The Level of Instructional Leadership Practices Among Principals of National Religious Secondary School in Malaysia

Samsiah binti Si-Rajab, Prof. Madya., Dr. Khalip bin Musa

Institut Aminuddin Baki
Ministry of Education Malaysia
71760 Bandar Enstek, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia
Faculty of Management and Economics
Sultan Idris Educational University
35900 Tanjung Malim, Perak, Malaysia

Abstract
It is stated that Instructional leaders are responsible for making sure that positive attitude towards change is organised and created among members of the school. The study aimed to identify the level of Instructional Leadership practices among principals of the National Religious Secondary School in Malaysia. A total of 365 respondents from 57 National Religious Secondary Schools were selected by systematic random sampling method to answer the questionaires. Data is analyzed by using descriptive statistics identifying the mean, standard deviation and percentage to recognise the level. The result showed that the level of Instructional Leadership practices is significantly high (mean=3.85, s.d.=0.41).   In conclusion, the study found that the level of Instructional Leadership Practices is high among the principals of the schools. The research implied that Instructional Leadership plays an important role and should be adopted by the principals and teachers of National Religious Secondary School to increase School Achievement.

Keywords: Instructional Leadership, Principals, National Religious Secondary School, School Achievement

Introduction

With the advent of technology and the challenges face towards the 4th industrial revolution in the coming years, education seems to be the most important and vital element to be encompassed to prepare future generation to face it. Hence, this effort would definitely demand development of school leaders as it becomes one of the main agendas in the National Educational Transformation Plan. Infact, this requirement is emphasized clearly in the Malaysian Educational Blueprint 2013 – 2015. School leaders are requested to look and seek for new competencies in leadership skills to face the oncoming challenges in the current changing educational environment.

Literature studies show that there are many criteria and requirements for school leaders to become more effective. One of the requirements is the instructional approach that must be practiced by school leaders (Meyers & Hitt, 2018; Reynolds & Teddlie, 2000). While the other criteria that can be considered are i) requesting them to become more purposeful leaders, ii) involving and participating in school events and activities, iii) demanding more monitoring and helping in persisting staff achievement personally, and iv) becoming more proactive in selecting and replacing staff. Turhan (2010) also listed these criteria as standards to measure enhancement of leadership towards a more effective education leadership.

In Malaysia, the School Management Division, Ministry of Education (MOE) (2004) has outlined seven key areas that a school leader needs to master. The guidelines are still applicable until 2018. The areas are i) curriculum management, co-curriculum and Student Affairs, ii) school management which includes

administration, finance, services and posts, iii) provision of teaching and learning facilities, iv) relationship with parents and community, v) school advancement, vi) teaching, and vii) instructional leadership and educational research. In fact, Ayob (2005) lists the duties of principals and head of schools in nine fields, namely: i) organizational management and leadership, ii) curriculum, iii) student affairs, iv) co-curriculum, v) physical and facilities, vi) financial, vii) office management, viii) management and development of Human resource, and viii) networking and collaboration. The list outlined by Ayob (2005) is also consistent with the Malaysian School Quality of Competency Standards (MSQCS) proposed by the Aminuddin Baki Institute (IAB) in 2006 which also outlines nine roles and responsibilities in administrating and managing a school.

In short, the role of principals and teachers as Instructional Leaders is still important to mould students and to produce the expected human capital. In fact, it is a need for school leaders to prioritize Instructional Leadership practices besides committing themselves to other various administrative responsibilities (Al Mahadi, Emam & Hallinger, 2018; Harris et.al, 2017; Gunawan, 2017; Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, 2002).

As mentioned earlier, the need to focus on Instructional Leadership is also clearly emphasized in the Executive Summary of E-10, Malaysia's Education Development Plan, MEDP (2013) which explains the impact of educational transformation challenges faced by school leaders, whereby school leaders will become outstanding Instructional Leaders who will receive access to international leadership training (PPPM, 2013). Therefore, MEDP has also taken the necessary actions to reduce administrative burden so that school leaders could focus more on Instructional Leadership. This enhancement efforts encourage the need to stress on the effectiveness of Instructional Leadership practices set out in the Education Development Master Plan (Jabatan Perdana Menteri, 2010; KPM, 2007).

Problem Statement
The role of Instructional Leadership in school needs to be emphasized so that the Transformation of Education can be realized. This intention is stated clearly in the fifth Shift of the Transformation System in Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025. It is also highlighted that the new career package for Principals and Teachers since 2013 will be provided with more support, flexible operational practices to improve school, curriculum and co-curriculum, as well as greater accountability to increase student's achievement. Despite these suggested efforts, it seems that the outcome of Instructional Leadership among school leaders who have been trained, turn out to apply the theories of Instructional Leadership separately or at mininum level.

Nevertheless, it is very important to make sure that the education sector is not being left out on current issues pertaining to the country's education policies and vision that is being influenced by changes in the new century (Dameron & Durand, 2017; Cornu, 2016; Tajul Arifin & Noraini, 2002; Abd Rahim, 2000). Hence the issues on choosing and prioritizing the right type of leadership in education at the right time need to be considered seriously. Furthermore, it is known that effective schools will definitely emphasize and focus more on the concept of principals as Instructional Leaders to create an effective school climate that will certainly leads to increment of school achievement (Pretorius & Villiers, 2009).

Instructional Leadership
There are many studies that have been carried out to determine the impact of leadership on school achievement. Previous researchers have listed some of these leadership as Instructional, Transformational, Transactional, Distributive, Shared Leadership and recently Spiritual Leadership. Nevertheless, there are many aspects such as strategic, teachers and collaborative efforts that have been studied (Hallinger, 2011) which relates to Instructional Leadership. Besides that, Instructional Leadership was found to have the greatest impact on students learning. It was also found that Instructional leadership is one of the main dimension that contributes towards school achievement (Hallinger, 2013). The concept and definition of Instructional Leadership was widely and extensively studied in the 1980s and 1990s (Hallinger, 2000, 2003). And the basis of this concept is highly related to the implementation of changes and school improvement of effective schools (Hallinger, 2003; Hallinger, et al., 1994). These findings imply that Instructional Leadership remains highly as the key factor in effective schools (Hallinger, 2011).

Instructional leadership was proposed by Phillip Hallinger (2000) through large-scale studies throughout the world. Hallinger and Murphy"s Model (1985) was utilized in this study due to its three-dimensional model. The model states that Instructional Leadership has three important leadership dimensions i.e. defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and creating a learning climate within the school. Ten functions or elements of instructional leadership that exist within this model are formulating the goals of the school, presenting the goals of the school, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, controlling the time of teaching, maintaining visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning. The definition of instructional leadership has since been further defined as a process of influence in which the principal identifies the direction of the school, motivates staff, and coordinates strategies for the school and classroom with the aim of improving teaching and learning processes (Hallingerand Murphy, 2012). Instructional leadership can also be thought of as a long and dynamic process aimed at achieving excellence in teaching and learning (Weber, 1989).

Whilst, according to Murphy (1990), Instructional Leadership model consists of four dimensions and 16 elements, the first dimension is to form a mission and goal. This domain consists of two elements, i.e. i) devising school goals, and ii) delivering school goals. The second dimension is to manage education which includes elements such as i) promoting quality teaching, ii) supervising and evaluating learning, iii) allocating and protecting teaching hours, iv) coordinating the curriculum, and v) monitoring student progress. The third dimension is promoting the academic learning climate with elements such as i) forming positive standards and expectations, ii) maintaining high visibility, iii) providing incentives for teachers and students, and iv) promoting professional development. The fourth dimension is to form a friendly and mutually helpful school environment which consists of elements such as i) creating a safe and orderly learning environment, ii) providing meaningful student engagement opportunities, iii) fostering collaboration and cohesion among staff, iv) getting external resources to support school goals, and v) establishing relationships between parents and schools.

As mentioned earlier, the theoretical framework that was developed for this study was based on the combination of Instructional Leadership proposed by Hallinger (2000) and Murphy (1990). This Instructional Leadership model has been used extensively in previous studies on education leadership (Azeez, Ibrahim, & Mustapa, 2017; Tanama, Bafadal, & Degeng, 2017; Othman & Nor, 2017; Maulod, 2017; Usman, 2015; James & Balasandra, 2009, Stebick, 2009; Fulton, 2009; Lim Siew Phay, 2009; Ho Yip Lean, 2008; Robinson, 2008; Sazali et.al., 2007; Latip, 2006; Mielcarek, 2003). It has also been proven that this Instructional Leadership model by Halinger (2000) and Murphy (1990) is still relevant for the 21st century despite the development of other new leadership models. It also proves that the Halinger and Murphy model has successfully incorporated most of the relevant elements of the instructional leadership.

Despite the fact that Instructional Leadership is widely acceptable in many researches, literature study found that there are still some related issues arise on the model which needs further investigation and studies. Among them are matters related to the diverse definition of Instructional Leadership itself.

Since 1970s until 2000s, there are various definitions of theories and models derived from Instructional Leadership. Instructional leadership is defined as a specific guide in relation to the role of a teaching leader (Flath, 1980). Instructional leadership is also defined in general as actions taken by a principal or authority to enhance student learning progress (Debevoise, 1984). Besides that, Instructional Leadership is also expressed as a leadership that must lead to the achievement of the lessons taught and making sure that the quality of instructional as a top priority. Instructional Leadership is also defined as leaders' capability in making the school vision a reality (Richardson, 1989).

In addition to these definitions, Instructional Leadership is also refered as efforts taken by school leaders to provide curriculum innovation and to develop teaching and learning processes for the purpose of achieving school goals (Hussein, 1989). The definition is further supported by a statement that says that instructional leadership is a combination of supervision of staff development and curriculum development (Blasé, 1998).

There are also views by scholars who take into account five main dimensions besides the definition given by Hallinger and Murphy. The five dimensions are i) interpreting and communicating school goals, ii)

managing curriculum and teaching, iii) cultivating a positive learning environment, iv) observing and responding to teachers, and v) evaluating teaching programs (Weber, 1997; Krug, 1992). Even though there are many various elements incorporated in the theory, instructional leadership has been viewed wholly as the role of school leaders operating in an open system that involve not only the community, but also the institutional and social system (Hallinger, 2011). In addition, the main functions in instructional leadership are actions and activities implemented by a leader with the intention of improving and strengthening the pedagogical process of teaching and learning at school (James & Balasandra, 2009).

The definition of Instructional leadership in the 2000s has also included the element of ICT in the model pioneered by Hallinger and Murphy in 1985. This recent definition focuses more on the IT elements as compared to the previous definition before the millennium (Lashway, 2002). Whereby, teaching leadership is defined not only as setting school goals, providing resources for learning, managing curriculum, controlling lesson plans and evaluating teachers, but also the application of latest technology in their instructional leadership behaviours. Respectively, a new instructional leadership model incorporating ICT elements into the new instructional leadership definition was proposed (Yusri & Aziz, 2013).

Hence, most of the definition of instructional leadership is based on the element of behavior or act of principals aimed at improving teaching and learning (TnL) practices besides improving teacher teaching competencies to increase academic achievement.

Despite of the many versions of definition of Instructional leadership, the most popular model and theory that are refered to in many researches is still the Instructional Leadership definition pioneered by Hallinger and Murphy (1985). And once again, this research is based basically on the model. As mentioned earlier the theory comprises three main dimensions: i.e. a) determining school goals, b) managing teaching programs, and c) creating learning climate to improve effective teaching and learning at school (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

The purpose of study
The aim of this study is to determine the level of instructional leadership being practiced by Principals of National Religious Secondary School. The variety of definitions and model of Instructional leadership will give inputs and widen views from various aspects, angles and elements which can be focused and detailed. Therefore, focus on the elements in leadership can also further be explored.

For this purpose, the following research questions have been formed:

RQ1: What is the level of Instructional Leadership practices among Principals of National Religious Secondary School?

RQ2: What is the highest element in Instructional Leadership that is being practised?

RQ3: What is the lowest element in Instructional Leadership that is being practised?

This study may serve as a guideline to the National Religious Secondary School in Malayisa to realize the need for a strong Instructional Leadership practice. This is important to promote a better learning approaches and environment to increase school achievement.

Methodology
The methodology used in this research is the quantitative method which is very consistent with and feasible in addressing educational phenomena. The method is applicable to describe the phenomenon through data collection that will be analyzed Mathematically or Statistically (Yusuf, 2016; Aliaga and Gundeson, 2000). The total of 365 respondents from 57 National Religious Secondary School throughout the whole country is enough to represent the population. The choice of sampling method is relevant as the characters of respondents are homogenous throughout to the study. By refering to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the proposed sampel size is 340 for a population of 3838. Sample selection was done through a simple systematic sampling method. Thus, by placing the sample size between 346 people (N = 3500, margin error = 5.0%) up to 641 people (N = 3500, margin error = 3.5%) for this study is sufficient by assuming that other indexes will be used for assess in the overall study (Chua, 2009; Kline, 2005; Byrne, 2001; Kaplan, 2000; Kelloway, 1998).

Statistical Analysis

Data was analysed using descriptive statistic to describe the research problem comprehensively. It is important to see the level of the elements of Instructional Leadership in this study. The descriptive statistic measures the percentage of frequency, mean, median and standard deviation to see the three-dimensional position contained in the Instructional Leadership Practice. It will also show the dimension and elements of Instructional Leadership practiced by principals at the administration and management level of the school.

Table 1 describes the characteristics of the respondents' demography factors such as gender, teaching experience, occupation grade, highest academic qualification and subjects taught in school

Table 1 Demographics

Demography factors	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative value
Gender	Male	113	31.0	31.0
	Female	252	69.0	100.0
	Total	365		
Teaching experience	Less than 5 years	76	20.8	20.8
	5 – 9 years	73	20.0	40.8
	10 – 15 years	71	19.5	60.3
	More than 15 years	145	39.7	100.0
	Total	365		
Occupation Grade	DG 41	144	39.5	39.5
	DG 44	134	36.7	76.2
	DG 48	82	22.5	98.6
	DG 52	3	0.8	99.5
	DG 54	2	0.5	100.0
	Total	365		
Highest academic qualification	Degree	323	88.5	88.5
	Master	40	11.0	99.5
	Philosophical Doctorate (PhD)	2	0.5	100.0
	Total	365		
Ever attended any courses on HOTS	Yes	274	75.1	75.1
	No	91	24.9	100.0
	Total	365		
Subjects taught in school (Department)	Languages	102	27.9	27.9
	Science and Mathematics	83	22.7	50.7
	Social Sciences	82	22.5	73.2
	Vocational and Technical studies	44	12.1	85.2
	Islamic Education	54	14.8	100.0
	Total	365		

Table 2 shows the mean, standard deviation and level of practices for all the ten elements in Instructional Leadership model practiced by Principals of National Religious Secondary School.

Table 2 Mean dan standard deviaton of dimension/elements in Instructional Leadership

CD	Dimension/Elements	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
A	Defining the school mission	365	3.42	0.343	High
A1	Frames the school's goal	365	3.16	0.469	Moderate
A2	Communicate the school goals	365	3.69	0.402	High
B	Managing the instructional programs	365	3.97	0.509	High
B1	Supervises and evaluate instructions	365	3.94	0.557	High
B2	Coordinates the curriculum	365	3.99	0.551	High
B2	Monitor students progress	365	3.98	0.567	High
C	Developing the school learning climate program	365	3.92	0.512	High
C1	Protects instructional times	365	3.94	0.609	High
C2	Maintains high visibility	365	3.78	0.660	High
C3	Provides incentives for teachers	365	3.86	0.635	High
C4	Promotes professional development	365	4.06	0.536	High
C5	Provides incentives for learning	365	3.95	0.623	High
	Overall Mean		3.85	0.410	High

Max. mean=4.06(C4), Min. mean=3.16 (A1), Overall mean=3.85

Results

According to the Likert scale of the five choices used in the study, the Principal Instructional Leadership practices can be divided into three levels basically 1.00 - 2.33 (low), 2.34 - 3.66 (moderate) and 3.67 - 5.00 (high).

Based on Table 2 above, it is found that the Instructional Leadership practices among the Principals of National Religious Secondary School is high (mean=3.85, s.d.=0.410). The element with the highest mean is for Promoting Professional Development (mean=4.06. s.d.=0.536) which indicates that the level is high. The element that has the lowest mean is Framing the School's Goal (mean=3.16, s.d.=0.469) which shows that the level for the element is moderately practiced by the principals.

It can be concluded that the level of Instructional Leadership Practice practised by the Principal of the National Religious Secondary School in Malaysia is high.

Discussion and Conclusion.
The finding concludes that the level of Instructional Leadership practiced by principals of NRSS thoughout Malaysia is high. The detailed findings showed that the principals have practiced all the 10 Instructional Leadership elements listed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), namely i) framings the school's goal, ii) communicating the school goals, iii) supervising and evaluating instructions, iv) coordinating the curriculum, vi) protecting instructional times, vii) maintaining high visibility, viii) providing incentives for teachers, ix) promoting professional development and x) providing incentives for learning. Hence it confirmed to what was asserted by Hallinger and Murphy that educational leaders should practice all the ten elements to gauge their skills and knowledge on the Instructional leadership.

This finding is similar to another finding derived by Shazwaathirah (2014), which also shows that the Instructional Leadership is practiced at a high level. The finding is also equivalent with the mean of Instructional Leadership practices among six principals in secondary schools at Sentul, Kuala Lumpur (mean=3.96, s.d.=e0.607) conducted by her. Similarly, this finding is supported with the findings of a study conducted by Mohd Zaini (2009) for low-performing schools (mean=3.75, s.d.=0.646). This result is also

consistent with the findings by other researches which showed that the level for Instructional Leadership Practices among the principal is high (mean=4.07, s.d.=0.53). in fact, practices of Instructional Leadership among principals in Technical and Vocational Secondary School in Pahang, Malaysia is found to be at a very high level (mean=4.43, s.d.=0.305) (Nik Mustapha, 2014; Yusri, 2014; Jamelaa, 2012).

The result of this study is also similar to the findings of a study conducted among principals in Tanzania whereby 58.2% (n = 113) of respondents acknowledge the fact that they practised all the ten elements in the Instructional Leadership model proposed by Hallinger and Murphy (Aysha, 2015).

Besides that, this finding is also supported by many other studies that also showed the level of Instructional Leadership that is practised by head of schools for all the elements in the model is high (Jamelaa & Jainabee, 2011; Packard, 2011; Peariso, 2011; Jita, 2010; Graczewski, Knudson & Holtzman, 2009; Stiggins & Duke, 2008; Latip, 2007; Andi Auryanah, 2007; DiPaola & Tschannen, 2005; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlsttom, 2004). Consequently, the same result is also obtained from a study conducted by Zakaria, 2016, which found that the head of school of six Low Enrolment School have also performed and exhibited the elements of Instructional Leadership in the model proposed by Hallinger and Murphy in 1985 in their leadership (Zakaria, 2016).

Further detail of this study shows that the elements of Framing the School's Goal has the lowest mean of 3.16. This shows that the level of Principal practicing the element is moderate. This element is essentially important to the NRSS Principal because an effective education leader needs to have high ability and capability to direct the school towards achieving the school vision (Bakar, Ramli & Fooi, 2015). This element is also vital to motivate teachers and communities as it acts as a catalyst for the stakeholders to achieve the stated school goals (Suhadi, Mujahidin, Bahrudin, & Tafsir, 2014; Abdul Ahmad, & Hashim, 2004). Studies showed that the principals' capabilities and abilities in this element need to be emphasized as it is found that principals allocate only 30% of their working hours for duties and meetings which involve curriculum and teaching whilst the other 70% is on attending and engaging themselves in other related tasks and obligation (TALIS, 2013).

Nevertheless, there are other findings that show that this element is less practised by the NRSS principal when it is actually an important aspect that can affect the school achievement. Priority should be given to this element because the school goals, individual goals, team goals will be able to hold and bind the spirit of working together and it is this spirit that continue to create success as well as improving school achievements (Center for Collaborative Education, 2003).

In many cases, the element of Framing the School's Goal is designed basically on data of student achievement (Sugiono, & Kurrohman, 2015). In addition, teacher's responsibility is also found to be taken into consideration too. Thus, the combination of those factors together with the analysed performance data will eventually strengthen the action towards achieving the goals of the school (Mohd Nor Jaafar, 2004). This statement was further proven with a finding that showed that 99.5% of principals in Malaysia were found using data of student achievement (national or international level) when determine goals and planning the school development programs (TALIS, 2013).

Respectively, it is a responsibility to most principals to make sure that they have the ability to frame the school goals so that they can accomplish the school goals accordingly. Hence the level of competency for this element must also be high so that principals can make sure that school goals is attainable. This is especially important for them as continuous practice in the process of framing the school goals will definitely increase their leadership competency especially in upgrading their data driven skills when developing their school goals. In Malaysia, school achievement which is defined as the school Average Grade Point is contributed by 70% of the school academic achievement. (SKPM 2010). So, the skills among principals in developing data-based school goals are factors that can give great impact on the achievement of a school (Ishak, Ghani, & Siraj, 2017).

Hence, it is important for NRSS principals in Malaysia to improve their skills when framing the school goals since this element is the foundation and essentially needed for planning and building vision for the school.

On the contrary, it is also found that this finding is contradicting to the findings of other studies that resulted to the highest mean of this element practised among heads of schools (Koh & Yusof, 2016). Studies showed that the head of school for the Chinese Primary School in Malaysia which is also known as SJKC, takes steps to ensure the achievement of students as a prerequisite in determining their school goals (TALIS, 2013). The actions taken by the SJKC leadership are proportionate to the concept of an effective school that distinguish the teaching focus and usage of systematic assessment (Othman, & Nor, 2017; Edmonds, 1979). Therefore, the NRSS principal should also improve their practices in this element as it has impact on the effectiveness and achievement of school.

This element on 'framing the schools' goal' is also taken into account by the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) when defining the concept of effective schools in the Standard Quality of Education in Malaysia (SQEM 2010). It is known that an effective school should be able to pursuit excellence and success in education (Yaakob, 1998). In order to ensure the mission, it is therefore very important for principal to give their attention and focus on this element as instructional leader. Moreover, literature studies show that the form of strategic curriculum planning by a Principal or Headmaster is a major factor that has brought up changes in the effectiveness of a school (Ibrahim, & Chua, 2017; Sammons, Hilman & Mortimore, 1995).

In summary, NRSS principals in Malaysia have to focus more on the element of formulating school goals. Their skills in formulating school goals are necessary to enhance effectiveness in the school improvement process and to be able to deal with any challenging changes that can impede the success of the school (Abas, & Baba, 2018; Ramli, 2002). At the same time, this effort will definitely shift the school towards being an effective school.

In comparison to the lowest mean of the element of framing the school goals practiced by the NRSS Principal, the mean of Promoting Professional Development was at the highest level (4.06) in this study.

This finding is likely to be associated with the efforts on developing the capacity of Civil Servants, since 2009 which was introduced through the Human Resource Training Policy. All civil servants are requested to attend any courses for at least seven days a year. The policy stated that 1% of the emolument is allocated for training purposes. In addition, the 'Continuous Professional Development Plan' emphasizing 'Professional Learning Community' (PLC) and 'Continuous Professional Development' (CPD) for educators has also been recommended by the MOE (KPM, 2014).

The continuous efforts and programs by Ministry of Education, State Educational Office and District Educational Office, which are increasingly initiated towards the improvement of teachers' professionalism and to provide teachers with the 21st century education can also become one of the contributing factors towards this finding (Noor Hasimah Hashim & Mohd Amir Shauki Ahmad, 2012). Those programs which included courses on ICT such as the application of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLEFROG) in the 1BESTARI project had also inculcated the elements of HOTS to fulfil the aspirations in MBP 2013-2025. This program has been initiated by Educational Technology Division of MOE for teachers in schools since 2013 (Halili, Rahman, & Razak, 2018).

The findings of this study were supported with recommendations from other studies to continuously improve the skills and increase the knowledge of teachers (Horng & Loeh, 2010; Glanz 2006; Balse & Blase, 2000). This is further supported by the fact that 98% of principals in Malaysia are taking tremendous cooperation with teachers to develop new teaching approaches in the classroom (TALIS, 2013).

It is also interesting to compare this finding with the finding of a comparative study carried out by Jamila Sebran in 2016. The findings of the comparative study which was conducted among seven types of schools found that the element of "promoting professional development" was the lowest practiced by the principals of NRSS as compared to other principals of other schools (Sharifah Jamila Sebran et al., 2016). As such, it is important for the NRSS Principal to ensure that the rate of increase in "promoting professional development" is at least at par with the other types of schools. This effort is important as other studies have suggested that it is important to emphasize on the continuous development of teachers' knowledge and skills, to improve the achievement of a school so that they are comparatively progressing with other schools (Horng & Loeh, 2010; Glanz 2006; Balse & Blase, 2000).

Eventhough there are differences between the level of Instructional Leadership practices among the Principals and Headmaster (PGB) in some studies, it is found that the differences in those studies are due to the populations and selected research samples. Besides, it could also be associated to demographic factors such as gender, school-grade differences, types of school etc. It is recommended for future researchers to look into the matter in detail when conducting studies on the level of Instructional Leadership practiced.

To suggest, comparative studies can also be done among principals or head of schools of different types of schools. In addition, a meta-analysis study is proposed so that research can show us the trends of the Instructional Leadership Practice level among them.

Further research can also be done to find out how teachers and middle leaders can and have contributed to the level of the instructional leadership practice by their school principals. Literature reviews stated that middle leadership will make teachers more productive when they interact among themselves. This can help principals improve their professional skills as instructional leaders (Printy & Marks, 2010). There are also findings that say that principals were found only to give support on providing resources in the TnL program which have been planned by the middle leaders. This leadership concept has brought a new dimension in the Instructional leadership approach (Printy & Marks, 2010, Murphy, 2002).

Infact, some other findings also showed that subordinate staff will give better concern to middle-leaders after they had returned from training programs. For middle leaders who do not attend any training program, their popularity among the subordinate is found to remain the same infact for some it was decreasing. Thus, the results of the study have convinced many organizations as they began to take action developing and upskilling their middle leaders' competencies to any organised program. That effort has proven to earn good feedback to the organisation (Black, 2017).

Another important point that need to be considered is the statement that says that principals should not hand over their responsibility managing the curicullum to the School Senior Assistant (Mohamad Yusof, 2005). It is suggested that they should instead be able to share their instructional leadership knowledge and skills with their school middle leaders (Printy & Marks, 2010). Hence, this implies that NRSS principal needs to improve and intensify the knowledge and skills of their instructional leadership so that they can correctly align school goals to the school staff especially to the school middle leaders. It is then that the responsibility of the middle leaders to comprehend and detail the implementation of those strategies in the school. With the skills and knowledge acquired by the middle leaders, instructional leadership is shared among them. Hopefully they are able to think strategically with better created initiatives. Thus, the organization can progress effectively together. Teachers are motivated with good team buliding spirit, and supporting staff at the school will be highly emotionally bonded.

In summary, this study confirmed that instructional leadership is practised by principal of NRSS in Malaysia at a high level. This finding is in line with the literature reviews and findings of many previous studies carried out locally and internationally.

References

[1] Abas, I., & Baba, S. (2018). School Principal's Leadership Styles and Teacher's Commitment Level of a School in Pahang. Pemimpin (The Leader), 3, 16-30

[2] Abdul Rahim Abdul Rashid. (2000). Wawasan dan Agenda Pendidikan. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications & Distribution Sdn.Bhd: Kuala Lumpur

[3] Abdul Ahmad, J., & Hashim, A. B. (2004). Kepimpinan Pengajaran Pengetua/guru Besar Dan Kepuasan Guru (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia)

[4] Al-Mahdy, Y. F. H., Emam, M. M., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Assessing the contribution of principal instructional leadership and collective teacher efficacy to teacher commitment in Oman. Teaching and Teacher Education, 69, 191-201

[5] Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2000). Interactive Statistics. Saddle River, m.s. 3-15.

[6] Ayob, J. (2005). Pengetua Sekolah yang Efektif. PTS Professional Publishing Sdn Bhd: Kuala Lumpur.

[7]   Aysha Saeed Rashed, (2011). "Features of Effective Educational Leadership from the Perspectives of Teachers." . Theses. 154. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.uaeu.ac.ae/all_theses/154 Aysha, 2015).

[8]   Azeez, M. I. K., Ibrahim, M. S., & Mustapa, R. (2017). Kompetensi Kepemimpinan Instruksional Di Kalangan Pengetua Sekolah Satu Kajian Empirikal Di Negeri Selangor. JuPiDi: Jurnal Kepimpinan Pendidikan, 2(3), 1-14.

[9]   Bakar, N. A., & Ramli Basri & Fooi, F. S. (2015). Hubungan kepimpinan Guru dengan pencapaian akademik pelajar. International Journal of Education and Training, 1(2), 1-11

[10]   Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective Instructional Leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 38(2), m.s. 130-141.

[11]   Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1998). Handbook of Instructional Leadership: How Really Good Principals Promote Teaching and Learning, Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press.

[12]   Byrne, M. M. (2001b). Evaluating the findings of qualitative research. AORN Journal, 73(3), m.s. 703-706

[13]   Chua Yan Piaw. (2009). Statistik Penyelidikan Lanjutan: Ujian regresi, analisis faktor dan analisis SEM. McGraw Hill, Kuala Lumpur

[14]   Cornu, B. (2016). Teachers and teacher education facing. Information Technology: Supporting change through teacher education, 319.

[15]   Dameron, S., & Durand, T. (Eds.). (2017). The Future of Management Education: Volume 1: Challenges Facing Business Schools Around the World. Springer.

[16]   DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as Instructional Leader. Educational Leadership, 41(5), m.s.14-20

[17]   DiPaola, M. F. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship Behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. Journal of School Leadership, 11, m.s. 424-447

[18]   Edmonds, R., (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, m.s. 15-27.

[19]   Flath, B., (1989). The principal as instructional leader. ATA Magazines, 69(3), m.s.19-22, m.s. 47-49.

[20]   Fulton, (2008/2009). Faculty Perceptions of Shared Decision Making and the Principal's Leadership Behaviors in Secondary Schools in a Large Urban District Leech, Don; Fulton, Charles Ray Education, v128 n4 m.s. 630-644 Sum 2008.

[21]   Glanz, J. (2006). What every principal should know about strategic leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

[22]   Graczewski, C., Knudson, J., Holtzman, D. J. (2009). Instructional Leadership in Practice: What Does It Look Like, and What Influence Does It Have? Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, v14 n1 m.s. 72-96.

[23]   Gunawan, I. (2017). Instructional Leadership Profile of Junior High School's Principal (A Case Study of Junior High School in Malang). International Research Based Education Journal, 1(1).

[24]   Halili, S. H., Rahman, N. H. A., & Razak, R. A. (2018). Traditional versus virtual learning: How engaged are the students in learning English literature?. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8(1)

[25]   Hallinger, P & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behaviors of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86, (2), 217-247

[26]   Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (2012). Running on empty? Finding the time and capacity to lead learning. NASSP Bulletin, 97, 5–21.

[27]   Hallinger, P. (2000). A review of two decades of research on the Principalship using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. http://www.leadingware.com [30 Disember 2009].

[28]   Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. Cambridge Journal of Education, 33, m.s. 329–351

[29]   Hallinger, P. (2011b). Leadership For Learning: Lessons From 40 Years Of Empirical Research. Journal of Educational Administration. 49 (2): m.s. 125-142.

[30]   Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. (1994). Exploring the impact of principal leadership. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5(3), 206–218.

[31] Harris, A., Jones, M., Cheah, K. S. L., Devadason, E., & Adams, D. (2017). Exploring principals' instructional leadership practices in Malaysia: insights and implications. Journal of Educational Administration, 55(2), 207-221.

[32] Ho Yip Leon. (2008). Kepimpinan Instruksional Dalam Penyeliaan Pengajaran Guru: Satu Perbandingan Antara Sekolah Kerajaan Dengan Sekolah Swasta. Universiti Malaya. Tesis Doktor Falsafah.

[33] Horng, E. & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. Kappan, 92(3), m.s. 66-69.

[34] Hussein Mahmood. (1989). A Study of Principals Perception of their Competency Needs in Instructional Leadership. PhD thesis, University of Michigan

[35] Ibrahim, J., & Chua, Y. P. (2017). The influence of principals' leadership behaviours on work stress of secondary school teachers in Melaka. Pemimpin (The Leader), 5, 59-74

[36] Ishak, R. B., Ghani, M. F. B. A., & Siraj, S. (2017). Amalan Pembelajaran Dalam Kalangan Guru Sekolah Berprestasi Tinggi. JuKu: Jurnal Kurikulum & Pengajaran Asia Pasifik, 1(2), 52-60

[37] Jabatan Perdana Menteri. (2010). Program Transformasi Kerajaan: Pelan halatuju. Unit Pengurusan Prestasi dan Pelaksanaan. Putrajaya.

[38] Jamelaa, B. A. & Jainabee, M. K. (2011). Instructional Leadership and Attitude towards Organizational Change among Secondary Schools Principal in Pahang, Malaysia. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15(2011), m.s. 3304–3309.

[39] James, A.J.E. & Balasandran. R. (2009). Kepimpinan Instruksional: Satu Panduan Praktikal. PTS Professional. Kuala Lumpur.

[40] Jita, L. C. (2010). Instructional leadership for the improvement of science and mathematics in South Africa. Procodia–Social and Behavioral Sciences,(9)2, m.s. 851–854.

[41] Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P. (2000). The Strategy Focused Organisation: How Balanced Scorecard Companies Thrive in the New Business Environment. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

[42] Kelloway, E.K. (1998). Using LISREL for Structural Equation Modeling. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.

[43] Kline, R.B. (2005). Principles and practice of structural equation Modelling (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford.

[44] Samuel E. Krug, (1992), Instructional Leadership: A Constructivist Perspective, Education Administration Qurterly, vol.28, No. 3 First Published August 1, 1992 Krug, 1992).

[45] Lashway, L. (2002, July). Developing instructional leaders. ERIC Digest 160.

[46] Latip, Muhammad, (2006). Pelaksanaan kepemimpinan pengajaran di kalangan pengetua sekolah di Negeri Selangor Darul Ehsan. Tesis Doktor Falsafah, Fakulti Pendidikan, Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

[47] Latip Muhammad. (2007). Pelaksanaan Kepemimpinan Pengajaran di Kalangan Pengetua Sekolah, Seminar Penyelidikan Pendidikan, Institut Perguruan Batu Lintang Tahun 2007. http//www/mpbl.edu.my/inter/penyelidik: April2013.

[48] Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. (Review of research). The Wallace Foundation, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 87 pages. Retrieved from http://www. wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/HowLeadership-Influences-Student-Learning.aspx.

[49] Lim Siew Phay, (2009), Kepimpinan pengajaran guru besar di beberapa buah sekolah di Segamat, Johor, dissertasi (M.Ed. Mgt) Jabatan Pengurusan, Perancangan dan Dasar Pendidikan, Fakulti Pendidikan, Universiti Malaya.

[50] Maulod, Shafinaz, (2017). Hubungan antara kecerdasan emosi dan kepimpinan instruksional pengetua dengan efikasi kendiri guru sekolah menengah kebangsaan di Negeri Sembilan / Shafinaz A. Maulod. PhD thesis, University of Malaya

[51] Meyers, C. V., & Hitt, D. H. (2018). Planning for school turnaround in the United States: an analysis of the quality of principal-developed quick wins. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 1-21.

[52] Mielcarek, J. M. A. (2003). A Model of School Success: Instructional Leadership, Academic Press and Student Achievement. Thesis of Doctor Philisophy. The Ohio State University.

[53]   Yusoff, N. M., & Osman, R. (2010). Hubungan Kualiti Penyeliaan Pengajaran Dan Pembelajaran Di Bilik Darjah Dengan Efikasi Guru. Journal of Educators & Education/Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan, 25.Yusof, 2005) (

[54]   Mohd Nor Jaafar. (2004). Kepimpinan pengajaran Guru Besar, Komitmen dan kepuasan Kerja Guru: Satu Kajian Perbandingan dan Hubungan antara Sekolah Kurang Berkesan. Universiti Sains Malaysia.

[55]   Murphy, J. (1990). Principal Instructional Leadership: Changing Perspective on the School. Advances in Educational Administration Journal. 1: m.s. 163–200.

[56]   Murphy, G. L. (2002). The big book of concepts. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[57]   Noor Hashimah & Amir Shaukhi. (2012). Gaya Kepimpinan Pengetua Dalam Menjayakan Pendidikan Abad Ke-21. Seminar Nasional Pengurusan dan Kepimpinan Pendidikan Ke-20: Institut Aminuddin Baki.

[58]   Othman, A. B., & Nor, M. Y. M. (2017). Amalan Kepimpinan Instruksional Guru Besar Dan Hubungannya Terhadap Komitmen Kerja Guru Sekolah Kurang Murid Di Zon Sibuti Daerah Subis. In Prosiding Seminar Kebangsaan Majlis Dekan Pendidikan Universiti Awam 2017 (p. 126).

[59]   Packard, D. (2011). School Size and Instructional Leadership of Elementary School Principals. ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

[60]   Peariso, J. F. (2011). A Study of principals' ınstructional leadership behaviors and beliefs of good pedagogical practice among effective California high schools serving socioeconomically disadvantaged and English Learners, A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment Of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Education, Liberty University

[61]   Pretorius & Villiers, (2009). A Changing Leadership Paradigm: South African Educators' Perceptions of the Dimensions of a Healthy School Culture for Teacher Leadership J Soc Sci, 32(2): 205-219 (2012)

[62]   Printy, S. M., (2010), Principals influences on Instructional Quality: Insights from US Schools Leadership and Management 30 (2).

[63]   Reynolds, D. & Teddlie, C. (2001). Reflections on the critics, and beyond them. School Effectiveness & School Improvement. 12, m.s. 99-114

[64]   Richardson, R, (1989). Developing friendship skills: Key to positive mainstreaming. Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 27(4), m.s. 138-151.

[65]   Viviane M. J. Robinson, Claire A. Lloyd, & Kenneth J. Rowe (2008). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types, Research Article.

[66]   Sammons, P., Hillman, J. &Mortimore, P. (1995). Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: a Review of School Effectiveness Research. Report by the Institute of Education, University of London, for the Office for Standards in Education

[67]   Sazali Yusoff, Rusmini Ku Ahmad, Abang Hut Abang Engkeh & Zamri Abu Bakar. (2007). Perkaitan antara Kepimpinan Instruksional terhadap sekolah berkesan. Jurnal Pengurusan dan Kepimpinan Pendidikan. Institut Aminuddin Baki. 17 (2): m.s. 105-117.

[68]   Sharifah Jamila Sebran et al. (2016). Program Transformasi Guru Pembina Negara Bangsa Siri 1 Peringkat Negeri Terengganu pada 26 - 28 Ogos 2016 di KBN Besut, Terengganu

[69]   Standard   Kualiti   Pendidikan   Malaysia   (2010).retieved   from https://www.moe.gov.my/...pendidikan/standard-kualiti-pendidikan.

[70]   Stebick, (2009). Comprehension Strategies for Your K-6 Literacy Classroom: Thinking Before , CORWIN PRESS

[71]   Stiggins & Duke. (2008), Effective Instructional Leadership Requires Assessment Leadership, Dan Phi Delta Kappan, v90 n4 p285-291 Dec 2008

[72]   Sugiono, R. K. A., & Kurrohman, T. (2015). Pengaruh Ketepatan Dana, Kecukupan Dana dan Sasaran Penggunaan Dana Bantuan Operasional Sekolah Terhadap Peningkatan Prestasi Belajar Siswa Di Kabupaten Jember. e-Journal Ekonomi Bisnis dan Akuntansi, 2(1), 23-28

[73]   Suhadi, E., Mujahidin, E., Bahrudin, E., & Tafsir, A. (2014). Pengembangan Motivasi dan Kompetensi Guru dalam Peningkatan Mutu Pembelajaran di Madrasah. TA'DIBUNA, 3(1), 42-60

[74]   Tajul Arifin Noordin & Noraini Ahmad. (2002). Penyelidikan Dan Pembangunan Manusia. Bandar Baru Bangi: As Syabab Media.

[75]   The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) - 2013 Results retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/education/school/talis-2013-results.htm

[76]   Tanama, Y. J., Bafadal, I., & Degeng, N. S. (2017). Pentingnya Kepemimpinan Pembelajaran Di Sekolah. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional Mahasiswa Kerjasama Direktorat Jenderal Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan Kemendikbud 2016.

[77]   Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, (2002), School Leadership in an Era of Accountability. Richmond, VA: Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute. p. 10. Retrieved September 1, 2007 from: http://www.cepionline.org/backupsite-11-01   06/Publications/SAELP/SAEL-

[78]   Turhan, M. (2010). Social justice leadership: implications for roles and responsibilities of school administrators. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9, 1357-1361.

[79]   Usman, H. (2015). Model kepemimpinan instruksional kepala sekolah. Cakrawala Pendidikan, (3).

[80]   Weber, J., (1989). "Leading the Instructional Program." In School Leadership: Handbook For Excellence, 2nd Edition, edited by Stuart C. Smith and Philip K. Piele. 191-224. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1989. ED 309 504

[81]   Weber, J. R., (1987).

[82]   Instructional Leadership: A Composite working Model Synthesis of the literature, ERIC Clearing house on Educational Management, University of Oregon. Ed 287211,

[83]   Mohd Yusri, I., & Wan Abdul Aziz, W. M. A. (2013). Membangunkan model modifikasi kepimpinan pengajaranpPengetua. Trend of Busines and Social, 2, 94–109.

[84]   Zakaria , Othman (2016) Kepimpinan instruksional guru besar di sekolah kurang murid. PhD thesis, University of Malaya.