaching performance of practices of improving instruction. The perceived influence of practices ranges from 4.00
(somewhat influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential) for Improving 1, Improving 2, and Improving 3. Improving 4 and Improving 5 have the range of 5.00 (influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential). The mean \((M)\) ranges from 4.94 to 5.50 and the standard deviation ranges from .50 to .86. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-20 Statistics of the Perceived Influence of Practices of Improving Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improving Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving 1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>9066.19</td>
<td>16788.29</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>9587.59</td>
<td>18061.27</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>9486.19</td>
<td>12818.64</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 4</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>11217.25</td>
<td>44748.39</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving 5</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>10976.62</td>
<td>44441.95</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at \(\alpha = 0.05\) level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \(\alpha = 0.05\) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of improving instruction, all Improving practices (Improving 1 to Improving 5) have a median of 5.00. It could be concluded that the practices of getting regular teaching feedback from the principal, having increased qualifications, attending professional development programs, having improved curriculum, and increasing standards were perceived by the teachers to be influential.

**Relationship between Perceived Importance and Influence on Teaching Performance of Practices of Improving Instruction**

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-21 suggests a moderate to strong relationship between the perceived importance and influence of improving practices. A moderate relationship means that the perceived influence on teaching performance of the practice is not as high as the perceived importance given to it. A moderate relationship is
found in getting regular teaching feedback from the principal. A strong relationship means that the more important the practice is perceived, the more influential on the teaching performance it is also perceived to be. The strongest relationship is found in having improved curriculum followed by attending professional development programs, having increased standards, and having increased qualifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improving</th>
<th>Improving 2</th>
<th>Improving 3</th>
<th>Improving 4</th>
<th>Improving 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.710**</td>
<td>.737**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5.3.4 Practices of Assessing Instruction

There were three practices (variables) of assessing instruction used in the questionnaire items. The practices were benchmarking on national examination results (Assessing 1), using data from teacher-made tests (Assessing 2), and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents (Assessing 3).

Perceived Importance of Practices of Assessing Instruction

Table 5-22 shows the statistics output for the importance of practices of assessing instruction. In general the degree of importance ranges from 5.00 (important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The exception is for Assessing 3 where the range is from 4.00 (somewhat important) to 6.00 (strongly important). The mean (M) ranges from 5.05 to 5.55 and the standard deviation ranges from .50 to .74. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.
Table 5-22 Statistics of the Perceived Importance of Practices of Assessing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>11416.08</td>
<td>45950.17</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>11096.61</td>
<td>44437.57</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>9465.97</td>
<td>17166.41</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a difference significant at α = 0.05 level

The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at α = 0.05 level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that from the investigated practices of assessing instruction, Assessing 1 has a median of 6.00. It could be concluded that the practice of benchmarking on national examination results was perceived by the teachers to be more important than the practices of using data from teacher-made tests and communicating the implications of the national exami

Perceived Influence on Teaching Performance of Practices of Assessing Instruction

Table 5-23 shows the statistics output for the perceived influence of practices of assessing instruction. The perceived influence of practices ranges from 5.00 (influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential) for Assessing 1 and Assessing 2. For Assessing 3, the range is from 4.00 (somewhat influential) to 6.00 (strongly influential). The mean (M) ranges from 4.81 to 5.48 and the standard deviation ranges from .50 to .80. The Skewness values indicate a clustering of scores at the high end while the Kurtosis values indicate a relatively flat distribution.

Table 5-23 Statistics of the Perceived Influence of Practices of Assessing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing Instruction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>11083.67</td>
<td>44424.89</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>11151.36</td>
<td>44539.91</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing 3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>8597.83</td>
<td>13585.16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a a difference significant at α = 0.05 level
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The obtained p-value (Sig.) shows statistically significant differences among the practices at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level of significance. The output of median analysis shows that all assessing instruction practices have a median of 5.00. It could be concluded that the practice of benchmarking on national examination results, using data from teacher-made tests, and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents were perceived to be influential by the teachers.

**Relationship between Perceived Importance and Influence on Teaching Performance of Practices of Assessing Instruction**

The output of Spearman’s rho correlation test in Table 5-24 shows suggests a strong relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance of practices of assessing instruction. A strong relationship means that the more important the practice is perceived, the more influential on teaching performance it is also perceived to be. The largest relationship is found in benchmarking on national examination results followed by using data from teacher-made tests, and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing 1</th>
<th>Assessing 2</th>
<th>Assessing 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.850**</td>
<td>.757**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
5.4. Summary of Perceived Importance and Influence on Teaching Performance of the Identified Practices of Instructional Leadership

The findings show that generally the perceived degree of importance was quite similar among the practices of managing instruction, promoting instruction, improving instruction, and assessing instruction. It ranged from being important to strongly important (see Table 5-13, 5-16, 5-19, and 5-22). Similarly, the perceived influence of the practices on teaching performance was not much different among the practices (see Table 5-14, 5-17, 5-20, and 5-23). However, the relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance was quite different among the practices (see Table 5-15, 5-18, 5-21, and 5-24). The relationship varied from being weak to strong.

From the investigated instructional practices, the relationship was found to be quite strong for three practices of assessing instruction (benchmarking on national examination results, using data from teacher-made tests, and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents). A strong relationship was also found in four practices of improving instruction (having increased qualifications, attending professional development programs, having improved curriculum, and increasing standards) and two practices of managing instruction (having access to teaching resources and facilities and having improved welfare).

Three practices of promoting instruction also had a strong relationship (setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, and creating a climate for learning). A moderate relationship was found in one practice of improving instruction (getting regular teaching feedback from the principal) and one practice of managing instruction (communicating instructional matters with the principal). A weak relationship was
found in one practice of promoting instruction (encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs) and two practices of managing instructions (monitoring classroom hours by the principal and having good relationships with stakeholders). From the findings, it could be concluded that in general the teacher respondents (N=371) gave more attention to almost all practices, particularly to promoting, improving and assessing instruction.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions

This study proposed that exploring and examining local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform would reveal local knowledge and practices of instructional leadership that could help identify strengths and weaknesses associated with instructional improvement efforts in school reform. Instructional leadership was used as the lens for the examination because of its ability to develop strategies for leading, teaching, and learning in schools. Local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership became important, considering the gap between reform goals and the Indonesian profile on various indexes. It was expected that appreciation of local perceptions would help close the gap. Besides, a deeper awareness of local perceptions of principals and teachers within the local context of Indonesia could act as a catalyst to improve student performance within the culture.

Chapter 6 recaps the key findings of this study by either combining or contrasting qualitative and quantitative findings to illuminate significant instructional leadership issues emerging from data analysis. From the qualitative phase, participants’ accounts revealed a strong focus on instructional improvements. There were four expected areas for the improvements to take place: curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and student learning outcomes. The expected improvements were reinforced by the identified practices of instructional leadership. Some of the identified practices of instructional leadership were local practices influenced by either Indonesian socio-economic, cultural or educational values, or the combination of such values. The root of these local practices could be linked to referenced instructional leadership models and specific findings of recent studies.
When the identified perceptions and practices were further investigated through a distribution of surveys in the quantitative phase, the findings suggested that some of the identified perceptions and practices were found to be limited aspirations and not reflected on a larger scale. Although there was a significant awareness of the importance of instructional leadership practices, it did not necessarily lead to increased frequency of the practices and the subsequent perceptions of their influence on instructional improvements. Moreover, expected instructional improvements were not strongly supported by current practices. The findings also showed different perceptions between principals and teachers that indicated their different priorities in instructional improvement efforts taking place in their school.

The findings revealed a need for a change in the existing school culture to amend how principals and teachers position instructional responsibilities between them and how each of them could contribute to the improvement process. The findings suggested that more promoting and improving instructional practices be performed by principals. The findings also implied a need for a constructive mindset towards performance evaluation, particularly in the form of classroom supervision and teaching feedback that requires the presence of a mutual trust between principals and teachers. Since instructional programs were more directed by results from external evaluation, there needs to be an increased confidence in the use of authentic internal evaluations. The findings also showed a need for broader and more meaningful engagement of parents and communities in instructional programs.

6.1 Discussion

This section discusses local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform to elicit the application of instructional leadership in a different cultural context. The discussion compares and contrasts the identified local perceptions and
practices with those recognised in scholarly discussions in Western contexts, particularly practices listed in Weber's instructional leadership model and Nettles and Herrington’s review of empirical studies on the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement. The discussion is intended to illuminate the relevance and significance of the identified local perceptions and practices within the general framework of instructional leadership.

6.1.1 Expected Instructional Improvements in Indonesian School Reform

The examination of expected instructional improvements in Indonesian school reform was designed as an initial step of this study to provide a preliminary description of how school reform was perceived by participants and what instructional improvements were anticipated from reforming the schools. The findings became the link for further examination of practices of instructional leadership performed by the principal. The findings showed a strong focus on instructional improvements in Indonesian school reform (see Section 4.1 of Chapter 4). Participants expected improvements in four areas: curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and student learning outcomes.

Public accountability has been emphasised by many scholars a common approach used to reform schools and a major driver of the improvements (Leithwood & Day, 2008; Pont, et al., 2008; Robinson, 2010; Sofo, et al., 2012). In Indonesia, the enactment of government regulations such as the National Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003 and Law on Teachers and Lecturers in 2005 has brought accountability to a higher level since the regulations made accountability mandatory for schools. On the other side, the regulations also gave a degree of freedom to schools, because, with the granted autonomy, schools could decide on ways to fulfil the expected accountability. This could be seen from practices of School-Based Management (SBM) and School-Based Curriculum endorsed by the National
Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003. Accentuating distinct characteristics among the schools, different ways for improvement were implemented (see Section 4.2).

Improvements in curriculum received quite an emphasis from the participants. The Indonesian curriculum has been criticised for neither adequately representing students’ characteristics, voices, or interests (Kunandar, 2007; Taruna, 2007) nor having the ability to generate excitement for learning and the freedom to learn (Taruna, 2007). The improvement in curriculum could be the answer to this criticism. The improvements were done primarily by revising the content of the curriculum to form distinct characteristics for the schools. Co-designing the curriculum content with partner industries particularly for productive (job-related) subjects was a common approach in vocational senior secondary schools. This was intended to match curriculum content with competencies required by job markets. In other school types, the revision of the curriculum was either to align it with school characteristics or to create a new image for the school.

There was an emphasis on creativity, innovation and the use of technology in the curriculum improvement. This emphasis showed a significant change in the way teaching and learning have been construed and performed. Participants expected that the improved curriculum could increase the relevance of learning, uplift students’ positivism towards learning and develop students’ potentials. Creative, innovative, and technology-driven teaching practices to promote students’ enjoyment of learning were the key characteristics of the revised curriculum. The application of such a curriculum could be a new beginning for better teaching and learning processes in Indonesian schools.
The improvement in teachers’ professionalism was measured from teachers’ increased competencies acquired either from professional development programs or higher education and from the roles they played in classroom teaching and learning activities. This expectation was also related to the enactment of the Law on Teachers and Lecturers in 2005 that encouraged teachers to increase their professionalism. Participants associated professional teachers with their ability to create an enjoyment for learning among their students through their competence, creativity and psychological capacity to cope with the heterogeneity of their students. Professional teachers were also perceived as those who could cultivate good characters in their students and become role models in learning for the students.

Recognition of teachers’ professionalism and contribution to students’ learning and development could be an important step in eradicating cultural practices which work against the image of teaching and teachers in Indonesia. The position of teachers as unsung heroes in Indonesian society has led to a lack of proper appreciation of teaching and teachers (Chan & Sam, 2007; Tilaar, 2009). An ingrained civil service culture among teachers was another cultural practice contributing to the absence of appreciation. As pointed out by some scholars, this civil service culture did not appreciate teachers’ individual freedom to be active, creative, and innovative (Bjork, 2005; Chan & Sam, 2007; Kintamani, 2002; Raihani, 2007; Tilaar, 2009). Therefore, the expected improvement in teachers’ professionalism could indicate a better appreciation of the importance of teachers and teaching.

The expected improvements in learning facilities were mainly driven by the impacts they had on teaching and learning activities. There was a strong preference among the participants to make the facilities more technology-friendly (see Section 4.1.3 of Chapter 4). In addition, the focus of improvement was not restricted to classrooms and laboratories where actual learning
took place. Attention was also given to facilities outside those buildings. Improvements in facilities outside classrooms were intended to create an atmosphere of learning throughout the schools. The improvements were also carried out to highlight the characteristics of the schools. This approach was taken particularly in Islamic/madrasah and vocational senior secondary schools.

The use of technology was quite influential in the improvement of learning facilities. The embrace of technology within learning facilities could indicate a willingness and readiness to incorporate changes in the society in the way teaching and learning is conducted in schools. Since schools are the mirror of the society, immense changes in the society due to rapid and sophisticated innovations in technology would affect how teaching and learning is performed in schools. The technology-friendly learning facilities could be seen as an effort to balance and accommodate changes taking place in the society.

Better student learning outcomes were the key improvement expected from the implementation of school reform. These improved learning outcomes of the students were considered as the way to prove accountability from the implementation of school reform and to strengthen the profile of schools in the society. Participants believed that improved learning outcomes could increase school competitiveness in attracting prospective parents and students. Although cognitive accomplishments were not the only criteria from participants in measuring learning outcomes, scores from the national exit examination were the preferred parameters in assessing student learning outcomes.
A new appreciation to the role of stakeholders, particularly teachers, parents and students, is also the main impulse of the expected instructional improvements. In Indonesian schools, this appreciation is a significant change. Although the Indonesian Ministry of National Education (2004) underlined stakeholders’ involvement in school programs and activities in the implementation of School Based Management (SBM) to achieve a more transparent, accountable, democratic, and responsive school management, the role of stakeholder participation in the implementation of SBM in Indonesia has been argued to be superficial (Fadjar; 2003). Parents are known to be rarely considered as school partners and their voices and concerns are hardly ever taken into consideration in formulating school policies and the related programs (Irawan, et al., 2004; Nandika, 2007). This new appreciation of the role of stakeholders could indicate a better prospect of accomplishing the key goal of the reform.

In summary, the expected improvements in curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and student learning outcomes were basically aimed at the improvements in teaching and learning processes. These improvements are in accordance with the focus on school reform as defined by many scholars (Dalin, 2005; Hopkins, et al., 1994; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001; Hopkins, 2001; Rowe, 2007; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000; Velzen, et al, 1985).

6.1.2. Practices of Instructional Leadership in Indonesian Schools

The following section discusses the identified practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian schools. The findings revealed four categories of practices of instructional leadership performed by principals: practices of managing instruction, promoting instruction, improving instruction, and assessing instruction (see Section 4.2 and Figure 4-1 in Chapter 4). Some of the identified practices matched with the practices of Weber’s instructional
leadership model (1996) and Nettles and Herrington’s review on school leadership practices that had direct effects on student achievement (2007). Other practices were local practices influenced by Indonesian socio-economic, cultural or educational values, or the combination of such values. These local practices strengthened the characteristics of school reform as being context-specific (Ainscow & West, 2006; Datnow, et al., 2002; Elmore, 1993; Harris, 2009; Harris & Chrispeels, 2006; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001) and culture-influenced (Dimmock, 2000; James, 2008).

Practices of Managing Instruction

This section discusses the identified practices of managing instruction from the interviews with the participants. Five practices were identified: monitoring learning hours, communicating instructional matters, providing learning resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of the teachers (see Section 4.2.1 of Chapter 4).

The first practice of managing instruction was monitoring learning hours. The majority of participants described this practice more as time management to ensure that classes were started and finished on time. The goal was to eliminate tardiness and to cultivate punctuality and discipline not only among students but also among teachers as well. This practice was perceived to be imperative, considering the large number in the student population in the schools. In 2012, it was estimated that eight million out of fifty eight million students attended senior secondary schools (Antara News, 2012). On average, each school where the interviews took place had more than 400 students. In vocational senior secondary schools, the number could be as many as 1,000 students. Participants believed that time discipline would maintain an orderly climate in the schools. Providing a safe and orderly academic
environment that supported effective teaching and learning has been identified among the instructional responsibilities of principals (Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

In addition to its definition as time management, monitoring learning hours was described as a practice of classroom supervision. This practice aimed at evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the supervised teachers. This classroom supervision was the definition of monitoring classroom hours in Weber’s instructional leadership model (1996). High performing principals were characterised by their ability to create opportunities for teachers to plan and work together on instructional issues and frequently monitor the instructional processes (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). However, this practice of classroom supervision was reported by very few participants. This indicated that evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the teachers did not get much attention from the participants.

The second practice of managing instruction was communicating instructional matters. Communication between principal and teachers reflected the ability of a school leader to cultivate action in common and build collective relationships. The participants perceived communication as the way to create a collegial relationship between principal and teachers. It promoted a culture of mutual trust between teachers and their principal. To build strong, positive, and productive relationships, a school leader needed to promote mutual trust. A collective relationship that was based on trust generated respect for each person's qualities and abilities. It activated people and accelerated their collective efforts. Providing such working relationships was recognised as a practice of leadership.
Teacher-to-teacher communication was also encouraged either in internal or external forums. The interviewed principals believed that communication would lead to collaborations among teachers. Teacher-to-teacher communication was among the foci of instructional leadership. It promoted collaborative inquiry among teachers and provided opportunities for reflection, discourse, and professional growth to develop professional learning communities (Huffman & Hipp, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mitchell & Sackney; Reitzug, et al., 2008). Collaboration engaged teachers to work together to improve their working effectiveness, both personally and collectively. This practice was also identified as a practice of leadership (Donaldson, 2006; Meier, 2002; Saphier, 2005).

The third practice of managing instruction was providing school resources and facilities. The interviewed principals expected that this practice could stimulate improvements in classroom instruction. Instructional leadership signified the practice of providing supportive working conditions as one of the responsibilities of school principals in relation to classroom instruction (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). The promotion of a climate for learning and the establishment of a supportive working environment in terms of providing learning resources and facilities demonstrated a focus on instruction and a practice of instructional leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Reitzug, et al., 2008).

From the interviews, the use of technology and multi-media received a very strong emphasis in the provision of learning resources and facilities. To provide these costly assets, the schools had to work together with parents and communities to get financial support. In Murphy’s (1990) model of instructional leadership, securing outside resources was included in the practice of developing a supportive network and environment. Leithwood et al (2008) characterised successful leaders as those who built productive relations with parents and the
community. The financial support from parents and communities described by the participants unavoidably brought an attached accountability to the practice. From the interviews, there was an awareness among the participants of the need to be accountable for both the provision and proper utilisation of the resources and facilities. Such awareness of accountability indicated that ethics were adopted in exercising the practice. According to Ramsey (2006), ethics was important in the practice of leadership and one of the basic requirements to build a better school.

Building partnerships with stakeholders was the fourth practice of managing instruction. Perceiving education as a shared responsibility, the participants believed that partnership with parents and communities would make schooling a successful experience for the students. Partnerships with school stakeholders have been recognised as a practice of instructional leadership (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 1990; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Weber, 1996). Some scholars believed that a collaborative process between schools and the stakeholders determined the success of educational reforms (Dalin, et al., 1994; Sergiovanni, 2001). Building partnerships with school stakeholders was also an emphasis in Indonesian educational reform (Fadjar, 2003). The reform process sought for a more intense stakeholders’ involvement in school programs and activities that could lead to a more transparent, accountable, democratic, and responsive school management (Ministry of National Education, 2004).

The need to involve parents and communities in Indonesian schools also resulted from the increasing pressure of the national exit examination. This examination is taken by students in the final year of their study. It determines whether the students can graduate and continue to a higher level. The pressure to pass the examination not only put a strain on parents but it also
added challenges to schools to achieve high graduation rates. Participants thought that the family environment and parental control were external factors that helped determine successful performance in this examination. Therefore, preparing students for the examination was believed to be a shared responsibility between schools and parents. The participants believed that involvement of parents could eliminate possible conflicts that emerged from the pressure to pass the examination. Scholars have identified high involvement of the stakeholders as the characteristic of high-performing schools (Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994).

Improving the welfare of teachers was the last practice of managing instruction. From the interviews, the economic burden was considered a real obstacle that could prevent teachers from doing and giving their best. Attention to the welfare of teachers could be related to the Indonesian Gross National Income (GNI) profile issued by the World Bank. For 2011, Indonesia’s GNI was US$ 2,940 and it was categorised into a lower middle income country (The World Bank, 2013). Teaching was among jobs in Indonesia that did not offer a high salary (Chan & Sam, 2007; Tilaar, 2009). As described by one of the participants, the title of unsung heroes for Indonesian teachers contributed to the lack of financial reward to teaching and showed a lack of appreciation to teachers’ roles in national development. Such treatment was criticised to undermine the important role of teachers in national development (Chan & Sam, 2007; Tilaar, 2009).

In the earlier models, the welfare of teachers was included into a practice of instructional leadership. In Hallinger and Murphy’s model (1985) and the subsequent Murphy’s model (1990), providing incentives for teachers was one of the practices of promoting an academic learning climate. Although this practice did not appear in recent practices of instructional
leadership, it could be linked to a review by Leithwood et al (2008). Part of their review was on the effects of teachers’ motivation, such as levels of commitment, sense of efficacy, morale, job satisfaction, and stress on student learning. The evidence showed that teachers’ capacities, motivation and commitment and their working conditions had subsequent effects on student learning and achievement (Leithwood, et al., 2008).

In summary, the practices of managing instruction in Indonesian schools brought out two highlights. First, some of the identified practices confirmed the existing empirical findings on practices of instructional leadership in managing instruction. It could be said that the established practices of managing instruction contained a universal dimension and could be applied in a different school system and cultural context. Second, some other identified practices provided a new insight into how culture and school population could influence how to manage instruction. These Indonesian socio-cultural contexts illustrated a different way of managing instruction, while at the same time they enriched existing empirical findings on practices of managing instruction.

**Practices of Promoting Instruction**

This section discusses the identified practices of promoting instruction from the interviews with the participants. Five practices were identified: setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, creating a climate for learning, encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs, and involving parents (see Section 4.2.2 of Chapter 4).

The first practice of promoting instruction was setting high expectations for students. From the interviews, high expectations were measured by some desirable traits expected from the
students. The traits not only covered cognitive excellence but they also consisted of affective, character, physical, and social qualities. Religious traits were also included. Religious teaching was a compulsory subject in Indonesia’s national curriculum and taught at all educational levels and school types. Communicating high expectations was recognised as a practice of instructional leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003; Murphy, 1990; Reitzug, et al., 2008). It created a shared purpose to stimulate performance and promoted an academic learning climate in schools. Empirical studies have shown the link of consistently communicating expectations for high performance and positive results in school and student achievement (Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Robinson, et al., 2008).

Focusing on character building of the students was the second practice of promoting instruction. Character building or character education was among the key elements of the Indonesian education system. The national education system was mandated to strengthen the people’s faith and moral character as a means for enhancing the intellectual capacity of the nation. The function of national education was to develop the capability, character, and civilization of the nation for enhancing its intellectual capacity. From the interviews, the adopted values for building the character of the students were taken from spiritual and cultural wisdom as well as universal principles. The universality of the adopted values was imperative in the Indonesian context because of the heterogeneous ethnicity and religious backgrounds of the students. The universal characteristics of the values could bond people from different religious and ethnic backgrounds (Komalasari, 2012).

Character was recognised as one of the elements of leadership. Scholars defined leadership as character expressed in terms of personal, emotional and moral capability, (Day, Harris, & Hadfield,
1991; Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993). Studies have identified that the setting and communication of behavioural standards and implementing effective processes to ensure that behavioural policies were applied consistently for all students were among the instructional responsibilities of school principals (Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

Creating a climate for learning was the third practice of promoting instruction. From the interviews, this practice was intended to create school conditions that could stimulate and promote learning. Research has shown that a leadership practice of ensuring an orderly and supportive environment had positive effects on student outcomes (Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Robinson, et al., 2008). From the interviews, creating a learning climate was also done by establishing good interpersonal relationships among school members. Relationships have been identified as an element of leadership and among 21 key areas of leadership that have a positive correlation with student achievement (Waters, et al., 2003).

The fourth practice of promoting instruction was encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs. This practice was perceived to be the means to balance students’ lives in schools and to invigorate their learning enthusiasm. Indonesia’s curriculum has been criticised because of its inability to generate learning excitement and to meet the needs and interests of the students (Kunandar, 2007; Taruna, 2007). Extracurricular programs could be an alternative to revive the enthusiasm for learning. Furthermore, extracurricular programs encourage physical activities and maintain mental health. These benefits were thought by the participants to be essential for improving learning concentration. In addition, extracurricular programs could become the place to develop students’ characters. Values such as sportsmanship, fairness, honesty, discipline, hard work and team work were fostered in these programs.
The last practice of promoting instruction was involving parents. This practice was intended to share responsibility between schools and parents in educating children. Parents and the family environment were considered important in making learning a successful experience for the students. As economic factors and the educational background of the parents could inhibit parental involvement (Irawan, et al., 2004; Raihani, 2007; Silverius, 2002), it could be quite challenging for schools located in suburban and rural areas where the majority of parents came from uneducated lower socio-economic classes to have parents engaged in their children’s learning. However, parental support was recognised by the participants to be essential, particularly for after-school control. This acknowledgement could be a significant step to promote more meaningful parental involvement in their children’s education.

Research has shown that parental involvement was essential in educational reforms. The opinions of parents on school improvement and their reactions to it were important to understand the whole change process of school improvement (Dalin, et al., 1994; Fullan, 1991 Sergiovanni, 2001). Successful leaders were those who built a collaborative culture and productive relations with parents (Leithwood, 2008). The implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesian schools was primarily driven by the importance of involving school stakeholders including parents in school decision making (Indonesian Ministry of National Education, 2004). It was expected that with parental support, schools would be able to improve quality through innovative efforts (Indonesian Ministry of National Education, 2004).

In summary, similar to the practices of managing instruction, some of the practices of promoting instruction reemphasised the practices suggested by empirical studies. The other identified practices were influenced by Indonesian educational and cultural values. Focusing
on character building, encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs and engaging parents were local practices for promoting instruction in Indonesian schools. These local practices accentuated contextual factors in the school reform efforts. Scholars have argued that contextual factors determine the focus of reform efforts (Ainscow & West, 2006; Harris & Chrispeels, 2006).

**Practices of Improving Instruction**

This section discusses the identified practices of improving instruction from the interviews with the participants. Five practices were identified: providing regular teaching feedback, increasing teachers’ qualifications, facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards (see Section 4.2.3 of Chapter 4).

The first practice of improving instruction was providing regular teaching feedback to teachers. There were different ideas among the participants on what data to use to guide the feedback. The majority used data from test scores particularly national examination scores rather than data from direct observation on teaching and learning processes in classrooms. However, empirical findings had shown that direct observations were the predictors of school effectiveness (Leithwood, et al., 2008; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Effective leaders were those who routinely visited classrooms, participated in team-level meetings, and paid close attention to student performance within their school (Leithwood, et al., 2008; Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

Different working cultures between Indonesian principals and teachers could contribute to the lack of direct observations on teaching and learning processes in classrooms. Principals were brought up in a culture that entitled them to act more as managerial leaders than as
instructional leaders (Mulyasa, 2011). Teachers honoured their principals in this managerial perspective (Mulyasa, 2011). Instructional affairs became the responsibilities of teachers (Tilaar, 2009). On the contrary, instructional leadership removed the division of instructional responsibilities between principal and teacher. Principals as instructional leaders actively engaged in instructional activities to create accountable learning systems in schools (Halverson, et al., 2005).

Instructional behaviours of principals consisted of making suggestions, giving feedback, modelling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching (Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

Increasing teachers’ qualifications was the second practice of improving instruction. This practice was done by encouraging teachers to pursue higher education. Motivational support and simpler administrative bureaucracy were the focus of this practice. Although increasing teachers’ qualifications was not explicitly listed as one of the instructional leadership practices, it could be regarded as a practice to facilitate professional development for teachers. Higher education degrees could expand and deepen teachers’ knowledge of their teaching subjects. It was expected that the mastery that they acquired from their study would improve their teaching performance and professionalism. More importantly, increasing teachers’ qualifications could be a strategic approach to develop teachers’ capacity. Teachers’ capacity determines a school’s pedagogical capacities (Penlington, et al., 2008).

The third practice of improving instruction was facilitating professional development programs for teachers. Research has shown that a principal’s success comes through
professional development opportunities for the staff, especially for teachers (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Effective principals were those who participated in professional development activities to gain understanding of classroom practices and acquired professional development resources for their school (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Promoting teachers’ professional development programs was among the practices of instructional leadership (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 1990; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Weber, 1996).

Improving school curriculum was the fourth practice of improving instruction. Empirical studies on instructional leadership have distinguished curriculum improvement as one of its core dimensions (Bateman & Bateman, 2001; Blase & Kirby, 1992; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Marks & Printy, 2003; Murphy, 1990; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Weber, 1996). Empirical studies have shown that evaluating teaching and curriculum was among the leadership practices that have positive effects on student outcomes (Robinson, et al., 2008; Waters, et al, 2003).

Improvement in instruction and curriculum was highlighted in the implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesian schools (Fadjar, 2003). Responding to the demand of a curriculum that could better accommodate the distinct local characteristics as well as the diversity of students’ needs and interests, School-Based Curriculum was applied in 2006. The objective was to minimise the government’s interference in curriculum development and to meet the mandatory requirement of the National Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003 and Government Decree Number 19 Year 2005 on National Education Standards (Kunandar, 2007; Ministry of National Education, 2004). Each school together with its teachers and school council was granted the authority to develop its own curriculum, along
with the learning indicators, syllabus, and other curriculum components, while still meeting the required standards of performance decided by the central government (Ministry of National Education, 2004).

In the Indonesian context, the practice of school-level curriculum improvement could reduce critical arguments against the government on the frequent changes in the national curriculum. Curriculum, indeed, has been quite a contested issue in Indonesia’s educational system (Drost, 2005; Taruna, 2007). The national policy on curriculum change has been criticised for its lack of analysis on factual need assessments and its tendency to rely on bureaucratic prediction and interests (Sagala, 2004). The implementation of the 2006 School-Based Curriculum as mandated by the National Education System Law Number 20 Year 2003 has been noted as a fundamental change in the education system because it required a paradigm change in learning and schooling (Kunandar, 2007). This school-based curriculum not only necessitated changes in teaching concepts, methods, and strategies but also involved a change in the education mind-set and philosophy as well as the commitment of teachers, schools, and stakeholders (Kunandar, 2007).

The last practice of improving instruction was increasing standards. From the interviews, the increased standards were applied to school management, school facilities, and student learning experiences. Securing high standards has been the focus of research on school reform and effective leadership (NCSL, 2001 in Bush, 2003). Leadership succeeded when it involved setting and sharing goals or standards (McDougall, et al., 2007). Ensuring quality teaching and learning standards was also part of instructional leadership practices (Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008). In Murphy’s (1990) instructional leadership model, establishing positive
expectations and standards was one of the practices of promoting an academic learning climate.

In general, the five practices identified from the data supported the empirical findings on instructional leadership practices. Similar to previous emerging practices of instructional leadership, some of the emerging practices were those listed in Weber’s (1996) instructional model and Nettles and Herrington’s (2007) review. In addition, the practices of increasing teachers’ qualifications, improving curriculum, and increasing standards were influenced by Indonesian educational and cultural values. Although leadership was a catalyst for school improvement, both the nature of leadership and its impacts were shaped by historical and current conditions in the schools (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). The type of leadership exercised during the improvement period was linked both to the school learning profile and its improvement capacity at a specific time along the process (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Scholars have found that effective leadership for school improvement needs to be responsive to these contextual characteristics (Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

**Practices of Assessing Instruction**

This section discusses the identified practices of assessing instruction from the interviews with the participants. Three practices were identified: benchmarking on national examination results, using data from teacher-made tests, and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents (see Section 4.2.4 of Chapter 4).

The first practice of assessing instruction was benchmarking on national exit examination results. This examination was a summative test organised by the Ministry of National Education. The examination was compulsory and taken by final year students. Students in
year six of primary school, year nine of junior secondary school, and year twelve of senior secondary school were the test takers of this national exit examination. The government was in charge of constructing and scoring the tests while local schools were responsible for administering the examination. The passing standard for this examination was set nationally by the government. The result of the examination would determine whether students could continue their study to a higher level. The high stakes of this test have made it the most important reference in assessing instructional quality. From the interviews, the result of this exit examination was most referred to in assessing a school’s instruction (see Section 4.2.4 of Chapter 4).

The practice of benchmarking to national exit examination results illustrated the effort to monitor students’ progress. Monitoring students’ progress was identified as a practice of instructional leadership (Bateman & Bateman, 2001; Blase & Kirby, 1992; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Benchmarking to national exit examination results could also be seen as a practice of supervising and evaluating instruction. This practice was listed as one of the practices in Hallinger and Murphy’s (1985) model of instructional leadership. Instructional leadership basically emphasised the responsibilities of school principals in relation to classroom instruction (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). The instructional responsibilities of principals were for evaluating (Goldring, et al., 2009; Robinson, 2010) and monitoring assessment and student progress (Marks & Printy, 2003; Murphy, 1990; Reitzug, et al., 2008).

The second practice of assessing instruction was using data from teacher-made tests. These tests were formative and summative tests. The results of the tests would inform the learning progress achieved by the students during the semester. The diagnostic attribute of the tests
facilitated teachers to identify problems and difficulties experienced by the students and to plan immediate enrichment and remedial programs. Using data from teacher-made tests could be a strategy to enhance student learning outcomes. Instructional leadership promoted teaching strategies that were demonstrably effective in meeting the learning needs of all students (Hattie, 2005; Rowe, 2007).

The last practice of assessing instruction was communicating the implications of the national examination with parents. This practice was driven by the increasing pressure on schools to succeed in national exit examinations. The pressure to pass the examination challenged schools to achieve a high graduation rate. A low graduation rate has severe implications for schools. Schools could be perceived to be low-performing if many of the students failed in the exam. This would severely affect the profile of the schools in the community and the attractiveness of schools for parents of prospective students. The purpose of communicating the implications of the national examination with parents was to get their approval for school examination preparation programs. Strengthening parental involvement was found to be essential in managing the conflicts that occurred during the implementation of reform programs (Chen, 2008).

Although communicating the implications of the national exit examination with parents was not a direct practice of assessing instruction, the key purpose was to help schools ensure the learning success of their students. Communicating information on student data to all stakeholders was among the leadership practices that have a direct effect on student learning outcomes (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Accountability for improved student learning achievement determined the quality of leadership (Leithwood & Day, 2008). Effective school leaders are those who have the ability to ensure learning success for every student in their
school (Davies, 2005; Donaldson, 2006; Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Johnson, et al., 1996; Southworth, 2005). Communicating the implications of the national exit examination with parents could be linked to the instructional leadership practice of communicating a school’s goals to stakeholders. This practice was recognised as instructional leadership practice (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 1990; Weber, 1996)

In summary, the identified practices of assessing instruction aimed at increasing learning outcomes and ensuring students’ learning success. These objectives were in accordance with the objectives of school improvement to increase student learning outcomes. In addition, the identified practices could be regarded as the instructional leadership practices of monitoring the progress of students and evaluating instruction.

6.1.3. Perceived Importance and Current Frequency of the Practices

The findings showed that the perceived degree of importance of the practices ranged from being somewhat important to strongly important (see Table 5-1, 5-4, 5-7, and 5-10) except for practices of Improving 1 and Improving 2 (see Table 5-7). The current frequency of the practices ranged from being “sometimes” to “always” (see Table 5-2, 5-5, 5-8, and 5-11) except for practices of Improving 1 and Improving 2 (see Table 5-14). The correlation between the perceived importance and the current frequency of the practices was quite different among the practices (see Table 5-3, 5-6, 5-9, and 5-12). The correlation varied from being very small to large, which suggested a very weak to strong relationship.

From the identified practices, practices of providing regular teaching feedback (Improving 1) and increasing teachers’ qualifications (Improving 2) were quite distinct. Compared to other identified practices, these two practices were perceived to be less important and currently less
often performed. Providing regular teaching feedback required a strong involvement of principals in teaching and learning processes. The lack of this practice could be as a result of assumptions about what school leaders were and what they do. Principals as school leaders were dominantly influenced by the logic of leading reform that did not appraise the professionalism and quality located in pedagogic expertise and research very much (Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2008). Research has shown that principals indirectly influence students’ learning outcomes in reading and mathematics through feedback and evaluation practices that shape teachers’ job satisfaction and achievement orientation (Bosker et al., 2000). The lack of attention to feedback and evaluation practices could minimise the contribution of principals to literacy and numeracy improvements in their school. It seems to explain the substandard achievement of Indonesia’s performance in the 2006 and 2009 PISA tests, in the 2007 TIMSS, and the 2006 PIRLS (see Table 1-3 and 1-4).

The lack of importance and current frequency of increasing teachers’ qualifications could be related to the financial implications of this practice since schools could not offer financial support to teachers to pursue a higher degree in education. Participants commented that the lack of financial support for higher degree study in addition to the heavy teaching load have been impediments to increasing the qualifications of teachers. To encourage teachers to take higher degree study, schools have tried to simplify the administrative bureaucracy by reducing the lengthy procedures for teachers to have approval for their study and readjusting their teaching schedule to match with their university study. As administration matters were usually delegated to school administrative staff, this seems to explain why the practice of increasing teachers’ qualifications did not strongly catch the attention of the principals.
The relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of the identified practices was different among the categories of instructional practices. A strong relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of practice was found in all practices of managing instruction (monitoring classroom hours, communicating instructional matters, providing resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of teachers) to be important and two practices of assessing instruction (benchmarking on national examination results and using data from teacher-made tests). This strong relationship meant that the more important the practices were perceived to be, the more frequently the practices were performed. Organisational functions attached to the practices could be the reason for the strong relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of the practices. School principals were found to be predominantly occupied with performing their organisational functions (Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007).

A moderate relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of practice was found in two practices of promoting instruction (setting high expectations for students and creating a climate for learning) and one practice of assessing instruction (communicating the implications of the national examination with parents). The moderate relationship meant that the current frequency of the practices was not as high as the degree of importance given to it. Because perception is necessary for conscious action (Gibson, 1987) the awareness of the importance of the practices could be used to promote the application of the practices. It opens up the opportunity to advance practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian schools, which was among the objectives of this study.

A weak relationship between the perceived importance and current frequency of practice was found in all practices of improving instruction (providing regular teaching feedback,
increasing teachers’ qualifications, facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards) and three practices of promoting instruction (focusing on student character building, involving parents, and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs). The weak relationship meant that the degree of importance given to these practices was not supported by their current frequency of practice. The practices were basically directly related to teaching and learning processes. Research has shown that principals’ knowledge of curriculum content and instructional materials (Stein & Nelson, 2003; Louis, et al., 2010) and their support for improved instruction (Leithwood, 2001; O’Donnell & White, 2005; Louis, et al., 2010) have an effect on student learning outcomes. The lack of interest in teachers’ teaching performance and the responsibility to improve the quality of teaching in Indonesian schools (Bjork, 2005) could contribute to the low frequency of these practices of improving instruction.

6.1.4 Perceived Importance and Influence on Teaching Performance of the Practices

The findings showed that generally the perceived degree of importance was quite similar among the practices of managing instruction, promoting instruction, improving instruction, and assessing instruction. The perceived degree of importance ranged from being important to strongly important (see Table 5-13, 5-16, 5-19, and 5-22). Similarly, the perceived influence of the practices on teaching performance was not much different among the practices (see Table 5-14, 5-17, 5-20, and 5-23). However, the correlation between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance was quite different among the practices (see Table 5-15, 5-18, 5-21, and 5-24). The correlation varied from being small to large which suggested a weak to strong relationship.
The relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance was found to be quite strong in three practices of assessing instruction (benchmarking on national examination results, using data from teacher-made tests, and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents). A strong relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance was also found in four practices of improving instruction (having increased qualifications, attending professional development programs, having improved curriculum, and increasing standards) and two practices of managing instruction (having access to teaching resources and facilities and having improved welfare). Three practices of promoting instruction also had a strong relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance (setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, and creating a climate for learning). A strong relationship meant that the more important the practices were perceived to be, the more influential the practices were on teaching performance. As these practices were directly related to teaching and learning processes, it seems to explain the high importance and influence on teaching performance perceived from these practices.

A moderate relationship between the perceived importance and influence on teaching performance was found in one practice of improving instruction (getting regular teaching feedback from the principal) and one practice of managing instruction (communicating instructional matters with the principal). The moderate relationship meant that the perceived influence of the practices on teaching performance was not as high as the perceived importance given to them. The limited influence of getting regular teaching feedback from the principal on teaching performance could result from a lack of this practice. The findings showed that providing regular teaching feedback was less performed by principals than other practices of improving instruction (see Table 5-14). The lack of teaching feedback from the
principal could reduce the opportunity to communicate instructional matters with the principal. It seems to explain why communicating instructional matters with the principal was perceived to have little influence on teaching performance. A weak relationship was found in two practices of managing instruction (monitoring classroom hours by the principal and having good relationships with stakeholders) and one practice of promoting instruction (encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs). Their lack of influence on teaching performance could be related to the absence of a direct connection with teaching and learning processes.

6.2 Conclusions

This section compares and contrasts the findings to bring out the similarities and contradictions among the findings. It aims to identify the strengths and weaknesses of reform efforts in Indonesian schools. The implications of the study were derived from this process of identification. This section also highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the research procedure applied in the study, as recommendations for future research.

6.2.1 Similarity and Differences between the Perceptions of Teachers and Principals

Instructional leadership focuses on students and their learning as the core purpose and provides enhanced educational opportunities for students through influencing the behaviour of the teachers. In this type of leadership, teachers play an important role as the mediating variable between principal and students. Therefore, basically the practices of instructional leadership can be seen as the empowerment of teachers for improving student learning. Thus, instructional leadership requires coordinated efforts between principals and teachers, for each other to play their roles to achieve the objectives. For this to happen there should be similar
perceptions between principal and teachers, including their perceptions on the practices of instructional leadership. These shared beliefs can thrive and bond their commitment and enthusiasm to reach the objectives.

The findings showed that principals and teachers shared similar perceptions on the importance of some of the identified practices of instructional leadership. First, principals and teachers perceived the practices of setting high expectation for students and focusing on student character building to be more important than the other practices of promoting instruction (see Table 5-4 and 5-16). They also perceived the practices of improving curriculum and increasing standards to be more important than other practices of improving instruction (see Table 5-7 and 5-19) and benchmarking on national examination results was perceived to be more important than the other practices of assessing instruction (see Table 5-10 and 5-22).

The similarity between the perceptions of principals and teachers was also found in the following practices that both of them perceived to be less important. First, they perceived the practice of building/having good partnerships with stakeholders to be a less important practice of managing instruction (see Table 5-1 and 5-13). Second, they perceived practices of involving parents and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs to be less important practices of promoting instruction (see Table 5-4 and 5-16). Next, they perceived the practice of providing/getting regular teaching feedback and increasing teachers’ qualifications were less important practices of improving instruction (see Table 5-7 and 5-19). They also perceived practices of using data from teacher-made tests and communicating the implications of the national examination with parents to be less important practices of assessing instruction (see Table 5-10 and 5-22).
However, the findings also showed that the similarity between the perceptions of principals and teachers on the practices of instructional leadership did not exist in some practices. Their different perceptions were found in the following practices. First, while principals considered the practices of monitoring classroom hours and communicating instructional matters to be more important practices of managing instruction (see Table 5-1), teachers perceived the practices of having access to teaching resources and facilities and having improved welfare to be more important practices of managing instruction (see Table 5-13). Second, principals did not perceive the practice of creating a climate for learning to be as important for promoting instruction as teachers did (see Table 5-4 and Table 5-16). Next, principals perceived the practice of facilitating professional development for teachers to be a more important practice for improving instruction, while teachers perceived it to be a less important practice for improving instruction. The differences reflected different priorities given to the practices by principals and teachers. When their priorities are different, it would be difficult to expect coordinated efforts between them.

6.2.2 Importance versus Current Frequency of Practice

This study assumed that the perceived importance of instructional leadership practices would influence the frequency of the practices. When a certain practice was perceived to be important, it was expected that it would increase its current frequency of practice. The results of the correlations showed that the high importance given to some practices was not always supported by a high frequency in their practices. A small correlation between the perceived importance and current frequency of practice was found in three practices of promoting instruction (focusing on student character building, involving parents, and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs) (see Table 5-6) and all practices of improving instruction (providing regular teaching feedback, increasing teachers’
qualifications, facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards) (see Table 5-9). The small correlation suggests a weak relationship which means that the high degree of importance given to the practices was not reflected in their current frequency of practice.

The low frequency of practices of promoting and improving instruction could be caused by the lack of experience and expertise of principals to carry out these practices. Although the principals were now implementing regional autonomy, they were accustomed to being the implementers of centralised government policies (Chan & Sam, 2007; Irawan, et al., 2004; Surakhmad, 2002). In the past, Indonesian schools were not provided with the opportunity to create ideas and strategies for improvement (Silverius, 2002). This condition has prevented many principals from taking any initiatives to make necessary changes as they continued to rely on directives from their superiors in their school districts (Chan & Sam, 2007; Irawan, et al., 2004; Surakhmad, 2002). Moreover, the lack of interest in teaching performance has reduced the responsibility to improve the quality of teaching (Azra, 2002; Bjork, 2005; Tilaar, 2009).

6.2.3 Importance versus Influence on Teaching Performance

This study assumed that the perceived importance of instructional leadership practices would influence their perceived influence on teaching performance. When a certain practice was perceived to be important, it was expected that it would affect its perceived influence on teaching performance. However, the results of the correlations showed that this assumption did not work for some practices of instructional leadership. A small correlation between perceived importance and influence on teaching performance was found in two practices of managing instruction (monitoring classroom hours by the principal and having a good
partnership with stakeholders) (see Table 5-13) and two practices of promoting instruction (encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs and involving parents) (see Table 5-18). The small correlation suggests a weak relationship which means that although the practices were perceived to be important, they were not perceived to be very influential on teaching performance.

The lack of influence of these practices on teaching performance could be related to their indirect connection with teaching and learning activities. Monitoring classroom hours by the principal was regarded more as a practice of management to ensure that classes were started and finished on time. The focus was to manage a large number of students, teachers and classes and to discourage lack of discipline and tardiness. The practice of having a good partnership with stakeholders was intended to encourage their meaningful involvement to make schooling a successful experience for the students. As this practice involved important decisions to be made, the principal was usually the one to represent the school in the decision making. Although encouraging student participation in extracurricular activities was primarily intended to balance students’ school life and to invigorate their learning enthusiasm, this practice was not directly related to teaching and learning activities. Similarly, a practice of involving parents was to encourage parental control of their children’s learning. As this practice was done outside school hours, its influence on teaching performance could be perceived to be less than its importance.

6.2.4 Current Frequency versus Influence on Teaching Performance

Current frequency of instructional leadership practices performed by principals could be associated with teachers’ perceptions of the influence of such practices on their teaching performance. This happened not only for practices with high frequency but also for the
practices with less frequency. Practices with high frequency and high influence on teaching performance were found in three practices of promoting instruction (setting high expectations for students, focusing on student character building, and creating a climate for learning) (see Table 5-5 and 5-17), three practices of improving instruction (facilitating professional development programs for teachers, improving curriculum, and increasing standards) (see Table 5-8 and 5-20), and one practice of assessing instruction (benchmarking on national examination results) (see Table 5-11 and 5-23). Practices with low frequency and low influence on teaching performance were found in two practices of managing instruction (communicating instructional matters and building partnerships with stakeholders) (see Table 5-2 and 5-14) and two practices of promoting instruction (involving parents and encouraging student participation in extracurricular programs) (see Table 5-5 and 5-17).

Current frequency of the practices could indicate the implicit importance given to them by the principal and it might affect how teachers perceive the influence of the practices on their teaching performance. Current frequency of the practices subconsciously built the culture within the schools about the practices. In addition, current frequency of the practices showed that the behaviours of principals could significantly determine what the teachers thought to be influential. Empirical studies have revealed that the behaviour of school principals influenced the behaviour of teachers and how teachers performed their job (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Opdenakker & Van Damme, 2007). Therefore, it was important for principals to consider the impacts of their actions on teachers and the consequence of such actions on the progress of their school reform programs. The findings; therefore, suggested a change is needed in the way principals and teachers position instructional responsibilities between them and how each of them could contribute to the improvement process.
6.2.5 Importance-Frequency versus Importance-Influence

With the exception for all practices of managing instruction and one practice of promoting instruction, the findings showed that teachers’ perceptions of the importance of instructional leadership practices and the influence of the practices on their teaching performance (see Table 5-15, 5-18, 5-21, and 5-24) had stronger correlations compared to that of the perceptions of principals on the importance of the practices and current frequency of the practice (see Table 5-3, 5-6, 5-9, and 5-12). Stronger correlations between the perceived importance and influence of practices of instructional leadership implied that teachers appreciated practices of instructional leadership more than principals did. Weaker correlations between the perceived importance and current frequency of practices of instructional leadership implied the need to reinforce the practices among principals.

However, the findings showed that generally principals were aware of the importance of instructional leadership practices. As principals have the power to catalyse change processes in schools (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000), their awareness could be a significant starting point for changes to happen in Indonesian school reform. What needs to be done is to encourage principals to perform practices of instructional leadership more often. This meets the objective of this study to advance the practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian schools and to develop principals’ proficiency as instructional leaders.

6.2.6 Authentic Assessment versus External Examination

The findings showed that both principals and teachers perceived the results of the national examination to be more important than data from teacher-made tests in assessing instruction (see Table 5-10 and 5-22). From the interviews, participants believed that students’ performance in the national examination influenced their school’s profile in the community.
The link between a school’s achievements in the national examination and a desirable public profile for the school increased the pressure for successful performance in the examination. The majority of the participants signified the scores students attained from the national examination in assessing whether the desired instructional improvements have taken place or not in their schools. Data on students’ scores in previous national examinations were used to analyse what subject matters need to be strengthened to prepare students for the future examinations. A preparation program for the national examination was implemented to help students succeed in the examination.

Considering the consequences of failing in this exam for students and schools, benchmarking on national examination results was perceived to be more important than using data from teacher-made tests. The high importance of the results of the national examination could also be seen from the frequency of its current practice by principals. This practice was more frequently performed than using data from teacher-made tests to assess instruction. The correlation between its perceived importance and current frequency of practice was higher than that of using data from teacher-made tests. Although teachers perceived benchmarking on national examination results was as influential as using data from teacher-made tests, benchmarking on national examination results was still perceived to be more important. Furthermore, the correlation between the perceived importance and influence of benchmarking on national examination results was higher than that of using data from teacher-made tests (see Table 5-24). This means that even for teachers, the national examination outweighed their own tests in assessing instruction.

A strong reliance on benchmarking on national examination results in assessing instruction means that data from this external evaluation has more authority in deciding instructional
programs than data from authentic internal evaluations. However, because the national examination was administered one time only, it has a very limited capacity to capture the progress of students’ learning. In addition, excessive confidence in the national examination could lead to the practice of teaching for testing, as proven by the flourishing examination preparation programs. These after-school programs were offered not only by schools themselves but also by private courses. The programs were intensive, where students were drilled with exam questions and problems. When learning is assessed by an achievement in this single national examination, it could lessen the relevance and meaning of learning.

On the contrary, teacher-made tests provide more reliable data because they are based on the actual learning progress of the students. Therefore, there should be a change of mindset towards the importance of using data from teacher-made tests in assessing instruction. Data from internal tests are more relevant because they are built on actual teaching and learning experiences in classrooms. The formative and summative data from these tests would provide a more comprehensive description of the instructional progress of the schools. In addition, the higher frequency of the administration of these tests makes the data from these tests a more reliable source in diagnosing areas for instructional improvement, compared to a single administration of a national examination. A confidence in these internal tests also means a confidence in teachers and their evaluation ability. For school improvement to take place, teachers need to be empowered by developing their competence and cultivating teaching professionalism (Rowe, 2007). Data from external evaluation should be used as a complementary and not a primary source for assessing instruction.
6.2.7 Parental Involvement

From the interviews, parental involvement was acknowledged to be influential in making learning a successful experience for the students. Parental support and home environment were thought to have more substantial impacts on student learning. Participants wanted parents to have a genuine interest in their children’s learning and be aware of the achieved learning progress. The need to involve parents in their children’s learning also resulted from the increasing pressure of the national exit examination. The majority of the participants felt the pressure to pass the examination. They also knew that parents felt a similar tension to ensure their children perform well in the examination. Therefore, involving parents became the option, to share the responsibility for preparing students for the examination. Regular communications with parents were made to get parents involved in their children’s learning.

Parental involvement was found to have a strong influence on student learning (Hattie, 2003). The opinions of parents on school improvement and their reactions to it were important to understand the whole change process of school improvement (Fullan, 1991). However, findings from the survey showed that parental involvement was not considered to be significant. It was a less important practice of promoting instruction, as perceived by both principals and teachers. It was also less frequently performed by principals. Teachers perceived it to be less influential on teaching performance. The correlations between its perceived importance and current frequency as well as between its perceived importance and influence on teaching performance were small. The small correlation suggested that the degree of importance given to the practice was not supported by its current frequency of practice, or by its perceived influence on teaching performance. The findings showed that the significance of parental involvement was not yet substantially acknowledged. To get the
benefits of parental involvement, broader and more meaningful engagement of parents in instructional programs are recommended.

6.2.8 Recommendations for Future Research

Guided by a pragmatism worldview that highlights the use of pluralistic approaches, this study was designed as an exploratory sequential mixed-method study. The qualitative phase focused on concept discovery of local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian schools from in-depth interviews with principals and teachers. In the quantitative phase, the identified practices were surveyed to measure their perceived degree of importance and influence on teaching performance and current frequency of practice as well as the correlations among them. The survey findings were intended to complement the interview findings to enhance the validity and to attain more robust research results. Therefore, the quantitative findings were not aimed at making any generalisations. The application of the findings was limited to the site and participants where this study was conducted. Future research involving larger numbers of participants and respondents is suggested to corroborate the findings of this study.

The output of descriptive statistics showed a positively skewed and relatively flat distribution of the data set. The differences among the mean \((M)\) was found to be too small to indicate the differences. As the questionnaire items were constructed in Likert-type questions to measure degrees of importance, frequency of occurrence, and degrees of influence on teaching performance of the identified instructional leadership practices, it seemed that options with the highest degree and highest frequency tended to attract the respondents more. This suggests that for this study, organising questionnaire options in an order of degree could result in a clustering of scores at the high end. To avoid such an occurrence, a different
organisation of questionnaire options is recommended for future research with a similar focus and participant characteristics.

Some of the identified practices of instructional leadership were local practices influenced by either Indonesian socio-economic, cultural or educational values, or the combination of such values. However, other identified practices reemphasised the practices suggested by the empirical findings of instructional leadership practices in a broader international context. The similarity between local and international practices of instructional leadership strengthened the applicability of the practices, while at the same time reinforcing the universality of the application. Some mismatches and overlaps of the categories of the identified practices with referenced instructional leadership models might indicate some common characteristics among the categories. This opens up opportunities for future research to compare and contrast the characteristics of the practices in multi-cultural contexts to affirm their categories.

6.3 Concluding Remarks

This study addressed the need to explore socio-cultural contexts of school reform to enrich cross-cultural comparative studies on leadership research. The primary interest was to explore and examine local perceptions and practices of instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform. Instructional leadership was used as the lens for the examination because of its ability to develop strategies for leading, teaching, and learning. The examination of Indonesian school reform indicated a gap between the reform goals and the educational achievements of the students (see Section 1.3). A further examination of the problematic conditions in Indonesian school reform (see Section 1.4) has pointed out some shortcomings in Indonesian school reform, particularly in terms of leading, teaching, and learning. Appreciation of local perceptions and practices was expected to help identify strengths and weaknesses associated
with leading, teaching, and learning in Indonesian school reform, to close the gap. In addition, a deeper awareness of the local perceptions of principals and teachers within the local context of Indonesia could act as a catalyst to improve student performance within that culture.

In addressing the abovementioned issues, this study responded to two key questions posed (see Section 3.1). It inquired into what instructional improvements were expected from school reform and what practices of instructional leadership were carried out by principals. To substantiate the inquiry, this study further examined the degrees of importance, current frequency, and degrees of influence on teaching performance of these practices and the relationship between the perceived importance and the frequency of the practice, as well as the relationship between the perceived importance and the influence on teaching performance of these practices.

The findings from the qualitative phase indicated a strong focus on instructional improvements in Indonesian school reform. The participants expected improvements in four areas: curriculum, teachers’ professionalism, learning facilities, and student learning outcomes. The expected improvements were reinforced in the identified practices of instructional leadership. Some of the identified practices of instructional leadership were local practices influenced by either Indonesian socio-economic, cultural or educational values, or the combination of such values. The root of these local practices could be linked to referenced instructional leadership models and specific findings of recent studies.

When the identified perceptions and practices were further investigated in the quantitative phase, the findings showed some contradictions that could be factors contributing to the gap
between the reform goals and the educational achievements of the students. First, some of the identified perceptions and practices were found to be limited aspirations and not reflected on a larger scale. Second, although there was a significant awareness of the importance of instructional leadership practices, this did not necessarily lead to increased frequency of these practices and the subsequent perceptions of their influence on instructional improvements. Moreover, expected instructional improvements were not strongly supported by current practices. The findings also showed different perceptions between principals and teachers that indicated their different priorities in the instructional improvement efforts taking place in their school.

The findings suggest that the perceptions and practices performed by principals have an influence on teachers. They imply that principals have the capacity to create changes in their schools. This power, when used to introduce new directions and targets of reform as alternatives to current conditions and outcomes, could be a very effective medium for the change process to take place. Moreover, this proposition could be achieved, provided that principals were able to take initiatives to make necessary changes. Schools’ readiness to change was facilitated when principals could identify major sources of existing problems and re-examine the priorities and actions required for improvements to occur in their schools. More importantly, broad stakeholder participation and clear directions and specific targets for achievements are required for accomplishing the desired improvements.
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Appendix 2: Interview Questions

Interview questions are predominantly guided by Weber’s instructional leadership model (1996) and Nettles and Herrington’s review on empirical studies on direct effects of school leadership on student achievement (2007).

Research Questions:
Q1 What instructional improvements are expected from school reform?
Q2 What practices of instructional leadership are carried out by principals?

Foundational Interview Questions

FQ1 Investigate participants’ views on Law Number 20 Year 2003 on the National Education System and subsequent implementation of School-Based Management to reform schools: To what extent do participants think Law Number 20 Year 2003 and School-Based Management have achieved what it sets out to do? How is Law Number 20 Year 2003 and School-Based Management implemented in the school? What instructional improvements are emphasised and the reasons behind the improvements? Focus on the explanation participants use to substantiate opinions and identify the improvements.

FQ2 Investigate participants’ views on practices of instructional leadership carried out by principals: What are the practices of managing, promoting, improving, and assessing instruction carried out to achieve the improvements expected from reforming their school? Why do participants perceive the practices to be important for reform efforts? Focus on the explanation participants give to identify the practices.

Exploratory Interview Questions

EQ1 What, how, why do participants perceive the enactment of Law Number 20 Year 2003 on the National Education System and subsequent implementation of School-Based Management as significant to improve instruction in their school?
EQ2 What, how, why are instructional improvements expected in their school?
EQ3 What do participants do to manage, promote, improve, and assess instruction in their school? How, why do participants manage, promote, improve, and assess instruction in their school?
EQ4 What contextual factors influence the practices to manage, promote, improve, and assess instruction in their school?

Probing Questions – for all participants

PQ1 Can you please explain what you think of Law Number 20 Year 2003 on the National Education System? What changes does it bring to your school? Does it have any impact on your job?

PQ2 The law mandates the implementation of School-Based Management which grants autonomy to schools. With the autonomy at a school level, how much can schools benefit from it? What is the main goal?

PQ3 For your own school, what does the autonomy mean to your school? Does your school need it? Is your school ready for it? How has the autonomy been implemented? What changes has your school experienced? Do you think the changes are important? Please explain.

PQ4 Does the autonomy give your school a better opportunity for instructional improvements? What instructional improvements do you expect? Are the improvements relevant and important for your school? What has your school done to achieve the improvements? Who have been involved in the process? Has their participation been significant for the improvements?

Probing Questions – for participants who are principals

PQ5 Generally, can you explain what you think of the role of a principal? What do you think of the instructional role of a principal? To what extent and how does a principal contribute to instructional improvements in their school?

PQ6 What do you do as a principal of your school? What do you think of your role as an instructional leader in your school? Does your school need you to be an instructional leader?

PQ7 What do you want your school to achieve for its instructional improvements? Were the improvements identified together with the stakeholders of your school? Do you think the accomplishment of the improvements will depend on your role as the principal? What do you think is the contribution of teachers in your school for the accomplishment?
PQ8 What do you think of the role of your school stakeholders, especially parents? Do you involve them in your school’s instructional improvements? What has your school done to promote their involvement?

PQ9 What do you think of the role of teachers in your school’s instructional improvements? Do you hold a certain expectation of them? Do they know your expectation? How do you foster it? Do they show an effort to meet your expectation of them? How do you recognise it? What has your school done to encourage teachers’ contribution to the improvements?

PQ10 What do you think of your students? Do you hold a certain expectation of them? Do they know your expectation? How do you foster it? Do they show an effort to meet your expectation of them? How do you recognise it?

PQ11 What do you think of classroom monitoring? Do you monitor classrooms? How do you monitor classrooms? What is your purpose of doing it? What are you paying attention to? What do you think is the reaction of teachers to classroom monitoring?

PQ12 How would you describe teaching resources and facilities in your school? Are they sufficient for the needs of teachers and students? What have you done to improve the resources and facilities in your school?

PQ13 How would you describe the climate in your school? Does it match with your expectation? What kind of school climate do you want to have in your school? What do you do to promote such a climate? Do you communicate it to teachers and students?

PQ14 What do you think of your school curriculum? What has your school done to improve the curriculum?

PQ15 How do you encourage your teachers to improve their teaching? What do you think of professional development programs for teachers? Are they necessary? What benefits can teachers get from such programs? How are the programs being supported in your school?

PQ16 What do you think of teaching feedback? What are the benefits for instructional improvements? Do you provide teaching feedback to your teachers? What data do you use for the feedback? What do you think of classroom supervision? Would it give more accurate data for teaching feedback? Have you ever done classroom supervision? What would you think the reaction of teachers to it would be?
PQ17 How do you assess instruction in your school? Who are involved in the assessment? What data do you use? Do you communicate the results of the assessment? Do the results affect your school’s instruction? What is the follow-up of the assessment?

PQ18 How would you summarise instructional improvements in your school? What is the ultimate goal? Do you think your school is on the right track to achieve the goal?

Probing Questions – for participants who are teachers

PQ5 Generally, can you explain what you think of the role of a principal? What do you think of an instructional role of a principal? To what extent and how does a principal contribute to instructional improvements in their school?

PQ6 What do you think of your principal? How would your principal contribute to instructional improvements in your school?

PQ7 As a teacher, what do you want your school to achieve for its instructional improvements? Do you think the accomplishment of the improvements will depend on the role of your principal?

PQ8 What do you think of the role of your school stakeholders especially parents in the accomplishment of the improvements? Do you think their involvement is imperative for your school?

PQ9 What do you think of your role as a teacher in your school’s instructional improvements? Does your principal hold a certain expectation of you? Do you know what the expectation is? Does your principal encourage you to meet the expectation?

PQ10 What do you think of your students? Do you hold a certain expectation of them? Do they know your expectation? How do you foster it? Do they show an effort to meet your expectation of them? How do you recognise it?

PQ11 What do you think of classroom monitoring? How is it done in your school? Do you think it will affect instructional improvements in your school?

PQ12 How would you describe teaching resources and facilities in your school? Are they sufficient for your needs? What has your school done to improve the resources and facilities?

PQ13 How would you describe the climate in your school? Does it match with your expectation? What kind of school climate do you want to have in your school? As a teacher, what do you do to promote such a climate? Do you communicate it to your students?
PQ14 What do you think of your school curriculum? Does it meet your expectation? What has your school done to improve the curriculum? Were you involved in the improvement?
PQ15 What do you do to improve your teaching? What do you think of professional development programs for teachers? Are they necessary? What benefits can you get from such programs? How are the programs being supported in your school?
PQ16 What do you think of teaching feedback? What are the benefits for instructional improvements? Does your principal provide teaching feedback to you? What do you think of classroom supervision? Have you ever been supervised by your principal? What do you feel about it? Was it a good experience for you?
PQ17 How is instruction assessed in your school? Are teachers involved in the assessment? What data does your school use for the assessment? Are the results of the assessment communicated? Do the results affect your school’s instruction?
PQ18 How would you summarise instructional improvements in your school? What is the ultimate goal? Do you think your school is on the right track to achieve the goal?
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for Principals (English Version)

This survey aims to identify the perceptions of senior secondary school principals on practices of instructional leadership in terms of their degree of importance and current frequency of practice. It is expected that the findings of this study will improve our understanding of the relevance of instructional leadership in the context of school reform in Indonesian schools. It is also expected that the findings of this research can be the reference to design and formulate any necessary professional development programs to advance instructional leadership in Indonesian schools.

General direction: please give the answer that best describes your opinion and your experience as a school principal. You do not have to provide any personal identity and your responses to this survey will be anonymous and confidential.

Q1. What type is your school?
- mainstream secondary public school
- mainstream secondary private school
- religion-affiliated secondary public school
- religion-affiliated secondary private school
- vocational secondary public school
- vocational secondary private school

Q2. How long have you been a school principal in this school including the current year?
- up to 5 years
- more than 5 years

Q3. What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

Q4. How old are you?
- < 30 years old
- 30 - 39 years old
- 40 - 49 years old
- 50 - 59 years old
- > 59 years old
Q5. What is your last educational degree?
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
- Doctoral degree

Q6. Please rank the importance of each activity for you as a school principal from strongly unimportant to strongly important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly unimportant</th>
<th>Strongly Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring classroom hours</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating instructional matters with teachers</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing learning resources and facilities</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building partnership with stakeholders</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the welfare of teachers</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting high expectations for students</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on students’ character building</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a climate for learning</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students’ participation in extracurricular programs</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving parents</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing regular teaching feedback</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the qualifications of teachers</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating teachers professional development programs</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving curriculum</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing standards</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking on national examination results to assess instruction</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data from teacher-made tests to assess instruction</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the implications of national examinations with parents</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Please rank the frequency of each activity you currently perform from never to always.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring classroom hours</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating instructional matters with teachers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing learning resources and facilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building partnership with stakeholders</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the welfare of teachers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting high expectations for students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on students’ character building</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a climate for learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students’ participation in extracurricular programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving parents</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing regular teaching feedback</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the qualifications of teachers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating teachers professional development programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving curriculum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing standards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking on national examination results to assess instruction</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data from teacher-made tests to assess instruction</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the implications of national examination with parents</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your kind participation in this survey! If you have any question about this survey, please feel free to send an email to:

umiati_jawas@yahoo.com or Francesco.Sofo@canberra.edu.au

or give a phone call to 0341-725451 or 081555797476.
Appendix 4: Questionnaire for Teachers (English Version)

This survey aims to identify the perceptions of senior secondary school teachers on practices of instructional leadership in terms of their degree of importance and influence on teaching performance. It is expected that the findings of this study will improve our understanding of the relevance of instructional leadership in the context of school reform in Indonesian schools. It is also expected that the findings of this research can be the reference to design and formulate any necessary professional development programs to advance instructional leadership in Indonesian schools.

General direction: please give the answer that best describes your opinion and your experience as a teacher. You do not have to provide any personal identity and your responses to this survey will be anonymous and confidential.

Q1. What type is your school?
   - mainstream secondary public school
   - mainstream secondary private school
   - religion-affiliated secondary public school
   - religion-affiliated secondary private school
   - vocational secondary public school
   - vocational secondary private school

Q2. How long have you been a teacher in this school including the current year?
   - up to 5 years
   - more than 5 years

Q3. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

Q4. How old are you?
   - < 30 years old
   - 30 - 39 years old
   - 40 - 49 years old
   - 50 - 59 years old
   - > 59 years old
Q5. What is your last educational degree?
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
- Doctoral degree

Q6. Please rank the importance of each activity for you as a teacher from strongly unimportant to strongly important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly unimportant</th>
<th>Strongly Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring classroom hours by my principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating instructional matters with my principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having access to learning resources and facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having good partnerships with stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having improved welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting high expectations for students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on students’ character building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a climate for learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students’ participation in extracurricular programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting regular teaching feedback from my principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having increased qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending teachers professional development programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having improved curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking on national examination results to assess instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data from teacher-made tests to assess instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the implications of national examinations with parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Please rank the influence of each activity on your teaching performance from strongly not influential to strongly influential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly not influential</th>
<th>Strongly influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring classroom hours by my principal</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating instructional matters with my principal</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having access to learning resources and facilities</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having good partnerships with stakeholders</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having improved welfare</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting high expectations for students</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on students’ character building</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a climate for learning</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students’ participation in extracurricular programs</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving parents</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting regular teaching feedback from my principal</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having increased qualifications</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending teachers professional development programs</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having improved curriculum</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing standards</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking on national examination results to assess instruction</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data from teacher-made tests to assess instruction</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the implications of national examinations with parents</td>
<td>♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your kind participation in this survey! If you have any question about this survey, please feel free to send an email to:

umiati_jawas@yahoo.com or Francesco.Sofo@canberra.edu.au

or give a phone call to 0341-725451 or 081555797476.