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ABSTRACT

Title: “RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHERS’ JOB PERFORMANCE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE PROVINCE OF KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN”.

Researcher: Zafar Khan

Supervisor: Dr. Umar Ali Khan

University: Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan, KPK, Pakistan

Year: 2012

Subject Area: Education

Degree: PhD

This study aimed at exploring teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership of secondary school heads and relationship of these perceptions with their performance on the job at secondary school level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan). The population of study consisted of 4488 teachers working in secondary schools during academic year 2009-10. Six hundred and fifty secondary school teachers were selected by using stratified random sampling technique, 493 (309 male and 184 female) teachers from 14 districts of the province responded with a response rate of 76%. Two instruments were used to collect the data: Instructional leadership questionnaire (ILQ) and teacher job performance scale (TJPS). ILQ was developed by the researcher and reliability of ILQ was measured by using Cronbach alpha coefficient, resulting in 0.87 for formulating educational objectives, 0.85 for developing learning environment, 0.83 for protecting instructional time, 0.87 for supervising and monitoring the progress, 0.88 for promoting professional development, and 0.96 for the whole questionnaire. Teacher Job Performance Scale (TJPS), developed by Hanif (2004) was adapted for this study. Mean, Standard
deviation, $t$-test, Correlation and regression were the statistical techniques used for the analysis of data. The results showed that teachers perceived instructional leadership of their school heads at moderate level in four functions, except for the function of providing learning environment that was perceived by teachers at higher level. Gender wise results showed that female secondary school heads were perceived better instructional leaders than their male counterparts in formulating educational objectives, providing learning environment, supervising and monitoring the progress, but in the functions of protecting instructional time and promoting professional development both are at the same level. No statistical significant difference was found in the teachers’ perception about instructional leadership of secondary school heads in rural and urban areas. A positive and statistical significant correlation at moderate level was found between Teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership with their job performance. There were 16 out of 20 pairs showed positive correlations between Perceived instructional leadership measures and teachers’ job performance at .05 levels of significance. Positive impact of perceived instructional leadership was found on teacher job performance. According to teachers’ perceptions, 37% estimate in their job is contributed by the instructional leadership of school heads. As the perceptions of teachers about instructional leadership increases their level of performance also increases. It was concluded that instructional leadership employed by secondary school heads is at moderate level and contribution of instructional leadership function promoting professional development in the promotion of teachers’ job performance is higher as compared to other four functions. Research study suggested that secondary school heads should pay more attention on supervision and monitoring of the instructional process in their schools.
It is further recommended to Elementary and Secondary Education Department that workshops seminars and conferences should be organized so that school heads’ and teachers come together to discuss their problems for bringing improvement in teaching learning. This study provided a foundation for further research and added a measurement tool to the leadership literature.
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CHAPTER-1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the study, with a specific focus on background of the study, importance of secondary education in Pakistan, and statement of the problem. It also outlines the objectives, research questions, significance, limitations, delimitations and definitions of terms/abbreviations used in the study.

1.1. Background of the Study:

Buildings and equipments are needed in the educational enterprise but persons are central to them. It is no exaggeration that a huge building, expensive equipments and well-planned curriculum will serve some useful purpose only when there are personnel who are fully aware of the mobility of the profession and its associated responsibilities; Moreover, the role of the leader is vital in the success of an organization. The person, who assumes this role in the context of school and carry out several functions, is the school principal. The Principal is considered as most important and influential person in the school, who facilitate the professional development practices within a school to ensure that teachers have the opportunity to get the knowledge they need, so that they can put together the changes in instructions that will affect student learning (Brailsford, 2001).

Findley and Findley (1992) stated that, “if a school is to be an effective one, it will be only because of the instructional leadership of the principal” (p.102). The instructional leadership of the principal means development of the teacher’s competency (Kwinda, 2002). The head of school plans programs and takes decisions
which improve the teaching. Secondary school head is a leader and influential figure of the educational system in Pakistan (Khan U. A., 1991). His/her behaviors affects the performance of teachers in one way or the other through his/her leadership, he/she raises the level of teachers and as a result of this influence a school environment is developed, which helps to achieve aims of education. The head teacher, who provides basic guidance in managing the teacher’s performance, mostly focused on working environment. Their performance can be improved if the school head provides advice, guidance and feedback (Heneman III and Milanowski, 2004).

Government of N.W.F.P (2005) reiterated that as we all know education plays a key role in the religious, social, and economic development of a country. It is also linked with the quality of product which an education system caters for the national development. Government of N.W.F.P further stated that all possible efforts are carried out to make the education system compatible with religious, moral, social and economic needs of the country. The present government has a strong vision and commitment to improve access, equity and quality of education so as to meet the challenges of 21st century. It means that we have to eradicate illiteracy and also promote the quality of education which meets the global standards. The Government of N.W.F.P (2005) further admitted that quality of education is another main concern. There is a general public opinion that quality of education is deteriorating and the system is producing semi-literate, poorly skilled technicians and professionals. The School and Literacy (S&L) department has therefore emphasized that each institution preferably starting with the secondary schools will establish and identify the benchmark marks for the base year (2004) and plan the targets both in quantitative and qualitative terms, so as to see the accumulative progress over a period of at least 5 years. Khan, Saeed and Fatima (2009) stated that like many other developing countries Pakistan is
also facing deterioration of educational standards. When we are talking about improvement in education system actually we are talking about the peoples inside it i.e. students, teachers, administrators, trainers and teacher is a supreme factor. Teaching performance is one of the most important areas in improving the quality of education; whereas teaching skills are necessary ingredient for the quality of instruction.

National Education Policy (2009) focuses on improving the quality of public sectors teachers, as there is a census among all the stake holders that the quality of teachers in the public sector is unsatisfactory. Provincial plan of action on education for all (2003) emphasized that teachers are not properly trained to achieve the objectives of their teaching, as there is no plan of action for teachers. Nine to twelve months training for pre-service secondary school teachers in Pakistan is a very short period for teachers’ build up, as compared to other countries of the world, where they provide 2 to 5 years teacher training. Rizvi (2004) also expressed that the formal training of high school teachers for B.Ed and M.Ed is one year each but actual classroom hours are estimated to cover about six months. This training is also based upon the abstract nature rather than the practical aspect of pedagogy. As in any system of education teachers play the central role and they are effective as their qualification and training allowed them to be. Teachers are truly the pivot of any educational system and educational standards are directly linked with the quality of teachers available in the field, how knowledgeable, professionally trained and committed to their profession they are. Afridi (2007) analyzes that our secondary education system has been incapable to makeup good qualities of character, balance personality and well-ordered students’ habits. The secondary schools in Pakistan are often criticized for their pure academic character and their failure to make adequate
provision for individual difference on account of age ability and aptitude. Moreover, the class room work is very academic, bookish consisting largely of parroting the least obviously with little though on the part of the teacher that the work should have some relationship with the life needs of the people.

There are only two places where a teacher can learn the art of teaching, and these places are the training institutes of the universities and the actual schools in which he/she is a teacher. The training programs only put the teachers on the right roads how to overcome the mechanical difficulties of teaching, and provide the right attitude toward their work. These institutes are doing an immense amount of valuable work, and student teachers therein derive great benefits from them, but the work of these training institutes is only completed in the schools in which the teacher begins the practice of their profession. They have to learn in the actual work of teaching, how to apply the principles which they learnt as a student. If learning is a life-long pursuit and if our goal is to improve the quality of education, then teachers, too, need to be continuously educated. It is the head teacher of the school a most experience person, to whom a teacher consults for his/her difficulties which occur during his/her real teaching.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) summerized that there are various factors that contribute to school effectiveness but the most important factor in school success are attributes to principal and teacher effectiveness, with principal accounting for 25% and teachers 33% of a school’s total impact on students’ achievement. The major variables identified are principals’ leadership, involvement, quality of teaching, learning environment and teachers’ participation. Khaki (2009) argued that schools can be improved through developing head teachers for leadership roles.
Impact of principal on student achievement can not be measured through a simple direct relationship. A principal’s actions most often do not have a direct effect on student learning. The most important area where principals can have an indirect relationship with the student learning is in regard to the effects they have on teacher attitude and performance. Hallinger and Heck (1996) explored that the norms and practices of teachers were generally affected by the principal. Gaziel (2007) pointed out that instructional leadership effect upon students’ achievement is indirect, but it directly affect teachers and school culture. For interactions to be effective, leaders need a range of expertise, from the classroom observations and data gathering, awareness of teacher’s stage of development to reflective communication skills. It was argued that much of the research regarding the direct casual effects of leadership on student learning remain unclear, only some researchers judged that effects both direct and indirect justified for up to one fourth of the total school level effects (Walker, 2009; Hallinger and Heck, 1998). But on the whole the general view is that principals mostly have an indirect effect on student achievement, as mediated through the interactions with teachers and the learning environment (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2000).

It was further found that effective principals had a positive impact on teachers which in turn had an overall positive effect on the performance of the school in a number of areas, not the least of which was student learning (Ogawa and Bossert, 1995). Researchers have only identified some specific instructional leadership behaviors related to improving the teaching and learning process (Blase and Blase, 1998).

Mahsood (2007) depicted that successful and effective fullfilment of education needs to be based on effectively run educational institutions and for this
purpose there is a need to have well trained and motivated teachers. To captuplicate the talent, capabilities and abilities of a group of the teachers we need to have an equally enthusiastic person to head the institution. Thus the school head has a pivotal role to play in promoting teaching learning process in an effective way.

In Pakistan almost all the documents emphasized the need of leadership in education. National Education Policy (2009) specifically stressed the importance of professional competence and leadership. Similarly the head of the school must be the type of person who can give leadership both to his teachers and to his students; a man whose ideas carry weight and whose personal character is an inspiration and an example to his/her teachers and students. There is vital importance of character and qualities of leadership, in those, to whom we entrust our young people. The head of a school is the person, who facilitates the professional development practices within a school to ensure that teachers have the opportunity to get the knowledge they need, so they can put together the changes in instruction and judgment of curriculum that will affect student learning (Brailsford, 2001).

There is no example of success in any organization without effective leadership. Leadership is described as a process of social influence, where the leaders induce followers to apply their energies and resources towards a collective purpose. It is an interactive relationship between leaders and followers, which is characterized by influence and identification. Leadership plays a central role in the outcome of any structured effort, and it is the ability of leadership that arranges and put in order the human and material resources, to get the maximum production. Same is the case with schools, where it finds no examples of success without principal leadership.
1.2. Importance of Secondary Education in Pakistan:

Secondary education in Pakistan starts from grade VI and ends at grade X. It commonly carry out a twofold purpose, one as a terminal stage for a large number of students and secondly a preparatory stage for higher education for those who wish to continue their education further. However, in secondary education after completing grade VIII, diversion of students takes place, when one stream goes to science group and the other enters in arts group. In science group, students have to learn science subjects like physics, chemistry, biology, and in recent years, a new subject of computer science has also been introduced at secondary school stage. Secondary school stage is also critical because if a student selects an arts group, he is not further allowed to switch into science group later on.

Secondary education in public sector schools of province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is administratively mixed phenomenon. In some schools there are classes from grade I to grade X, while majority of schools are scheduling classes from grade VI to grade X.

According to Government of Pakistan (1998) secondary education is an important sub sector of the entire educational system. On one hand, it produces the middle level work force for the country and on the other; it acts as feeder for the higher level of education. Higher education that is likely to produce specialists in different fields spins on the quality of secondary education. The level of education therefore, needs to be overhauled in such a way that it prepares young men and women for the pursuit of higher education as well as prepares them to adjust their
practical lives meaningfully and productively. It is obvious that secondary education fulfill the varied needs of the country.

1.3. Statement of the Problem:

In the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa due to lack of quality and performance, public sector schools are under continuous public pressure and therefore these are losing confidence and trust in public. This loss of confidence presents various challenges to the leadership of the school principals. The effective leadership of principals may play a key role in enhancing the teachers’ efficiency and hence students’ achievement to meet the challenges and needs of the time. An effective school leader may exercise direct or indirect influence on teachers in performing their job. A natural question strikes the mind of the researcher that as instructional leadership is primarily concerned with high quality teaching and learning so the effectiveness of secondary school Principals matters in determining the motivation of teachers for performing their job. This is why the present study was initiated to examine the extent to which secondary school heads employ instructional leadership in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and their relative influence on teachers’ job performance from teachers’ viewpoint.

1.4. Research Purpose:

The purpose of this research is to examine the instructional leadership of secondary school heads and its relationship with teachers’ job performance in secondary schools in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.
1.5. **Objectives of the Study:**

The study was directed by the following major objectives

a. To assess the instructional leadership of secondary school heads as perceived by teachers.

b. To examine the location and gender wise difference in the instructional leadership of secondary school heads as perceived by teachers.

c. To find out the relationship between instructional leadership of secondary school heads and job performance of teachers at secondary school level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

1.6. **Research Questions:**

The study was focused on the following questions:

a. What are the present levels of instructional leadership of secondary school heads according to teachers’ perceptions at secondary school level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa?

b. Is there any significant difference in the instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads as perceived by their teachers?

c. Is there any significant difference in secondary school heads’ instructional leadership in the rural and urban areas as perceived by teachers?

d. Is there any significant relationship between instructional leadership and teacher job performance as perceived by teachers?

e. To what extent do teachers’ perceptions of secondary school heads’ instructional leadership practices promote their job performance?
1.7. **Significance of the Study:**

School head occupies a key position in the hierarchy of management. He is responsible for efficient and smooth functioning of the school. He makes the teacher efficient and prompt in delivery through his leadership. School’s effectiveness is dependent on the leadership of the principal.

The worth of this study can be viewed from two perspectives. The most general perspective relates to this study is the perceived instructional leadership of secondary school heads with their teachers, while the second relates to the feelings of performance that secondary school teachers experience.

Following points signify the importance of the study;

1. The results of this study may be helpful in strengthening the instructional leadership of secondary school heads in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

2. The study may help the policy makers to develop strategies for teachers in developing their capacities in association with instructional leadership.

3. The results may provide guidelines to the principals who aspire to become more effective.

4. The study may provide an opportunity to principals to examine their contribution to promote instructions in their schools and to find alternatives for the best professional development of their teachers.

5. The study may also be helpful for the educational authorities to set standards for school heads as instructional leader and the acceptable level of performance for teachers.
6. The findings of study may provide information that can be used to focus and may be helpful for the improvement of training of secondary school heads.

7. This study would provide information about secondary school heads instructional leadership that could be useful to improve the teacher performance.

8. The results of this study will help the head of secondary school to adjust their leadership to boost teacher performance. It is assumed that a secondary school head leadership enhances effective teaching, which results in better academic achievement of students.

9. The study may lead to further related investigation aimed at understanding the importance of instructional leadership in our local context and gaining an understanding of employing the school head as the instrument with which to establish an effective school.

10. The study may provide an insight to various agencies in making efforts for bringing about suitable changes in the training programs.

1.8. **Delimitations of the Study:**

a. The study was delimited to secondary school teachers (SST’s) of public sector secondary schools of the Province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

b. Private schools and government higher secondary schools were excluded from the study.
1.9. **Limitations of the Study:**

a. Ideally, this study could have been conducted as an assessment of teacher job performance by observing their classrooms, but due to lack of time, resources and wide geographically area of KPK teacher job performance is obtained by a standardized scale named Teacher Job Performance Scale (TJPS). Teachers’ job performance was studied in the context of their teaching skills, management skills, interpersonal skills and discipline and regularity by rating scale.

b. The findings of this study are limited to the accuracy and perception of the secondary school teachers who completed the questionnaires, they were considered as objective and honest in their responses.

c. Since the collection of data was limited to only SST’s, so the generalization of results of this study should only be done with extensive care.

1.10. **Definitions of Terms / Abbreviations:**

a. **Bachelor of Education:** one year of education beyond the bachelor’s degree.

b. **Master of Education:** one year of study after bachelor of education.

c. **Secondary School Teacher:** A graduate teacher posted in the secondary school to teach grade IX-X.

d. **Secondary School Head:** Head Master/ Head Mistress/ Principal of secondary school, who is responsible for all the activities and functioning of a school.

e. **Secondary School:** School in public sector that operates to provide formal education to students from grades VI-X.

f. **Department of Elementary & Secondary Education:** New name given to school & literacy department.
g. **Government of N.W.F.P**  It was the old name of province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. After passing the 18th amendment by the national assembly, it was renamed as Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

h. **Perception:**  Recognition and interpretation of sensory stimuli based chiefly on memory.

i. **Behavior:**  The actions of reactions of persons or things in response to external or internal stimuli.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>Master of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILQ</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJPS</td>
<td>Teacher Job Performance Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W.F.P</td>
<td>North West Frontier Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPK</td>
<td>Khyber Pakhtunkhwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; S E</td>
<td>Elementary &amp; Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; L</td>
<td>School &amp; Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMRS</td>
<td>Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.I.S.E.</td>
<td>Board of Intermediate &amp; Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER-2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the review of literature in relation to instructional leadership and teacher job performance as both separated and related topics. The first section of the literature review elaborates the instructional leadership in the light of existing models of instructional leadership, with a discussion on major functions of instructional leadership. The second section covers up the teachers’ job performance and factors affecting it. The third section discusses the relationship of instructional leadership with teachers’ job performance. It also examined the empirical research studies on the present topic. The chapter concludes by presenting the conceptual framework for this study.

2.1. Conceptions of Instructional Leadership:

The concept of Instructional leadership comes out in the early 1980s in the investigations on successful schools. The term instructional leadership refers to those practices and actions of a head of institution that are concerned with the school central purposes such as teaching / learning and the resources which support the teaching learning process. However, instructional leadership has been defined in different ways by different researchers as many definitions of instructional leadership exist (Begum, 2004; Celikten, 2001).

Blase and Blase (1999) define instructional leadership as a blend of several tasks, like supervision of classroom instruction, staff development and curriculum development. It means that the primary purpose of instructional leadership is direct assistance to teachers, staff development, and to supervise teachers to implement the
pedagogy in a better way. The primary responsibility of the school head is to facilitate the teaching and learning in the school (O'Donnel and White, 2005).

Leithwood, Janti and Steinbach (1999) defines instructional leadership as an approach to leadership that lays emphasis on the behaviors of teachers, as they are engaged in activities directly affecting the growth of students. They further elaborated Instructional leadership as management-oriented and leadership oriented activities, which encompasses: appropriate application of resources for teaching, agreeing upon goals, encouraging cooperative relationship among teachers, and particularly the evaluation and counseling of teachers during instruction, during classroom observation, structured feedback, and coaching.

Memon (1999) states that the role of educational leadership includes setting school wide goals, defining school’s purposes, providing resources needed for learning, appraising teachers, coordinating staff development activities, and creating collegial atmosphere. In practice, this means that the key responsibility of instructional leader is to focus on the teaching learning process and to influence the teacher professional development.

According to Quinn (2002) instructional leaders are responsible for updating teachers about latest educational approaches, skills and mechanism that pertain to effective teaching. Head of school must also assist teachers in critiquing these tools to determine their applicability to the classroom. School head as an instructional leader takes various initiatives and explore training opportunities all the time, paying attention to needs, resources to accomplish learning objectives, and the school’ goals
(Kunwar, 2000). It shows that instructional leadership enhances the quality of teaching, which in turn enhances the students’ outcomes.

Research has been consistent in confirming that school principal behavior as an essential factor for their effectiveness in schools (Hoy and Miskel, 2001). Instructional leaders plan and put into practice clear objectives for the school (Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides, 1990). They prepare, evaluate and implement instructional programs including learning objectives and instructional strategies for the school. It appears that instructional leaders offer a purposeful school atmosphere, which is favorable to learning. National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001) defines instructional leadership as "leading learning communities". In learning communities, staff members meet on a regular basis to discuss their work, work together to solve the problems, reflect on their jobs, and take responsibility for what students learn. Ballu and Podgursky (1995) opined that there is a one consistent presentation in the literature on effective schools is that good schools have good leadership. According to Bass (1981) Leadership is considered as the one most important factor in the success or failure of institutions and/or organizations. The passing of examination, for which the students have been crammed and their brains are swollen with a superficial knowledge of a large number of subjects, should not be the main object of a school, and it is important that head of school should recollect the tone of a school and turn his attention on what might be done to make the school more efficient. It is through him that the staff is going to gain advancement, and it is of course one of the duties as well as one of the pleasures of the headmaster to do his utmost for the staff under him.
The success or failure of a school hinges upon the leadership of a school principal (Findley and Findley, 1992). Even if good the teaching is, large the number of students, the qualified the staff, unless the leadership of school is of high-quality, the school is more than likely to fail eventually in its purpose. What is the purpose of a school? It is to train up its students to be loyal, honorable, useful, healthy citizens, capable of taking their share in the work of the wider world.

Researchers consistently describe instructional leadership in the literature through the behaviors and processes a principal needs to run a school effectively. A number of conceptual models that demonstrate instructional leadership exist. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) studied the instructional leadership behaviors of ten elementary school principals in a school district and developed a model of instructional leadership. They collected qualitative data from principals, supervisors, and school staff on instructional leadership behaviors. In addition to that they also analyzed principals’ documents such as newsletters, organizational information from their school records including instructions in their schools, staff meeting programs and teacher evaluation reports. From the amalgamation of opinion poll and the organizational information, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) formed a framework of instructional management with three main functions and eleven job descriptors, named as the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS). The conceptualization of instructional management framework of Hallinger and Murphy (1985) with three dimensions and eleven job descriptors is explained as:

The first domain of PIMRS contains the principal job function of framing the school goals and communication of these goals. Principal frame school goals in consultation with teachers and parents by identifying areas of improvement and make
strategies to achieve these set goals. The next function communication of school goals refers to the ways through which the principal put into words the significance of the school goals to all stakeholders. They use formal or informal ways to communicate these established goals for example in school assembly, staff meeting, and parents teachers meeting.

The second domain managing instructional dimension contains working directly with teachers linked to curriculum and instruction. Job descriptors incorporated in this dimension consists of supervising and evaluating the teaching, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring the student progress. Supervising and evaluating the teaching consists of activities that offer instructional support to teachers, observe classrooms learning through informal classroom visits, and making classroom practice in line with school goals. Coordinating the curriculum pointed towards principal activities that provide opportunities to teachers for teamwork on alignment of curriculum to standards and achievement tests. The instructional management job descriptor monitoring the student progress refers to the use of test results of students for formulating educational objectives for school, assessing the curriculum, monitoring the instruction, and measuring the progress towards the school based targets.

The third domain of Hallinger and Murphy (1985) PIMRS includes principal behaviors that protect instructional time, put forward teacher professional development, keep up high visibility, provides incentives for teachers, develop and enforce academic standards, and offer incentives for learning. The job functions included in this dimension represents the activities required to influence the promotion of a positive learning environment through indirect actions.
Murphy (1990) presented a comprehensive instructional leadership framework after an extensive review of instructional leadership studies by following a line of investigation on school improvement, faculty development and organizational change literature. Murphy’s framework consists of four dimensions of instructional leadership which further divided into sixteen behaviors in all. These dimensions of instructional leadership encompasses developing mission and goals; organizing the educational production function; promoting professional development; and developing a supportive work climate, are explained below and indicate the different instructional leadership behaviors that builds up these dimensions.

The first dimension of developing mission and goals is central in building a sense of collective purpose (Murphy, 1990). All the efforts carried out in the school spin around a common idea. Murphy split up this dimension into further two functions i.e. principals behaviors of framing school goals and communicating school goals: Framing school goals focused on those targets which put emphasis on all students achievements, existing student performance, as well as the staff tasks for achieving the goals. Communicating school goals to all stakeholders i.e. teachers, students, and parents through formal and informal ways to discuss the importance of school goals, that guides the activities of school.

The second dimension of Murphy (1990) framework is managing the educational production of the school. This dimension gives emphasis to management behavior of the school principal. As an instructional leader the principal enhances the quality of instruction by conducting teacher assessment, frequent visits to classrooms, giving feedback and suggestions on the teaching learning process, and checking teacher assignments in the best interest of students. Furthermore, the principal
distribute and look after the instructional time according to school rules and procedures. The principal works with teachers to organize the curriculum through bringing in line with state standards, and models how to use assessment data to set goals and set instruction (Murphy, 1990).

The third dimension of the Murphy’s framework is to promote an academic learning environment that influences the norms, attitude, and beliefs of the students, teachers, and parents. This dimension of instructional leadership framework deals with the teaching and learning process in the classroom. The main focus of the principal in this domain is on the development of a conducive learning environment to teaching and learning by formulating positive expectation, keeping high visibility, giving incentives to teachers and students, and promoting professional development (Murphy, 1990).

The fourth and final dimension of Murphy (1990) framework of instructional leadership is developing a supportive work environment. Job descriptors incorporated in this dimension consists of creating a safe and orderly learning environment, providing opportunities for student involvement, develops collaboration among the staff members, and from the links between the home and school. The principal that focuses on this dimension concentrates on the development of suitable learning environment for teaching–learning process.

Blase and Blase (1999) carried out a qualitative study to come across everyday strategies of principals, practicing exemplary instructional leadership and how these practices influenced teachers. An open-ended questionnaire was used to explore the characteristic of principals that enhanced their classroom interaction and what
impact those characteristics had on teachers. One of the theme derived from their instructional leadership data was promotion of teachers’ professional growth with respect to teaching methods and interaction about teaching and learning. They further found that principals’ instructional leadership hinged on the development of teachers as learners who collaborate with one another to study teaching and its effects. They also highlighted the collaborative networks among teachers which were essential for useful teaching and learning. The characteristics of instructional leadership and its effects on teachers as identified by Blase and Blase (1999) are as under:

Theme 1. Talking with teachers to promote reflection related strategies:

1. Making suggestions  
2. Giving feedback  
3. Modeling  
4. Using inquiry and soliciting advice and opinions  
5. Giving praise

Theme 2. Promoting professional growth related strategies:

1. Emphasizing the study of teaching and learning  
2. Supporting collaborative efforts among teachers  
3. Developing coaching relationship among teachers  
4. Encouraging and supporting redesign of programs  
5. Applying the principles of adult learning, growth, and development to all phases of staff development  
6. Implementing action research to inform instructional decision making
Krug (1993) provided another description of instructional leadership. He offers a “five factor taxonomy” that organizes all the activities in which an instructional leader should engage. The five categories identified are, “defining a mission; managing curriculum and instruction; supervising teaching; monitoring student progress; and promoting instructional climate” (pp. 431-433). However, how the school administrator interacts with the staff is even more important in influencing change in instruction.

In their monumental study of how principals make a difference in promoting quality schooling, Smith and Andrews (1989) concluded that strong principals functioned as forceful and dynamic leaders who brought to their practice high energy, initiative, tolerance for ambiguity, a sense of humor, analytical ability, and practical stance toward life. They identified four broad areas of strategic role interaction between principal and teachers: they are (a) resource provider, (b) instructional resource, (c) communicator, and (d) visible presence. Their research reveals important differences in the ways teachers viewed strong, average, and weak principals across these four dimensions. In every case, strong principals received more positive rating than average and weak, and average principals more positive ratings than weak. Smith and Andrews (1989) research demonstrates the importance of principals giving prime attention to the schools’ core technology, teaching and learning- a finding now well established in the literature.

Rutherford (1985) listed five essential qualities for principals to exhibit in order to be effective instructional leaders: (a) creating a clear vision of what they want their school to become, (b) translating these visions into goals, (c) formulating a
school climate that support progress, (d) continuously monitoring progress, (e) and intervening in a supportive or corrective manner. Weller, butterfly, and Bland (1994) identified similar characteristics of effective principals: a principal who emphasizes curriculum and student achievement, provides a positive instructional environment, evaluates student performance, develops instructional improvement plans, supports teachers, and facilitates communication.

Literature on principal leadership and school effectiveness has argued that the success of any school highly depends upon the quality of the principal leadership (Arikewuyo, 2007; Memon, 2000). Principal can play an important role in the success of the educational institution through their influence on teachers’ morale, job performance, satisfaction, and students’ learning outcomes (Amoroso, 2002).

2.2. Major Functions of Instructional Leadership:

This section reviewed the existing conceptualization of instructional leadership used in the present study.

After having explored a variety of literature sources on instructional leadership (Blase and Blase, 1998; Blase and Blase, 1999; Blase and Blase, 2004; Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, 2001; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985; Hallinger and Heck, 1996; Heck, 1992; Murphy, 1990), the researcher has found that there are some major functions of instructional leadership that are most common in all instructional leadership literature. They can be accomplished and are vital to secondary school heads who are seeking to become an effective instructional leader. They are:

1. Formulating educational objectives for school
2. Providing learning environment
3. Protecting instructional time

4. Supervising and monitoring the progress

5. Promoting professional development

2.2.1. **Formulating Educational Objectives for School:**

Formulating educational objectives are the first step in any academic and administrative assignment (Shahid, 2009). In the leadership literature the head of a school is described as a central figure of the institution. He is not only presented as official head of the staff, but also as its effective leader. Heck (1992) pointed out that strong leaders create strong schools. He goes on to say that effective schools have strong leaders who share decision making, have clear goals, effective instruction and great deal of classroom time devoted to learning. They also have a vision of what they want their schools to be, and translate this vision into goals for their schools and expectations for their teachers. They create a school climate that supports their goals and they monitor progress.

Hallinger and Leithwood (1996) pointed out that the highly set objectives are in fact the actions that shows the instructional leadership expectation for excellence, quality and high performance on the part of the teachers and other staff members at the school. They are the motivational factors that raise the trust and assist teachers to see the challenging nature of the targets that are set by the instructional leader. Leadership skills for example enhance their ability to lead and manage people to work towards common goals. Decision-making skills enhances their ability to investigate, solve problems, and make appropriate decisions,
communication skills enhances their ability to make point clearly and understand the view of others.

Mthombeni (2004) reported that it is the responsibility of the school principal as an instructional leader to formulate vision and make it a reality through communicating it to all stakeholders. The joint ownership of the school mission and vision provides a level of commitment and enthusiasm among all the staff members.

Smith and Andrews (1989) declared that “communication of vision is perhaps the most important way of a principal to exert effective leadership to leave no doubt about school priorities” (P. 16). Petersen (1999) concluded that instructionally focused superintendents created a vision for academic success through strong and tightly coupled leadership. Principal leadership is essential for formulating a vision for school progress and efforts to put into practice (Stevens, 2008). The head of school articulated vision and share it with teachers in different ways such as through meetings, seminars, and inviting guest speaker. He wanted teachers to learn and grow in self-understanding (Hallinger and Heck, 1996). Brewer (1993) mentioned that leadership of the school head has an effect on the motivation of teachers, providing a stimulus for their classroom targets. After controlling for a variety of environmental influences, Brewer found higher academic gains in high schools where principals held high academic goals.

Khan, Saeed and Fatima (2009) asserted that in general, the school effectiveness is associated with the efficiency of the head of the institution; therefore, it can be argued that their role is fundamental in raising the standard of education through teachers. Secondary school heads who want to become effective instructional
leaders need a personal vision for school that should be focused on high teachers’ performance and students’ achievement. It is essential that the secondary school head communicates his/her vision of academic success for the school in terms that parents, teachers, and students can easily understand. This significance of shared vision and commitment is highlighted by (Sergiovanni, 2006) who reflect that with a clear vision and commitment, the staff members focused their energies around a common purpose. Without a concept of where we are trying to go, it serves no meaning “to improve”. The shared school vision should express all facets of teaching and classroom activities. It means that all the staff members in the school should be committed to the pursuance of goals that are set by the instructional leader. The goals set by the interaction and cooperation of the staff members. The instructional leader should put together team work by modeling and making it a nucleus of the school. The headmaster promotes the harmonious development of the school and ensure proper maintenance of the discipline in the school (Shahid, 2009). He/she carries the traditions as well as project the image of the school according to his/her own ideas and ideals in collaboration with staff. Shahid (2009) further suggested that head of school involve, staff, students, and parents by convening the meeting of staff council, parents teacher association, and students council to arrive at a decision for implementation. The headmaster makes plan for distribution of work, particularly teaching assignments among the staff, teacher-wise and class-wise time tables, distribution of various co-curricular activities, and arrangement of necessary physical facilities.
2.2.2. Providing Learning Environment:

A major constituent of instructional leadership is providing teaching and learning environment in the school. This function of instructional leadership makes sure that the conditions and incentives are provided in school to maintain a conducive learning environment for learners, that fully support the teaching and learning process (Dimmock, 1995). Instructional leadership behaviors have significant effect on the technical core of schools (Heck, 1992). Research studies shows that principals who express more instructional leadership behaviors take out more satisfaction and performance from teachers, as well as set up a climate that support confidence, risk, and cooperation (Blase and Blase, 1998; Blase and Blase, 1999; Sheppard, 1996). Ways of interacting with teachers that will lead to changes in their instructional practice is an important component of instructional leadership. Principals create a learning environment that is open, friendly, and culturally inviting. Khan, (2009) also mentioned that school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. So, one of the essential responsibilities of a school head is providing conducive environment in school that allows for effective teaching and learning.

2.2.3. Protecting Instructional Time:

This function covers that aspect of instructional leadership that is related to availability of sufficient and an effective use of time for teaching learning process, as shortage of time affects student learning negatively and they become scant and feel fatigue. According to Hallinger and Murphy (1985) teachers’ classroom management and instructional skills are not used optimally if instruction is frequently
interrupted by announcements, tardy students, and request from the office. The principal can control this area of activity through the development and enforcement of school wide policies. Principal who successfully implements policies that limit interruptions of classroom learning time can increase allocated learning time and, potentially student achievement. It means that instructional time is the in-class time teachers spend on task.

2.2.4. **Supervising and Monitoring the Progress:**

One important ingredient in teacher learning and development is supervision. In this perspective, supervision refers to school based activity that engages teachers in meaningful and ongoing instructional discussion that is focused at teaching and learning. Principals in this process as instructional leaders are viewed as critical in promoting teacher growth (Blase and Blase, 1999). According to Afridi (2008) “Supervision is the process of bringing about improvement in instruction by working with people who are working with pupils” (p.40). It implies a first hand contact with the product and the process. Supervision enhances teacher development (Sergiovanni, 2006). Classroom observation plays a vital role in this process; it calls for considerable personal contact between head of the school and teachers. In this way the instructional leader, encourages teachers to utilize the available resources in the most efficient and effective way to secure the best possible student learning outcomes (Dimmock, 1995). Leithwood (1994) considered instructional leadership as the series of behaviors designed to monitor the instructions and the collection of data that may be useful in setting targets for improvement. When principals frequently visits classrooms, in fact they put attention to teachers’ efforts and progress in instructional techniques. For gaining the knowledge of what is going on in the classrooms,
effective school heads visits the classrooms frequently and observes teaching methods and materials being used. Heck, Larsen, Marcoulides (1990) found that most common behaviors of the principals in the high achieving schools were the direct supervision of instructional strategies. Hopkins (2001) observed that, more the classroom observation were made by the principal, better the students achievement. Actual presence in the classroom is the best way of judging efficiency in methods of teaching. Secondary means such as examination of teacher work book, class diary and apparatus used will aid in correcting such judgements. A number of visits should be made and should be distributed more or less evenly among all the teachers. First and most important are the actual instructions and discipline in the class as determined by correct method of supervision. Sergiovanni (2006) argued that principal must keep teachers informed about educational methods and development in the field of successful teaching, feedback provides possible development to teachers as they will be aware of shortcomings and will improve on them.

Supervision implies a critic by which method and result can be judged. The principal must have a clear idea of what can be expected under the existing conditions, and this idea should exist at the same time in the minds of the teachers. The criterion for judgment should not be some hidden mysterious things which only the principal knows, but it should be something which has been developed and which exist in the minds of the teachers. Sergiovanni (2006) suggested the following questions to answer for supervision and evaluation of teaching:

1. What is actually going on in the classroom?
2. What is the teacher and what are the students actually doing?
3. What are the actual learning outcomes?
4. What actions should be taken to bring about even greater understanding of teaching and learning and better congruence between our actions and beliefs?

Particularly findings of (Blase and Blase, 1998; Blase and Blase, 1999) demonstrate that when there is a feedback on teaching-learning process from instructional leader, there were increase in teacher reflection, better teaching strategies, well-planed lessons, and a rise in implementation of new ideas.

On the other hand, principals who did not make use of monitoring and feedback on teaching-learning process they had a negative impact on teachers classroom practices (Blase and Blase, 1998). It should be done with the spirit of cooperation and should be used as a basis for aid and correction. The teachers should be encouraged to show work and method, to invite examination and criticism. Interaction and feedback are crucial in the process of supervision, and evaluation. Teacher should know how they perform, and the head of school should indicate areas of improvement. While the principal in the classroom, should not only take note of the activities in the classroom, but also interact with the teacher if the situation permits (Blase and Blase, 1999). After the principal has been in the classroom, he/she must provide feedback to the teacher concerned. Feedback should contain the words of encouragement and praise about specific teaching strategy.

In accordance with government rules, supervision is concerned with the day-to-day quality of work in the schools, and therefore must become an important responsibility of the head master/head mistress/ principal (Government of N.W.F.P, 1982). Modern practices reject the strongly authoritarian head master/head mistress/ principal who dominates every aspect of the school. Current ideas emphasize two way
communications through which the head encourages initiatives on the part of the teachers. Supervisor is seen through group inter-actions and analysis of common problems. It also means to help the teachers in assessing his/her weakness and drawbacks of the students (Afridi, 2008).

Afridi (2008) noted that building of rapport with staff is one of the important methods to stimulate willingness to cooperate. The head of the institution establishes the climate for the supervisory programme of the school. He realizes that only through his/her teachers the quality of education in the schools can improve (Ahmed, 2004). The head of the institution must grasp every opportunity to show that his major purpose in the school is to help teachers, so that they become more effective. Head of institution must recognize the morale boost that teachers get when they are initiated to help work out problems, and in result feeling of responsibility which they develop for the success of the planes they have helped to devise (Blase and Blase 2000). Teachers will grow only when they want to grow. The head of institution cannot make a teacher improve merely by telling him to do. The following have been the essential elements of successful supervisory behavior as suggested by Government of N.W.F.P (1982).

- Provide example rather then percept.
- Have confidence in teachers, show appreciation of their work, encourage initiative.
- Do your home work and have a good knowledge of methods of teaching, practical ideas to offer teachers which will help their teaching.
- Come to school prepared to offer guidance and constructive help.
- Be a good listener, show emotional stability, control mood and temper.
- Consciously and deliberately cultivate open lines of two way communication
Always be courteous to teachers, extend the same courtesy and interest to children in the school. Be aware of their problems and able to discuss them with teachers.

Further elaborating the concept of supervision Sergiovanni (2006) described that contemporary supervision is dynamic and it opens up the way for innovation and change. Supervisors are educational builders they must have sound foundations, effective methods of constructions and good design if they are to create a worthwhile finished product. Government of N.W.F.P (1982) developed a criteria of supervision which could be helpful and evolved through the following model:
This is the process by which schools and teachers can be improved. According to Government of N.W.F.P (1982) supervision is professional leadership which can only be provided by people who understand and value the importance of good human relations and who emphasise:

- Interaction and communication
- Guidance and development
Staff morale  
Children and a positive learning climate

Head of institutions are educational builders, therefore they must have sound foundations, effective methods and good plans if they are to create a worthwhile finished product. He must fit himself for the role. He will develop only if he/she has the best foundation possible:

- A progressive attitude  
- Training in modern techniques  
- Knowledge of modern teaching methods and the curriculum  
- Administrative support

Elementary and Secondary Education Department (2010) stated that Supervision should be supportive and Head of the institution must encourage the teachers to develop their talents to the heights if the schools are to change. Positive and supportive supervision means that the emphasis is placed upon the good things that are being done; on the efforts that are being made to run a good school; on the achievement of teachers and students (Afridi, 2008). Government of N.W.F.P (1982) further put forward the following important points of supervision in terms of

a. To support to the teacher is in his task:

All the teachers need encouragement and support in performing their difficult job and head of a school is the obvious person to provide it. A teacher will not expect to receive help from a stranger and therefore an effective school head is a person on whom they can trust.

b. To assist the teachers to clarify their ideas:
often a person who is on the every day job, in the same place ceases to see the things that need to be done around him.

c. To develop staff morale:

A leader who is seen often begins to become known as one who is interested in the problems and every day life of those who have to carry out the daily task. No one ever expects other people to solve all the problems that he has but the fact that the supervisor is aware of the difficulties helps develop high morale.

d. Community involvement:

Effective education can only be proceed when the community supports the school and the teachers. A supervisor who know the community well, will be able to point out ways in which the community can be helped to understand the work the school does.

e. Use of praise:

Part of the good supervisor’s technique is his ability to notice those features of the work of a school which deserve praise- and then give the praise. Often the feature may be very minor but it should be realised that praise which is deserved is very great encouragement. Praise should go to the person deserving it.

2.2.5. Promoting Professional Development:

This function of instructional leadership provides teachers the necessary support, guidance and helping them in improving their skills and performance, in simple terms it is an improvement of teachers’ teaching skills. Professional development involves a change in the knowledge, behavior, understanding and attitude of group of peoples (Directorate of staff development, 2007). Instructional
leader arrange staff development programs that are coupled with the progress of teaching and learning (Blase and Blase, 1998). Effective professional development allows opportunities to apply the knowledge and to practice the new skills with feedback. Instructional leadership behaviors related to promoting professional growth and teachers’ development provided useful outcome for classroom instructions (Blase and Blase, 1998; Blase and Blase, 1999; Sheppard, 1996). Particularly, principals who informed their teachers about new trends in pedagogy, set up a culture of cooperation and learning, provide resources in the classroom, in turn, this increase the student achievement (Sheppard, 1996; Blase and Blase, 1998). Techniques used by principals that were discovered in this study added to those produced from a study by (Blase and Blase, 2000) where characteristics of principals that enhanced teachers’ instruction were identified.

Kunwar (2000) stated that Professional development is an essential part of instructional leadership practices of a school leader, as teachers need to grow professionally. Principal as an instructional leader encourages professional development activities to meet teacher’s need in the classroom, arrangement of staff development programs help teachers to attain their potential by improving their skills and performance (Clark, 1996). An instructional leader should also deal with the individual teacher to facilitate individual professional development apart from the creation of learning community. He/she organizes faculty development programs that are school based and linked to the improvement of teaching and learning.

The school leader develops an understanding of what students need, and what training teacher needs to deliver that learning. It requires a skillful school leader who guides continuous instructional improvement. According to (Sigford, 2006)
professional development deepens teachers’ content knowledge, prepare them to various types of classroom assessments, and provide them an instructional strategy to assist students. Christie (2006) defined professional development as the ability to demonstrate high level of skill or expertise. Within the context of education, professional development is measured by teachers’ ability to effectively impact on their students learning.

A clear understanding that is based on most staff development efforts is that, such change will improve performance of teachers in a constructive way (Clark, 1996). An instructional leader needs to be actively involved in knowing what is taught, how well students are doing, and how to ask the right questions. He must provide support to curriculum adoption and professional development activities in a way that supports the learning of teachers and students in a continuous way. It means that instructional leader provides training, time and resources for reflective practices.

Ruffin (2007) in her study of instructional leadership found that principals perceives their role as instructional leadership through provision of professional development, monitoring instructions and building working relationships with teachers. Professional development programs assist teachers to reach potential by improving their skills and performance. Professional development programs mean a change in the knowledge, behavior and understanding of the teachers. An obvious assumption that is underpinning most professional development efforts is that such change will improve performance of teachers in a constructive way (Clark, 1996). An effective instructional leader arranges professional development programs that are school based and linked to the improvement of teaching and learning. Teachers’ development refers to the instructional leadership’s responsibility to develop more
determined attitudes among teachers. Professional development and training subject teachers in to academic engagement and it ultimately adds meaning to the high performance expectation (Whitaker and Moses, 1994).

2.3. **Desirable characteristics of an effective teacher:**

   Education aims at modifying the behavior of the individual and thus through it an establishment of a refined society (Malik, 2000). The teacher is the pivot of educational process, and occupies a dominant and extremely important position in the education system. The duty of teacher is to provide a suitable environment in which the development of an individual can take place towards a prosperous society. It is the teacher who decides what is to be taught and how it is to be taught (Bhatti, 1987). The fact of the matter is that the quality of education is dependent on the quality of teachers. The training, motivation and professional commitment of the teachers has lot to do, with the quality of classroom teaching and learning by the students. The designing and appropriateness of curriculum determines the direction of education and the textbooks and produced in pursuance thereof have much to do with the quality of education. Equally important in this regard are the techniques and methodologies of teaching and the environment of learning. Bakkenes, Vermunt and Wubbels (2010) opined that teachers are the most important agents in determining education for students and bringing in change and innovation in educational practices. It means that quality of education is the net result of the performance of teachers. If the teachers are properly trained, guided and motivated, definitely the result will be in the form of quality of education.
There is a consistent finding in the research literature that performance of teachers in the classroom ultimately determines success or failure of the educational endeavor, so questions arise: What qualities are desirable in a prospective teacher? What commitments are necessary? As the task of the teacher is central to education and they are considered as the king-pin of the learning process so, they leave deep impact on the development and the attitudes and behavior pattern of his/her students both within and without the classroom. The teacher places before and transfers to the students the recorded wisdom of the past. He explains it, elaborates on it and opens up the minds of the youth. He opens up vistas for serious thinking in new directions and advancement. His conduct within and outside the classroom is emulated by his students. Holdzkom and Brandt (1995) described effective teacher in term of certain qualities. According to them, an effective teacher is he who actively engages students in learning, ability to understand the students and their problems, ability to explain things clearly to the students, ability to make anything interesting to learn, ability to control the class, ability to be ready and willing to help the students when they need, and ability to be fair as possible in dealing with students.

An ideal teacher is one who creates a desire in his pupils which encourages them to concentrate whole heartedly in learning a new thing (Ahmed, 2004). The role of the teacher, indeed, starts with the entry of the students in the educational institutions and end with their certification. They determine the scholastic attainment and intellectual development of an individual.

According to Iqbal (1996) a teacher’s function is not mere promotion of literacy by imparting a certain amount of knowledge to pupils. A teacher is the ideal and model to be followed by students. He is a key to whole education process. A
teacher should be such a person who commands the respect of pupils by virtue of what he is. He should grasp the meaning of education and its relation to society. The likes and dislikes, attitude, personality and behavior of the teacher serve as a model for the students. So a teacher should try to motivate his students by teaching them in an interesting, loving, sympathetic manner and should take into account the intellectual level of the students before presenting a subject to them. The teacher must guard against the teaching of a matter which is beyond his comprehension.

On the basis of opinions expressed by the educators above and experts in the field of education the operational definition of teachers’ effectiveness which emerge is, an effective teacher is he who has clear concept of subject matter, ability to write clear objectives for his course, ability to organize learning materials, ability to communicate his knowledge to the students successfully and to deal with classroom situation.

2.4. Evaluation of teachers’ Job performance:

No educational system can be better than the quality of its teachers (Malik, 2000). The competence and enthusiasm of teachers determine the heights to which an educational system can rise. We may put in any effort to improve our objectives, policies, programs, curricula, equipment and administration structure, but it is only the teachers who put life into the skeleton (Iqbal, 1996). Teaching is the main component of the education system. There is no knowledge without teaching.

Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer (1969) stated that “The objective of job analysis is to break down any particular business activity into distinct and essential actions. Each action is then evaluated in terms of what it contributes to the ultimate
objective. Although the actual abilities of the workers have not been improved, what they now do, count for more because much lost motion has been eliminated” (p.162).

Teachers’ job is generally evaluated in two ways either summative (Judgmental) or formative (development). Judgmental evaluation refers to those results that make judgments and do not help in improving the things, while developmental evaluation is a means that results in development both in skills and task prospect of the individual teacher and leads to the improvement. A number of authors have the same opinion that a formative process that promotes teacher professional growth is a main purpose of teacher evaluation (Danielson, 2007; Ribas, 2005). This study is focused on the developmental approach of the evaluation. The most important purpose of developmental approach is to; make easy the personal and professional development of teachers in order to get better the quality of teaching. The researcher believed, as Blase and Blase (1999) confirmed the importance of autonomy and choice to tachers’ classroom performance, and suggested that “teachers’ supervision of their own instructional practices, including self analysis, reflectivity, monitoring their own progress towards goals, and implementing changes based on reflection, may prove useful” (p. 370).

In order to evaluate good teaching it is necessary to decide first upon criteria in terms of which teaching may be called good. Good teaching quite obviously is teaching that accomplishes the aims of education, described somewhere else as the transmission of knowledge concerning the conditions and ideals of our culture and the development of individual skills and tastes necessray for self realization.
2.5. Factors affecting teachers’ performance:

Researchers have identified certain factors that contribute to teachers’ instructional practices (Afridi, 2007). Most of these factors can be divided into (a) in school factors (b) out of school factors.

According to Afridi (2007) in school factors are those which affect teaching/learning are more easily. They may include physical resources, school management and leadership, teacher characteristic, teacher training, allocated time, learning technologies and curriculum.

Physical resource factors include accessibility to students, size of school, and condition of buildings, availability of general and academic facilities, school furnishing and material resources. Researchers assume that minimal facilities are important for effective teaching/learning (Ahmed 2004). In most systems, however, a designated location for schooling, usually but not always in the form of a school building, is all that is required to generate the resources indispensable for teaching/learning to go on; a teacher and some minimal materials such as blackboards and writing materials. However a teacher usually feel it is easier to teach when there are fewer children in the classroom and the abilities of children are reasonably similar.

Class size may be important in one respect. There is no indication that physical facilities have a discernible impact on the ability of teachers to perform effectively. There was little to differentiate the kinds of facilities available to effective teachers from those available to less effective teachers, including as well as class structure, the kinds of furnishing in the classroom. On the other hand in countries where a scarcity of facilities forces double or triple shifting that cuts in to the hours of instruction, lack of facilities have an impact on achievement.
Lawler (1973) as cited in Kamal, et al., (2006) illustrated performance as the product of ability multiplied by motivation, and ability is the product of aptitude multiplied by training and resources. Ability refers to native skills a person brings to the job. They further commented that most of the inherent abilities can be enhanced by education and training. Nevertheless, it is useful to consider training as separate component of ability, since it represents an important mechanism for improving employee performance. An intensive training program can increase the applicant’s qualification to perform the job. Afridi (2007) supplemented this idea and added that school management factors such as: headmaster characteristics, supervision policies, school organization, entrance requirement, leadership style, teacher turnover and relation with the community can enhance the teachers’ job. Instructional quality tends to be better when headmaster/headmistress emphasizes instructional and community relations roles more than their administrative roles. When there is some latitude, effective managers are more likely to define school policies in terms of educational goals. For example they may restrict admissions according to a specified set of guide lines related to school capacity or age level, but may be willing to accept dropout back unconditionally. Attention to such details reflects the more orderly school environment and the greater concern for academic goals that occurs in schools where more effective instruction goes on. Brewer (1993) noted that principal leadership affects both the selection and motivation of teachers in terms of their classroom goal setting. After controlling for a variety of environmental influences, Brewer found that there is a higher academic gain in high schools where principals held higher academic goals. Locke and Latham (1990) stated that target setting is an effective way to increase motivation and performance. Principals that define and communicate shared goals with teachers provide organizational structures that guide the school toward a
common focus. This common focus on academic press influences teachers’ behaviors within the classroom, which leads to more effective schools.

Teacher creativity and innovations are the consequences of professional development opportunities. When teachers perceive their creative ability, they become satisfied with their job, and hence are motivated to do more (Blase and Blase, 2000). Qualification of teacher is a significant component in teaching but professional training is more essential in teaching, because a skillful teacher can teach better than an un-trained teacher. In general, it is argued that a trained teacher knows well how to teach effectively. Out of school factors are usually of three kinds: community factors, family factors, and student characteristics. Community factors include demographic structure, labor force composition, and degree of urbanization, social heterogeneity and cultural characteristics. Family factors include socio-economic status, family size, values and educational background. Student characteristics include health, nutrition, cognitive development, attendance stability, gender, previous schooling etc. Out of school factors are extremely important in affecting teacher performance and student learning. According to Khan (2009) an employee’s performance is very much dependent on his/her perceptions. However, they are usually difficult for educators to affect directly by policy changes; therefore they are only mentioned here.

### 2.6. Instructional leadership and teacher job:

“Not only do leaders understand their own function--their role--they also know the roles of the other members on their team” (Toler, 2002, p. 105). Effective instructional leadership is not something like a checklist of certain tasks, but it can be viewed as behaviors of school head that are carried out to improve the quality of
teaching and learning in the school. Danley and Burch (1978) supposed the effective principal to be the “master teacher,” making frequent visits to classrooms and providing detailed suggestions for improving the quality of teaching. Southworth (2009) described that modeling is the power of example. Teachers watches their leaders closely and observe wheather their actions are consistent over time and wheather they do as they say, but the effective leaders set an example and use their actions to show how collegues should behave. They prepare themselves to whatever they ask others to do. Therefore principals have to cooperate with teachers to build an atmosphere that values and support successful teaching and learning.

There are many important things for a good school, favorable learning environment, good curriculum, good relations with parents and community but nothing is as important as teacher. What that person knows, believes and can do, has an effect on student learning. How the teacher is motivated to do best in their job totally depends upon the leadership abilities of the principal of the school. Effective school leaders exercise direct or indirect but powerful influence on a school capacity to implement school reforms and improve students’ level of achievement (Smith and Andrews, 1989). A principal energizes his staff to perform better in their jobs by influencing them due to their leadership behaviors. The recognition of teacher efforts by the head of the school provides a stimulus to teachers in performing their jobs. They want that their efforts are appreciated and valued in the delivery of instructions. These expectations motivate them for better job performance. Principal through their words and actions provide instructional leadership to facilitate and promote effective teaching (Afridi, 2007). Although quality of teaching strongly influences and determines the level of students’ achievement, but quality of leadership matters in
determining the motivation of teachers and quality of their teaching (Fullan, 2002). Richard (1992) found in his study that principals positively influenced the teacher’s use of skills and knowledge, and the teaching/learning environment. For the most part, principals affect instruction indirectly, through practices such as the acquisition and allocation of resources, supporting and encouraging staff, enforcing rules for student conduct, or taking personal interest in the professional development process. However, principals can also affect teaching practice directly through teacher supervision and appraisal. According to Shahid (2009) headmaster is the leader of the school and the guide of teachers and students. She/he is the head of teachers and holds the key position and plans, coordinate and organize various programs. Schools are the actual places where teachers practice the art of teaching which they have learnt in the teacher training institutes as a student. As the training programs only put the teachers on the right roads how to overcome the mechanical difficulties of teaching, and provide the right attitude toward their work. The work of these training institutes is completed in the schools in which the teacher begins the practice of their profession. They have to learn in the actual work of teaching, how to apply the principles which they learnt as a student. It is the head teacher of the school a most experienced person, to whom a teacher consults for his/her difficulties which occur during his/her real teaching. Researchers have indicated that principals’ instructional leadership has positive impacts on the classroom practices (Quinn, 2002; Sheppard, 1996). He is there to listen to the doubts and difficulties of teachers, to solve them if possible, or at any rate to offer suggestions for their solution. He is not there merely to pick holes in a teacher’s teaching, but to help him by virtue of his riper experience to solve difficulties, and he can often offer exactly the solution for which the teacher has been searching. The leadership of principal could have positive impact on the teachers’
work performance (Adeyemi, 2010). Principals’ instructional leadership from both formal and informal ways facilitates the variety of pedagogy used by teachers, including those in the school and classroom, help shape teachers’ sense of professional community. Al-ghanabousi and Idris (2010) commented that every single factor that impacts student achievement, researchers have become progressively more interested in the school principal’s practices and instructional leadership skills. Teacher desire to improve teaching skills largely depends upon the leadership of the principal they experience (Coad and Berry, 1998). “Good leaders never ask people to function in ways they’re not equipped to serve” (Toler, 2002, p. 105).

Instructional leadership behaviors have significant effect on the technical core of schools. Research studies shows that principals who express more instructional leadership behaviors take out more satisfaction and performance from teachers, as well as set up a climate that support confidence, risk, and cooperation (Blase and Blase, 1998; Blase and Blase, 1999; Sheppard, 1996). In-depth research studies of instructional leadership from teachers’ perspectives move toward a conclusion that classroom instruction of teachers are positively influenced by the behaviors associated with instructional leadership of principals (Blase and Blase, 1998; House, 1971; Sheppard, 1996). However, Youngs and King (2002) highlighted that “despite an abundance of research on principal leadership, few studies have conceptualized or empirically examined connections among principal leadership, professional development, and school organizational conditions that may influence instructional quality” (p.644). An instructional leader will always use the opportunity to assist
teachers with educational issues, demonstrate new methods, bring new ideas, help to develop understanding of curricula and encourage teachers in their difficult task.

Cheng (1994) concluded that “Principal leadership may have direct effects on organizational performance and teacher performance and then the latter two may have effects on student performance” (p. 296). Sheppard (1996) identified framing school goals, communicating school goals, coordinating the curriculum, supervising and evaluating the progress, monitoring student progress, maintaining high visibility, protecting instructional time, and providing incentives for learning as principal behaviors that contribute to teachers’ professional growth and performance.

In a study on urban high schools (Louis and Miles, 1991) noted that those schools who made improvement in performance, their principals focused on the changes in teachers’ classroom behavior for example classroom management, increased time on task, improved relationships among teachers. Southworth (2009) described that effective leaders set an example and use their actions to show how colleagues should behave. They prepared themselves to whatever they ask others to do.

Jones, et al., (1969) expressed that secondary school head is the administrator official to whom all teachers are directly responsible and he is responsible for promoting teachers’ growth and efficiency and for securing maximum use of supervisory services. They go on to say that it is his/her responsibility for planning the school year and to develop and maintain high morale among his/her faculty members. He/She must understand the nature and purpose of supervision and be able to organize and administer important phases of instruction that demand leadership from the principal.
On the basis of above arguments and opinions expressed by the researchers it is argued that a correlation exists between instructional leadership of secondary school heads’ and teachers performance. There is also a saying that if teachers want to get better the instructions then the skills of teachers should be promoted. Professional development must be carried out and teachers should be required to give evidence of change (Benveniste, 2002).

2.7. Studies on Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Teachers’ Job:

The studies which have been attempted to establish a link between principal leadership and teacher performance have been clustered under this area. Some of the studies in this area are given below:

A study on Principals Instructional leadership role and its effects on teachers’ job performance was investigated by (Enueme and Egwunyenga, 2008) in Nigerian secondary schools to answer the research question, if principal instructional leadership has an effect on teachers job performance. The results of their study indicated that principal classroom instructional leadership practices have a positive and significant relationship with work performance of teachers. They also summarized that school leader (Principal) is often been considered to have an influence on the teachers’ job, because teachers look towards the principals for their professional problems in the schools. If the heads of school effectively play their role as instructional leader, ultimately they effect the performance of their teachers and hence students learning.
Lineburg (2010) conducted a study on the influences of the instructional leadership on changes in teachers’ instructional practices. Teachers from urban, suburban, and rural areas serving in different time zones were included in his study. The study focused on how much change teachers experience in their instructional practices. He identified seven principal influences and fifteen other influences on teachers through interviewing both teachers and principals. The principals influences are communicating goals, promoting professional development, supervision of teaching, issuing directives, and providing support, resources and incentives. Lineburg (2010) found a limited influence of principal instructional leadership on change in teachers’ instructional practices. Promoting professional development got highest mean rating by teachers of the 7 principal influence variables, Issuing directives of principal instructional leadership was significantly related to the change in teachers’ instructional practices. The results of the study showed that there are also other variables which influences the teachers’ instructional practices and they are out of control of principals. However, according to this study, how the school administrator interacts with the staff is even more important in influencing change in instruction.

Sayre (2007) conducted a study on teachers’ views about the superindent instructional leadership and instructional capacity to influence the classroom instructions in the state of Missouri. Teachers from seven school districts completed a questionnaire related to teachers’ perceptions of the superindent’s instructional leadership as well as involvement in their own learning. The perceptions of teachers have an impact on the performance of the school, as they are the key stake holders and have major contribution in achieving the schools’ mission. Because the ultimate
goal of the school is students’ learning, which mostly depends on the content knowledge, skills and pedagogical knowledge of teachers. Results of Sayre (2007) study revealed that teachers’ perceived superindents instructional leadership as an important and powerful component in the development of classroom instructions, which has a significant influence on classroom instructions and professional development. A moderate relationship was found between instructional leadership, instructional practices and individual professional development.

In a study on principals’ leadership styles and teachers job performance in senior secondary schools Adeyemi (2010) tested teachers’ job performance with the principals leadership styles i.e. democratic, autocratic, laissez-faire and got the result that democratic leadership style was the most commonly used leadership style among principals of senior secondary schools. He further found that teachers’ job performance was better in schools where principals used autocratic leadership style as compared to the schools where the principals adapted the democratic or laissez-faire leadership style. Adeyemi (2010) further recommended that principals should use mixture of autocratic and democratic leadership styles to get better job performance from their teachers.

Richard (1992) found in his study that principals positively influenced the respect accorded teachers, teacher participation in decisions affecting their work, professional collaboration and interaction, use of skills and knowledge, and the teaching/learning environment. However, research studies made on the linkage between instructional leadership of secondary school head and teachers’ job performance could not be found in Pakistan. According to Pannah (2008) unlike in
many developed countries where studies on principal leadership styles, competencies are available in multitude, such studies are still at its low ebb in Pakistan.

2.9. Conceptual framework of the study:

The theoretical framework of this study has been explored in the literature discussed earlier. The literature review revealed that in order to make effective secondary schools with high students achievement in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the heads of schools and teachers should recognize the multi dimensions of instructional leadership that are aimed at improving the performance of teachers and hence student achievement. Principals who pose intellectual challenge to teachers stimulate their effort to improve professionally (Bogler, 2001). Working from the premise that instructional leadership should increase the teacher development, Mullins (1971) theory was used to guide the conceptualization of instructional leadership used in the current study. This theory is an explanation for changes that teachers makes in their instruction based on influencing factors, with special emphasis on the influence of high school principals. This theory has two components of influence: (a) Leadership strategies of principals and (b) Other influences on teachers’ classroom practices.

The major interest of this study is in the instructional leadership behaviors of secondary school principals and how these influence the instructional practices that teachers use in their classrooms. When the teachers are performing well in their profession then the students' achievement will also be high. The principals’ primary role is a change agent in the school and to provide the organization and its members
the pathway towards improvement. The other influences which affect teacher performance are beyond the scope of this study.

Figure 2.2 Conceptual Framework for the Study
CHAPTER-3

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents an overview of the research methodology that was used to investigate the teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership of their respective secondary school heads and its relative influence on their job practices. This section of the study includes brief discussion of population, procedure for selection of sample, sample size, followed by instruments of data collection, their descriptions and procedure for data collection, and data organization. The investigation under various captions has been discussed as follows:

3.1. Population:

The focal point of this study was public sector Secondary Schools in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, so all the male and female SST’s working in the year 2009-2010 in the public sector secondary schools of province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa were the population of the study.

According to Education Management Information System (EMIS, 2009-10) report, there are 1697 functional secondary schools with 1200 boys and 497 girls’ schools in the province. These schools were further categorized by location as urban (n= 226) area schools and rural area (n=1471) schools. There are total 4488 SST’s on job with a division of 3262 male and 1226 females’ teachers.

3.2. Sampling Procedure and sample size:

The desired information is generally gathered from representative population while keeping in view the time and resources. The present study was concerned with
the investigation of instructional leadership of secondary school heads of province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and its relative influence on teachers’ job practices. All the secondary school teachers of province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa would constitute the population but it was difficult to collect data from the entire population. Therefore, investigation was carried out in a sample that would represent the population relevant with the study. Stratified random sampling technique was used for the selection of sample. The advantage of stratified random sampling technique is that it ensures specific groups representation proportionally in the sample e.g. by gender and location (Black, 1999). It was done through several stages. First of all districts were selected as mentioned below

The province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa consists of 7 administrative divisions which covers 24 districts.

Table-3.1 Division and District wise Distribution of Province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bannu</td>
<td>Bannu, Laki Marwat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dera Ismail Khan</td>
<td>Dera Ismail Khan, Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazara</td>
<td>Abbottabad, Haripur, Manshera, Battagram, Kohistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malakand</td>
<td>Chitral, Dir upper, Dir lower, Swat, Malakand, Shangla, Bunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>Peshawar, Nowshera,Charsda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohat</td>
<td>Kohat, Karak, Hangu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardan</td>
<td>Mardan, Swabi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/khyberPakhtunkhwa

The researcher selected two districts from each division. Bannu, Dera Ismail Khan and Mardan divisions have only two districts, so they were directly selected. For the remaining divisions, two districts from each division were randomly selected. The other selected districts were Abbottabad, Manshera, Chitral, Swat, Peshawar, Nowshera, Kohat and Hangu from Hazara, Malakand, Peshawar, and Kohat respectively.

In the second stage the researcher focused on the selection of schools. For this purpose (EMIS, 2009-10) report prepared by the Elementary and Secondary Education Department was used. As per school census report the schools were categorized as urban boys’ high schools, urban girls’ high schools, rural boys’ high school and rural girls' high schools for each district. Two schools from each stratum were randomly selected for each district, thus the selected number of schools from
each district were 8. Hence, the total numbers of schools selected for this study were 112. A list of schools by gender and location is presented in Appendix-F.

In the third and last stage, the senior secondary school teachers SST (G) and SST (Sc) teachers were selected. For this purpose, a list was procured from EMIS office, consisted of teacher’s name, location and school address. There was 4488 SST’s (3262 Male and 1226 Female) working in the public sector schools (EMIS, 2009-10). The sample consisted of 387 male and 263 female teachers. The sampling frame is exhibited in figure below:

Figure-3.1 Illustration of the Sampling Frame by Location and Gender from selected Districts of KPK Province

3.3. Rationale for selection of sample:

A survey approach was considered appropriate due to wide geographical area. SST-G and SST-Sc were selected because of their potential to respond to the
instruments of the study. They were experienced and in a better position to share their views about school head as well as to reflect on their own job practices. Furthermore, they have the opportunities to work in different environment during their carrier, so collecting data from SSTs’ working under the secondary school heads were considered as the best source for this specific research. Moreover, it was also believed that these were senior practicing teachers in the school so they can provide the appropriate information and there is a need to know the teacher perspective.

### 3.4. Instruments for data collection:

Following two instruments were used for the collection of data.

1. Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (ILQ)
2. Teacher Job Performance Scale (TJPS)

Instructional leadership questionnaire was used to ascertain the instructional leadership of public sector secondary schools heads as perceived by their working teachers. ILQ was developed by the researcher (See Appendix-B).

Teacher job performance scale was adapted from a previous study (Hanif, 2004) and was administered to teachers’ for their self-evaluation of job. Permission to use the TJPS was obtained from the author (Appendix-D).

These instruments are characterized as under:

### 3.5. Instructional Leadership Questionnaire:

Instructional leadership questionnaire had two parts. Part “A” consisted of questions for collecting demographic information of teachers such as age, gender, academic qualification, and professional qualification, location of school, and total experience as secondary school teacher, and experience with present school head. Part
“B” was developed by exploring the available literature on instructional leadership i.e. books, thesis, research papers and other existing concerned literature (Blase and Blase, 1999; Blase and Blase, 2004; Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, 2001; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985; Hallinger and Heck, 1996; Heck, 1992; Murphy, 1990). ILQ was based on five functions of the instructional leadership including; formulating educational objectives for school, providing learning environment, protecting instructional time, supervising and monitoring the progress and promoting professional development. These functions were preferred because they are related to effective teaching; reflect the needs of Pakistani context and frequently discussed in leadership literature. The scale was developed on 5 point Liker type scale format. The response category varies from “Always” to “Never”. Scoring used for the instrument was; Always 5, Frequently 4, Occasionally 3, Seldom 2, Never as 1. The score was reversed in case of negative statement.

The research instrument was made standardized and it was ensured that each respondent would interpret each item in the same way. The items were also kept simple, short and objective. Each item was presented in such a way that the respondents could give their opinion regarding the extent to which principal demonstrates definite instructional leadership behavior as per statement. The tool developed for this study consisted of 30 items. It took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

3.5.1 Validity of Instructional Leadership Questionnaire:

Initially 70 statements were identified by the researcher, compiled them in a logical sequence, and sent to 20 experts of the field for content validation. These experts included working experienced teachers, retired school principals, teachers of
Institute of Education and Research, Ph.D scholars and trainers in the field of education. Participants were asked to provide feedback keeping in view the following areas: (a) relevance of items with the functions; (b) relevance of items with Pakistani context; (c) clarity (d) repeated/redundant items.

After receiving the feedback the adapted criteria for an item to be acceptable was, if it had to attain the census by 80% of the experts. Thirteen items were dropped because majority of the expert considered them that they did not best fit in our existing education setup and 7 more were dropped as they were repeating the concepts. Thirteen more statements were dropped, as they do not receive a consensus of more than 80% of the experts. Eight statements were re-written. The format of questionnaire was also discussed with the experts. After incorporating the feedback from content and methodological reviewers ILQ was piloted on a representative sample.

For pilot testing the researcher sent the questionnaire to the randomly selected 80 senior teachers of the secondary schools in the district Dera Ismail khan. Twenty teachers were recruited from each stratum i.e. rural, urban, male, and female.

Principal Axis factoring with varimax rotation method was performed to examine construct of the extracting factors.Coefficients with absolute values less than .40 have been suppressed. Seven items were discarded, as they did not strongly load on the factors greater than .40 (Khan, 2010). Six items from each function with highest scores were included in the questionnaire. The components of instructional leadership to be studied included:

1. **Formulating Educational Objectives for School:**

   This function refers to the instructional leader’s responsibility of developing vision, aims and objectives that everyone can understand in consultation with staff
members, and formulating high expectation and intellectual engagement of teachers and students.

2. *Providing Learning Environment:*

This function of instructional leadership make sure that the conditions and incentives are provided in school to maintain a conducive learning environment for learners, that fully support the teaching and learning.

3. *Protecting Instructional Time:*

This function covers that aspect of instructional leadership that is related to availability of sufficient and an adequate amount of time for teaching learning process, as shortage of time affect student learning negatively and they become scant and feel fatigue.

4. *Supervising and Monitoring the Progress:*

This function of instructional leadership provides an opportunity for the school head to remain in touch with what is going on in the classroom, what teachers are doing and to show a personal interest and be aware of their needs, concerns and achievements. It also provides a personal contact between teachers and school heads and enables the school head to give feedback and encourage teachers in effective way to secure good teaching.

5. *Promoting Professional Development:*

This function of instructional leadership provides teachers the necessary support, guidance and helping them in improving their skills and performance. Professional
development involves a change in the knowledge, behavior, understanding or attitude of group of peoples. Instructional leader arranges staff development programs that are coupled with the progress of teaching and learning.

**3.5.2 Reliability of Instructional Leadership Questionnaire:**

For measuring reliability of ILQ, item total correlation, inter scale correlation and Cronbach alpha values were computed. Table 3.2 presents results of item-total correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P <0.01 level (2-tailed)**

The correlation coefficient ranges from .40 to .85, which validate that all items are consistent with the total score of the scale.
Table-3.3 illustrates the inter scale correlation between the functions of Instructional leadership as well as with the total score of the instrument.

**Table-3.3 Inter scale correlation of Instructional Leadership Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Formulating Educational Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Developing Learning atmosphere</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Protecting Instructional time</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Supervising and Monitoring the Progress</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Promoting Professional development</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P< 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

It is evident that all the functions of the instrument are significantly correlated with each other as well as with the total score of the instrument. Defining mission and vision and developing learning atmosphere have highest correlation (.84), while protecting instructional time and defining mission and vision have lowest correlation (.64).

**Table-3.4 Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability of Instructional leadership Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Alpha Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulating Educational Objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Learning atmosphere</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Instructional time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising and Monitoring the Progress</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Professional development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-3.4 depicts the reliability analysis for ILQ. The alpha value ranges from .83 to .88, while this value for the whole scale is .96.

### 3.6 Teacher Job Performance Scale:

This scale was developed by Hanif (2004) for her study on teachers’ job performance in Pakistan, and named it as Teacher Job Performance Scale (TJPS). Request for use of TJPS has been presented in Appendix-C. The items relates to the amount of performance, the secondary school teachers drive from their job activities in the schools. The scale consisted of 25 items, covers four facets of teachers’ job i.e. teaching skills, management skills, interpersonal skills and discipline and regularity. The scale was designed on a 5 point Likert scale format with response categories “Always”, “Frequently”, “Occasionally”, “Seldom” and “Never”. Scoring was obtained by alloting a score of 5 to “Always” response, a score of 4 “Frequently”, and so on while negatively worded items were scored in the opposite direction with “Never” assigning a score of one. The numbers of items for the TJPS on each sub scale are as follows;

- a) Teaching Skills (6 items)
- b) Management Skills (5 items)
- c) Discipline and Regularity (7 items)
- d) Interpersonal Relations (7 items)

Cronbach’s alpha value for each of the four sub scales teaching skills, management skills, discipline and Regularity, Interpersonal relations and full scale was .56, .58, .51, .50 and .71 respectively (Hanif, 2004). Furthermore, this tool was
validated in our local context. A copy of the Teacher Job Performance Scale has been presented in Appendix-E.

3.7. Procedure for Data Collection:

Two questionnaires along with letter of request were sent to teachers by postal mail and through personal contacts. Both the questionnaires have clear directions on its first page for respondents. The letter of request (Appendix-A) clearly indicated that the responses obtained through these questionnaires would only be used for research purpose and would not be used for any other purpose.

The process of data collection was interrupted due to most sever flood (July 2010) in the history of the country. The provincial Government had extended summer vacations in the flood-hit areas of the province as the schools in some districts like Nowshera, Charsadda and Peshawar were still occupied by the Internally Displaced Peoples (IDPs). The Provincial Minister of Education declared that the flood and monsoon rains damaged about 900 schools, of which 200 destroyed and 700 partially damaged. Education Minister appealed to the affected families to voluntarily vacate the school buildings for the sake of future of thousands of school children. However, Government decided to resume classes in the flood affected areas by shifting the students to nearby schools, tented schools or by hiring rented building or by starting second shifts in the schools.

Of the 650 distributed questionnaire 493 respondents returned the useable questionnaire with an overall response rate of 76%.
3.8. **Data Organization:**

An identification code was assigned to each respondent’s questionnaires on the top right corner to easily check in the case of any discrepancy. The score of instructional leadership questionnaire of each respondent was calculated for whole scale as ILQ total score as well as the score for each of its five instructional leadership functions. Similarly, TJPS total score as well as score for its 4 categories was calculated for each respondent.

3.9. **Statistical Procedures for Data Analysis:**

Data collected through questionnaires were analyzed by using the statistical package for social sciences SPSS version 16 for Windows 2007. The following statistical techniques were used for analysis:

a. Descriptive statistics like Mean, and Standard Deviation were computed for each of the function of ILQ and for whole scale (Research question one).

b. Independent sample \( t \)-test was used to make comparisons across locality and gender wise difference (Research question two) and (Research question three).

c. A correlation analysis was employed to explore associations between instructional leadership and teacher job performance (Research question four).

d. A linear regression analysis was used to explore the contribution of instructional leadership to teacher job performance (Research question five).
The scores of instructional leadership and teachers’ job performance were analyzed with the help of following statistical procedure:

1. **Mean:**

Mean was calculated from the obtained score of ILQ for knowing the present level of secondary school heads instructional leadership. Mangal (2004) defined mean as the sum of all the values of the items in a series divided by the number of items. It is represented by “M”. The formula used for calculating the mean of an ungrouped data is

\[ M = \frac{\sum X}{N} \]

Where \( \sum X \) = sum of the scores

\( N \) = total number of the series.

The Mean was calculated for whole scale as well as for all the five functions of instructional leadership. The decision rules are as follow:

Any score that falls between

- 0 to 1.49 = very low extent,
- 1.50 to 2.49 = low extent,
- 2.50 to 3.49 = Moderate extent,
- 3.50 to 3.99 = high extent,
- 4.00 to 5.00 = very high extent.

2. **Standard Deviations (SD):**

Standard deviation is considered as the most stable and reliable measure of variability as it employs the means for its computation. Mangal (2004) defined
standard deviation as “the square root of the average of the squares of the deviations of each score from the mean” (p. 71).

The formula has been used for calculating standard deviation has been given below:

\[
SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X - M)^2}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N}}
\]

Where

- \(X\) = individual score
- \(M\) = Mean of the given set of the scores
- \(N\) = Total No.
- \(x\) = Deviation of each score from the Mean.

Mangal (2004) recommended the use of Standard deviation when:

1. We need a most reliable measure of variability;
2. There is a need of computation of the correlation coefficients, significance difference of Means and the like;
3. Measure of central tendency is available in the form of Means;
4. The distribution is normal or near to normal.

**3. Independent Sample T-test:**

The Independent-Samples T Test procedure compares means for two groups of cases. Ideally, for this test, the subjects should be randomly assigned to two groups. In such situations, it is to ensure that differences in other factors are not masking or enhancing a significant difference in means.
The formula for \( t \)-test if the samples are related i.e. two measures from the same subject is

\[
t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2} - 2r \frac{S_1}{\sqrt{n_1}} \frac{S_2}{\sqrt{n_2}}}\}
\]

Where

\( \bar{X}_1 \) = Mean of sample 1

\( \bar{X}_2 \) = Mean of sample 2

\( n_1 \) = number of subjects in sample 1

\( n_2 \) = number of subjects in sample 2

\( S_1^2 \) = Variance of sample 1 = \( \frac{\Sigma(x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2}{n_1} \)

\( S_2^2 \) = Variance of sample 2 = \( \frac{\Sigma(x_2 - \bar{x}_2)^2}{n_2} \)

4. Correlation:

The linear coefficients of correlation were calculated for determining the degree of relationship between the dependent variable (Teachers’ performance) and independent variable (Instructional leadership). Product Moment Method was used to determine the coefficient of correlation and its symbol is \( r \). A correlation coefficient provides a concise, quantitative summary of the relationship between two sets of scores. According to Moore (2000) “the correlation measures the direction and strength of the linear relationship between two quantitative variables” (p.98). Lien (1976) defined correlation as “it is the degree of relationship which exists between two sets of scores” (p.68). Mangal (2004) explained that correlation clearly reveals that how the change in one variable is accompanied by a change in the other or to
what extent increase or decrease in one is accompanied by the increase or decrease in
the other. The correlation between two sets of scores or variables can be positive or
negative. It is said to be positive when an increase (or decrease) in one corresponds to
an increase (or decrease) in the other. The range of correlation is from -1.00 (perfect
negative correlation) to +1.00 (perfect positive correlation).

Range of correlation = -1--------0----------+1

The correlation can vary from perfect positive +1.00 to -1.00, perfect negative
correlation. As the coefficient increases from 0.00 to +1.00, the relationship becomes
greater, as it approaches -1.00, it also becomes greater, but in the negative direction.

The formula used for calculating coefficient of correlation has been given below:

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{\Sigma xy}{N\sigma_x\sigma_y} \]

Where \( r_{xy} \) = coefficient of correlation between two sets of scores i.e. X and Y.

\( x \) = Deviation of any X-score from the mean in test X.

\( y \) = Deviation of the corresponding Y-score from the mean in test Y.

\( \Sigma xy \) = Sum of all the products of deviation (each x deviation multiplied by its
corresponding y deviation).

\( \sigma_x \) = Standard deviation of the distribution of scores in variable X

\( \sigma_y \) = Standard deviation of the distribution of scores in variable Y

\( N \) = Number of cases
**Interpretation of the computed correlation coefficient:**

A common guide given by (Mangal, 2004), for interpreting a coefficient of correlation, is as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>± 0 (Zero value)</td>
<td>Zero correlation, no relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.00 to ±0.20</td>
<td>Slight, almost negligible relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.21 to ±0.40</td>
<td>Low correlation, small relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.41 to ±0.70</td>
<td>Moderate correlations, moderate relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.71 to ±0.90</td>
<td>High correlation, marked relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.91 to ±0.99</td>
<td>Very high correlation, quite dependable relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 1</td>
<td>Perfect correlation, almost identical or opposite relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mangal (2004) further pointed out that first of all sign of correlation coefficient should be taken into consideration. A positive sign tells about the existence of positive correlation between two variables while the negative sign indicates the negative correlation. Minimum absolute values of r required to be statistically significant at 0.05 levels for various sample size (N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size (N)</th>
<th>Minimum r for statistically significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Lien, 1976, p.72)
5. Linear Regression:

Linear Regression is based on one dependent variable and one independent variable. In this study, independent variable was teachers’ perception of instructional leadership of their respective school heads and dependent variable was their performance on the job. A linear regression analysis is the best technique for describing the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable using a regression line (Pavkov and Pierce, 1997). In regression analysis, the impact of the independent variable upon the dependent variable is assessed by using the coefficient of each variable. The larger the coefficient of determination, the larger the effect upon dependent variable.

Regression investigates the dependence of one variable on the other, and provides an equation to be used for estimating the average value of the dependent variable from known value of the independent variables. In Regression Analysis, there is a single quantitative dependent variable. Although the independent variables can be either categorical or quantitative “Regression describes a relationship between an explanatory variable and a response variable” (p.106, Moore, 2000). It determines not only whether variables are related, but also the degree to which they are related. The relation between the expected value of the dependent variable and the independent variables is called a regression relation.

The basic idea of Simple Regression is that you obtain a “regression equation”. The regression equation defines the “regression line” that best fits a pattern of observations. A “regression line” is a straight line describes how a response variable y changes an explanatory variable x for a given value of x. The two important characteristics of any line (including a regression line) are the slop of the line and the
y-intercept of the line. The slop b of a regression line is usually important for the interpretation of the data. The slop is the rate of change, the amount of change in Ŷ when x increases by 1. The intercept (a) of the regression line is the value of y when x = 0. Although we need the value of the intercept to draw the line, it is statistically meaningful only when x can actually take values close to zero.

The slop b and the intercept (a) are the two key components of the regression equation. The simple regression equation formula is as under:

\[
\hat{Y} = a + bx
\]

Where

\- Ŷ = predicted value of the dependent variable
\- a = y- intercept
\- b = regression coefficient or slop, and
\- x= single independent variable.

An alpha level of .05 was set as the level of significance for this study.
CHAPTER- 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents the results of the survey study, which was carried out to investigate the extent to which secondary school heads’ exercise instructional leadership practices in public sector schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and their influence on secondary school teachers’ job.

Specific quantitative research methods including descriptive data as well as correlational data were used in the study. Descriptive data permitted the investigator to identify current conditions of Secondary School heads’ instructional leadership, while correlational data were analyzed to investigate the relationship between components of instructional leadership and its impact on teachers’ job performance. Likert-type scales were used to collect data regarding teachers’ perception of instructional leadership that secondary school heads’ exhibit and their influence on teachers to do the job. The responses to 30 statements on the instructional leadership questionnaire (ILQ) survey were analyzed as total ILQ scores. Besides, the scores for each of the five leadership practices measured by the ILQ survey were analyzed. Similarly the responses to the teacher job performance scale were totaled for the whole scale as well as for four categories. The results of this research study are presented in the following order.

(i) Descriptive profiles of the respondents are illustrated,

(ii) A description of the statistical analysis.
Table-4.1 Gender Wise Distribution of Secondary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No of Secondary School Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>62.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>37.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 309 (76% of the returned survey) teachers reporting gender, 173 (35%) and 136 (27%) are male teachers serving in the urban and rural areas respectively, while out of total 184 female teachers 113 (23%) serving in the urban areas, while 71 (14%) serving in the rural areas.

Table-4.2 Age Wise Distribution of Secondary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>No of Secondary School Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-40</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-48</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to age table 4.2 illustrates that the age of the teachers’ respondents ranged from 24 years to 58 years. Sixty two percent of the respondents belonged to age group under 40, indicating that a large number of teachers belonged to youngest age group.
Table-4.3 Academic Qualification of Secondary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>No of Secondary School Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.3 above shows that 87 percent teachers are master degree holders against 13 percent who holds bachelor degree.

Table-4.4 Professional Qualification of Secondary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualification</th>
<th>No of Secondary School Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil Degree</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.4 above shows that 60 percent teachers hold master degree in education followed by 39 percent teachers with bachelor degree in education and less than 1 percent hold master of philosophy in education.
Table 4.5 Experience Wise Distribution of Secondary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>No of Secondary School Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 furnishes details with regard to teaching experience, 44 percent of teachers had teaching experience of less than 8 years, 36 percent between 9-16 years, 9 percent between 17-24 years and 11 percent between 25-33 years. Overall, the range of total experience was from 1 to 33 years with a Mean of 12.

Table 4.6 Years of Experience of Secondary School Teachers at Present School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience (Present School)</th>
<th>No of Secondary School Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that the 71 percent teachers fall in the category of 1-3 years followed by 23 percent in 4-6 years, and 5 percent of teachers have a service of 7-9 years in the present school. Very little only 01 percent sampled teachers have an experience of 10-12 years at present school.
The researcher sought an answer to research question # 1 which was “What are the present levels of instructional leadership of secondary school heads according to teachers’ perceptions at secondary school level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa?”

The instructional leadership questionnaire (ILQ) scores of respondents were analysed by using the SPSS statistical software package. The following tables illustrate the mean score and standard Deviation of each instructional leadership function of secondary school heads’ as perceived by teachers.

Table-4.7 Teachers’ Perceptions on the Aspect of Formulating Educational Objectives for School as Employed by Secondary School Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consults teachers on subject interest for planning school time table</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigns duties to teachers in accordance with educational objectives of school</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes plan for improving educational standard of school</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds discussion about academic progress of students in the staff meeting</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls staff meeting to set academic targets</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops collective vision for school by involving staff members</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-4.7 illustrates the ranking of all 6 items with their Means and standard deviations of each item on the aspect of formulating educational objectives of instructional leadership. The secondary school heads consult teachers about their subject interest in planning school time table to high extent (M=3.86). The next four items in the function of setting educational objectives, practiced at moderate level by secondary school heads with a Mean scores of 3.43, 2.98, 2.90 and 2.71 respectively. The practice with lowest mean score of 2.43 is that the school heads develop collective vision for school by involving staff members. Overall the Mean score of all items which constitute the function of formulating educational objectives for school falls in the category of moderate extent with a Mean score of 3.05.

Table-4.8 Teachers’ Perceptions on the Aspect of Providing Learning Environment as Employed by Secondary School Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives enough autonomy to teachers in instructional work</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers for their innovative approaches in teaching</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors teachers’ opinions and ideas</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops working relationships among teachers</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates teachers for their work related to student engagement</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps teachers to solve their teaching problems</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-4.8 indicates the ranking of all 6 items with their Means and standard deviations of each item, overall Mean and standard deviation on the aspect of providing learning environment as pointed out by secondary school teachers. The most common practices of school heads are, giving enough autonomy to teachers in instructional work and encouraging teachers for their innovative approaches in teaching with a Mean score of 3.86 and 3.81 respectively. These two aspects of instructional leadership fall in the region of high extent. Appreciating the teachers for their engagement in student work and helping them in solving their teaching problems, these two areas of instructional leadership are practiced by secondary school heads at moderate level with a Mean score of 3.36 and 3.22 respectively. Overall the Mean of the learning environment function is 3.59 which fall in the high extent region of instructional leadership.
Table-4.9 illustrates the ranking of all 6 items with Means and standard deviations of each item on the aspect of protecting instructional time. The perceived measures of instructional leadership to high extent by the secondary school heads are; the arrangement of alternate setup in case of teacher absence, avoidance of teacher interruption during teaching hours, readiness for interaction with teachers and implementation of school rules for effective use of instructional time with a Mean scores of 3.92, 3.88, 3.82, and 3.78 respectively. The secondary school heads restrict the interruption of time consuming activities affecting teaching learning process at moderate level with a Mean of 2.71. The practice with lowest Mean score of 2.35 is
the interaction of the heads with the teachers about classroom activities. Overall the Mean score of all the items which constitutes the function of protecting instructional time fall in the region of moderate extent with a Mean score of 3.41.

Table-4.10 Teachers’ Perceptions on the Aspect of Supervising and Monitoring the Progress as Employed by Secondary School Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates the teaching according to syllabus break up</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheeks test results of students for their learning outcomes</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits class rooms to monitor teaching learning process</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide feedback to teachers after class room observation</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares teaching strategies with teachers for improvement in instruction</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observes teachers’ lesson planning and use of audio visual aids</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.10 depicts the ranking of all 6 items with Means and standard deviations of each item, overall Mean and standard deviation on the aspect of supervising and monitoring the progress. The most common practice of school heads is to evaluate the teaching according to syllabus break up followed by checking the results of students for their learning outcomes, with a Mean score of 3.47 and 3.15 respectively. These two aspects fall in the region of moderate extent. Discussing teaching strategies with teachers for improvement of instruction and observation of
teachers’ lesson plan and use of audio visual aids are those areas of secondary school heads that were least practiced with Mean scores of 2.40 and 2.34 respectively. Overall the Mean of the supervising and monitoring the progress is 2.86, falls in the moderate extent region of instructional leadership.

Table-4.11 Teachers’ Perceptions on the Aspect of Promoting Professional Development as Employed by Secondary School Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to improve professional qualification</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominates teachers for in-service training on need basis, whenever program is available</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides teachers to improve their teaching skills</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports teachers for use of skills acquired during in-service training</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage collaborative learning among teachers</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses matters of professional development whenever he/she meets teachers</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.11 shows the ranking of all 6 items with Means and standard deviations of each item on the aspect of promoting professional development of secondary school heads as perceived by their teachers. The practices viewed to high extent by secondary school teachers about their heads are; encouragement of teachers to improve their professional qualification, nomination of teachers for in-service
training on need basis whenever program is available with Mean scores of 3.84 and 3.66 respectively. The practice with lowest mean score of 2.39 is the heads of school do not discusses matters of professional development whenever they meet with teachers. Another practice with second lowest Mean score is school heads do not encourage teachers for collaborative learning. Overall the Mean score of all items which constitutes the function of promoting professional development as employed by school heads lies in the category of moderate extent with a Mean score of 3.08.

Table-4.12  Mean and Standard Deviation of ILQ and its Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing learning environment</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting instructional time</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting professional development</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating educational objectives</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising and monitoring the progress</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.12 shows the Mean and standard deviations of ILQ as well as all of its five functions, clearly indicating that instructional leadership function providing learning environment (M = 3.59) got higher value than any of other four functions, falls in the mean category of high extent. The overall Mean of ILQ (M=3.19) falls in the category of moderate extent.
To investigate the research question # 2 “Is there any significant difference in the instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads as perceived by their teachers?” The researcher used independent sample t-test as statistical technique to answer this question. The following tables illustrate the perceptions of secondary school teachers in each function of the instructional leadership of their schools’ head.

Table-4.13 Gender Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Formulating Educational Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>-3.90</td>
<td>313.328</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>4.453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.13 shows that in the function of instructional leadership related to formulating educational objectives, the significant value (.000) generated by t-test is lower than alpha level 0.05, which indicates that there is a significant difference between the instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads regarding the formulating educational objectives for school according to their teachers’ perceptions. Mean score of female teachers (M=19.26) is higher than male teachers (M=17.76), which indicates that female school heads are perceived better instructional leaders as compared to their male counterparts in the function of formulating educational objectives for school.
Table-4.14 Gender Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Developing Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>3.606</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.14 depicts that in the function of instructional leadership related to developing learning environment, the significant value generated by $t$-test (.004) is lower than alpha level 0.05, which indicates that there is a significant difference between the instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads regarding the developing learning environment according to their teachers’ perception. Mean score of female teachers (M=22.14) is greater than male teachers (M=21.19), which exhibits that female school heads are perceived better instructional leaders as compared to their male counterparts in the function of developing learning environment.

Table-4.15 Gender Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Protecting Instructional Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>-1.280</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>4.310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.15 illustrates that in the function of instructional leadership related to protecting instructional time, the significant value generated by $t$-test (.201) is greater than alpha level 0.05, which indicates that there is insignificant difference between the
instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads regarding the protecting instructional time function as perceived by their teachers.

Table-4.16 Gender Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Supervising and Monitoring the Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>3.736</td>
<td>-4.357</td>
<td>307.659</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>4.940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.16 shows the testing of significant difference between the perceptions of male and female secondary school teachers about the instructional leadership of their school heads regarding the function of supervising and monitoring the progress. The significant value generated by $t$-test (.000) is less than the alpha value .05, which clearly indicates that there is a significant difference in the instructional leadership of male and female school heads in the area of supervising and monitoring the progress. Mean score of female teachers (M=19.29) is higher than male teachers (M=17.46), which shows that female heads are better instructional leaders as compared to their male counterparts in the function of supervising and monitoring the progress.

Table-4.17 Gender Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Promoting Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>3.797</td>
<td>-2.145</td>
<td>341.845</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>4.393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-4.17 reveals the instructional leadership of secondary school heads in the function of promoting professional development as perceived by their teachers. The generated value of \( t \)-test (.063) is greater than the alpha level (.05), which indicates that there is insignificant difference between the instructional leadership practices of male and female secondary school heads in the function of promoting professional development.

Table-4.18 Gender Wise Difference in the overall Instructional Leadership score of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>96.83</td>
<td>14.804</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>340.571</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-5.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>102.45</td>
<td>17.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.18 shows the testing of significant difference between the perceptions of male and female secondary school teachers about the overall instructional leadership score. The significant value generated by \( t \)-test (.000) is less than the alpha value (.05), indicating that there is a significant difference in the total instructional leadership score of male and female school heads. Mean score of female teachers (M=102.45) is higher than the male teachers (M=96.83), depicting the picture that instructional leadership of female secondary school heads is better than their male counterparts.
To investigate the research question # 3 “Is there any significant difference in secondary school heads’ instructional leadership in the rural and urban areas as perceived by teachers?” The researcher used independent sample t-test as statistical technique to answer this research question. The following tables illustrate the perceptions of secondary school teachers in each function of the instructional leadership of their respective secondary schools’ head in rural and urban areas.

Table-4.19 Locality Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Formulating Educational Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>4.095</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.19 depicts the secondary school heads instructional leadership function related to formulating educational objectives for school in rural and urban areas. The generated value of \( t \)-test (.072) is greater than the alpha level (.05), which indicates that there is insignificant difference in this function of instructional leadership in rural and urban areas.

Table-4.20 Locality Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Developing Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>3.366</td>
<td>-.474</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>-.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>3.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-4.20 illustrates the testing of significant difference between the perceptions of secondary school teachers about the instructional leadership of their school heads regarding the function of developing learning environment in rural and urban areas. The significant value generated by $t$-test (.636) is greater than alpha level (.05), which reveals that there is no significant difference in the instructional leadership function developing learning environment of secondary school heads in rural and urban areas.

Table-4.21  Locality Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Protecting Instructional Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>4.175</td>
<td>-5.88</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-2.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>4.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.21 illustrates that in the function of instructional leadership related to protecting instructional time, the significant value generated by $t$-test (.07) is greater than alpha value (.05), which indicates that there is no significant difference in the instructional leadership function of protecting instructional time in rural and urban areas.
Table-4.22 Locality Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Supervising and Monitoring the Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>3.949</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>474.636</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>4.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.22 shows the testing of significant difference between the perception of teachers about the instructional function supervising and monitoring the progress of their school heads in rural and urban areas. The significant value generated by \( t \)-test (.061) is greater than alpha value (.05), which indicates that there is no significant difference in instructional leadership function supervising and monitoring the progress in rural and urban areas.

Table-4.23 Locality Wise Difference in the Instructional Leadership of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers on the Aspect of Promoting Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>3.956</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>-.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>4.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.23 reveals the instructional leadership of secondary school heads in the function of promoting professional development as perceived by their teachers in rural and urban areas. The generated value of \( t \)-test (.220) is greater than the alpha value (.05), which indicates that there is no significant difference in the professional practices of school heads in rural and urban areas of the province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
Table 4.24: Locality Wise Difference in the Overall Instructional Leadership score of Secondary School Heads as Perceived by their Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>96.48</td>
<td>15.881</td>
<td>-2.91</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-4.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100.69</td>
<td>15.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24 shows the testing of significant difference between the perceptions of secondary school teachers regarding overall instructional leadership score of school heads in rural and urban areas. The significant value generated by $t$-test (.08) is greater than alpha value (.05), which indicates that there is no significant difference in the overall instructional leadership of secondary school heads in rural and urban areas.
The researcher sought an answer to research question # 4 which was, “Is there any significant relationship between instructional leadership and teacher job performance as perceived by teachers?”

Before running statistical test, the individual respondent scores were computed for each ILQ and TJPS. Correlations were used to determine the possible linear relationship between instructional leadership and teachers’ job performance.

Table 4.25 Correlation between Instructional leadership and Teacher Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Value</th>
<th>Teaching Skills</th>
<th>Management Skills</th>
<th>Discipline Regularity</th>
<th>Interpersonal Skills</th>
<th>TJPS Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILQ (F1)</td>
<td>r 0.222*</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.220*</td>
<td>0.479*</td>
<td>0.393*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILQ (F2)</td>
<td>r 0.186*</td>
<td>0.233*</td>
<td>0.396*</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.417*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILQ (F3)</td>
<td>r 0.067</td>
<td>0.189*</td>
<td>0.709*</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.486*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILQ (F4)</td>
<td>r 0.357*</td>
<td>0.240*</td>
<td>0.273*</td>
<td>0.386*</td>
<td>0.504*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILQ (F5)</td>
<td>r 0.360*</td>
<td>0.294*</td>
<td>0.349*</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
<td>0.509*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILQ (Total)</td>
<td>r 0.321*</td>
<td>0.275*</td>
<td>0.506*</td>
<td>0.294*</td>
<td>0.608*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 levels.

Table 4.25 depicts the total instructional leadership score and all of its five functions with total teachers’ job performance score and all of its categories at .05 levels of significance. The value of “r” between the total score of both the scales was .608, indicating a significant moderate correlation exists between teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership and their job performance. Further all the functions of ILQ were significantly correlated with TJPS (Total) and all of its
categories. TJPS score in the category of discipline and regularity was moderately correlated to ILQ total \( (r=0.506) \) as compared to teaching skills, interpersonal skills, and management skills, showing low correlation with the coefficient of correlations 0.321, 0.294, and 0.275 respectively.

There are three categories of TJPS i.e. teaching skills, interpersonal skills and discipline and regularity, showing significant correlation with the ILQ function of formulating educational objective for school. For the second function, providing learning environment of ILQ there are three significant correlations with the categories of TJPS. These significant correlations were with the teaching skills, management skills and discipline and regularity, the strength of coefficient of correlation was stronger in discipline and regularity as compared to teaching skills and management skills. The third function of ILQ i.e. protecting instructional time was significantly correlated with management skills and discipline and regularity. The strength of correlation between protecting instructional time and discipline and regularity \( (r=0.709) \), has higher value than all the correlations i.e. high correlation. For the fourth function of ILQ i.e. supervising and monitoring the progress there are significant correlations with all the categories of TJPS as well as TJPS total. The fifth and final function of ILQ i.e. promoting professional development also shows significant correlation with all the categories of TJPS total and its categories.
Table-4.26 illustrates the relationship of demographic variables of secondary school teachers with their perceptions about the instructional leadership of their respective school heads. The variables like teacher’s age and academic qualification of teachers show no relationship with the perceived instructional leadership of school head. Experience of teacher at present school and teacher gender revealed low positive relationship with their perceptions about secondary school head instructional leadership.
The researcher sought an answer to research question # 5 which was, “To what extents do teachers’ perceptions of secondary school heads’ instructional leadership practices promote their job performance?” The coefficient of determination, or $r^2$, was calculated from each Pearson $r$ value. This coefficient is an indication of what percent of the variance in the two variables is common variance. The results drawn from statistical analysis are presented in the following tables.

Table-4.27  Linear Regression Analysis of Instructional Leadership Function Formulating Educational Objectives with Teacher Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(Constant)</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating Educational Objectives</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05

Table-4.27 shows the results of the linear regression analysis for the instructional leadership function formulating educational objectives with the teacher job survey score. The results showed that secondary school heads’ instructional leadership function formulating educational objective as perceived by teachers was a significant predictor ($R^2 = .154, P < .05$) of teacher job performance. In other words the results indicated that secondary school heads’ instructional leadership as perceived by teachers explained about 15% of total variance in the teachers’ job performance.
Table-4.28  Linear Regression Analysis of Instructional Leadership Function Providing Learning Environment with Teacher Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>69.729</td>
<td>2.427</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.734</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>10.169</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05

Table-4.28 indicates the value of (R² = .174, P < .05), meaning that 17% of the variance in the teacher job performance is predicated by the variance in the perceived instructional leadership function of providing learning environment.

Table-4.29  Linear Regression Analysis of Instructional Leadership Function Protecting Instructional Time with Teacher Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>69.610</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.426</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>12.318</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05

Table-4.29 presents the values of linear regression analysis, perceived instructional leadership function protecting instructional time with the job performance survey score of secondary school teachers. It is evident form of (R² = .236; P < .05) value that 23% of the variance in the teacher job performance is
predicted by perceived instructional leadership function of protecting instructional time.

Table-4.30  Linear Regression Analysis of Instructional Leadership Function
Supervising and Monitoring the Progress with Teacher Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>73.830</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising and Monitoring</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>12.935</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05

Table-4.30 shows the results of the linear regression analysis for the instructional leadership function supervising and monitoring the progress with the job performance score. It is obvious that the values of (R² = .254; P < .05) illustrates that 25% variance in the teacher job is predicted by supervising and monitoring the progress.

Table-4.31  Linear Regression Analysis of Instructional Leadership Function
Promoting Professional Development with Teacher Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>71.855</td>
<td>1.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Professional Development</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>13.091</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05
Table-4.31 shows the results of the linear regression analysis for the instructional leadership function promoting professional development with the teacher job performance score. The value of \((R^2 = .259; P < .05)\) exhibits that nearly 26% variance in the teacher job performance is predicted by the perceived instructional leadership function promoting professional development.

Table-4.32: Linear Regression Analysis of Total Instructional Leadership Score with Teacher Job Performance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model R R^2 B Std.Error Beta t Sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(Constant) .608 .370 58.076 2.148</td>
<td>27.024 .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership Total Score .364 .021 .608 16.977 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05

Table-4.32 shows the results of the linear regression analysis for the instructional leadership total score with the teacher job performance total score. The results found that secondary school heads’ instructional leadership as perceived by teachers was a significant predictor \((R^2 = .370, P < .05)\) of teacher job performance. In other words the results indicated that secondary school heads’ instructional leadership as perceived by teachers explained about 37% of total variance in the teachers’ job.
CHAPTER- 5

FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMERY

This chapter starts by presenting the findings of the study followed by discussion according to research questions. It then presents conclusion followed by recommendations, suggestions for further research and ends with summery of the study.

This study aimed at exploring teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership of secondary school heads and relationship of these perceptions with their performance on the job at secondary school level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan). The study was directed by the following research questions:

a. What are the present levels of instructional leadership of secondary school heads according to teachers’ perceptions at secondary school level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa?

b. Is there any significant difference in the instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads as perceived by their teachers?

c. Is there any significant difference in secondary school heads’ instructional leadership in the rural and urban areas as perceived by teachers?

d. Is there any significant relationship between instructional leadership and teacher job performance as perceived by teachers?

e. To what extent do teachers’ perceptions of secondary school heads’ instructional leadership practices promote their job performance?
Developing deeper in to understanding of how teachers view their school heads instructional leadership as well as its relative influence on their job, data was collected from secondary school teachers of both gender teaching in public sector secondary school located at both rural and urban areas of the province.

5.1. Findings of the Study

The major findings of the study are presented in this section. The findings are arranged and presented in relation to each of the research question which directed the study:

1. Instructional leadership as a composite variable received a mean rating of 3.19 from the perspective of teachers. The standard deviation associated with all the functions of instructional leadership ranges from .74 to 1.33, indicating moderate variations in the perceptions of respondents.

2. Instructional leadership function providing learning environment received a higher Mean rating (M=3.59, SD=1.00) among all its functions.

3. The second highest Mean score was found in the function of protecting instructional time (M=3.41, SD=1.12).

4. Two functions of instructional leadership promoting professional development (M=3.08, SD=1.07), and formulating educational objectives for school (M=3.05, SD=1.01) received very similar Mean ratings by teachers.

5. Instructional leadership function supervising and monitoring the progress received the least rating by teachers about their school heads (M=2.86, SD=1.02).

6. Among the 30 individual items 11 items (37%) got higher rating by teachers within instructional leadership, makes an alternative arrangement for class
when teacher is late or on leave; and does not interrupt teachers while they are engaged in teaching, are the items those got highest Mean rating by teachers with (M=3.92, SD=1.24), (M=3.88, SD=1.54) respectively. Both these items belong to the function of protecting instructional time.

7. The least instructional leadership practice as experienced by teachers is observing teachers’ lesson plan and use of audio visual aids in the classroom by their school head with a Mean rating (M=2.34, SD=1.14). This individual item is a part of instructional leadership function “supervising and monitoring the progress”.

8. Gender wise analysis of secondary school heads produced the following results
   a. Female school heads got higher and significant ratings in the functions of formulating educational objectives for school, providing learning environment, and supervising and monitoring the progress by their teachers as compared to their male counterparts.
   b. No significant difference was found in the instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads in the functions of protecting instructional time and promoting professional development.

9. No statistical significant difference was found in the instructional leadership of secondary school heads in the rural and urban areas as perceived by their teachers.

10. Coefficient of correlation between ILQ and TJPS indicate the following results:
a. A positive and statistical significant correlation at moderate level was found between Teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership with their job performance ($r = .608, P \leq .05$).

b. A high correlation was found between teachers’ perception of instructional leadership function “protecting instructional time” with their discipline and regularity ($r = .709, P \leq .05$).

c. There is a moderate correlation between teachers’ perceptions on instructional leadership functions; developing learning environment, protecting instructional time, supervising and monitoring the progress, promoting professional development with their job performance.

d. There is a low correlation between teachers’ perceptions on instructional leadership function formulating educational objectives with their job performance ($r = .393, P \leq .05$).

e. Instructional leadership function promoting professional development showed high value of “r” as compared to other function with TJPS total score ($r = .509, P \leq .05$).

11. Linear regression analysis between functions of instructional leadership and TJPS total score produced the following results:

   a. The amount of estimation between overall instructional leadership ILQ total score and TJPS total score is ($r^2 = .37, P \leq .05$).

   b. Among all the instructional leadership functions promoting professional development got higher correlation with TJPS total score ($r^2 = .259, P \leq .05$).

   c. The relationship of instructional leadership functions with TJPS (Total) is found to be significant in monitoring and evaluating the progress
(r²=.254), protecting instructional time (r²=.236), developing learning environment is (r²=.174), and formulating educational objectives and TJPS (total) is (r²=.154) at .05 level.

12. The positive beta score in all the five functions and overall instructional leadership with TJPS (total) signified that as the teachers’ perceptions of school heads level of instructional leadership increased the level of teacher job performance also increased.

5.2. Discussion of Results:

Discussion of results regarding instructional leadership of secondary school head as well as its relative influence on teachers’ performance as perceived by teachers in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is presented in this section, in accordance with the research questions set for the study.

The first research question was what are the present levels of instructional leadership of secondary school heads according to teachers’ perceptions at secondary school level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa? Mean and standard deviations were used to answer this question. Focus of this research question was on five instructional leadership functions of secondary school heads, developed for this study from the review of related literature. These aspects were formulating educational objectives for school, developing learning environment, protecting instructional time, supervising and monitoring the progress, and promoting the professional development, widely discussed in the instructional leadership literature. Results showed that 11 items (37%) out of 30 total items in instructional leadership survey got higher rating by teachers. Only developing learning environment and protecting instructional time functions have 4 items each which were highly rated by teachers.
(see table-4.8 & table-4.9). This shows that teachers perceived their school heads stronger in these functions.

It is surprising of course that; any item in the category of supervising and monitoring the progress rated by teachers got a Mean rating to very high extent (see table-4.10). Two items in the function of promoting professional development (table-4.11) and only one item in the category of formulating educational objectives for school got a mean rating of very high extent (table-4.7).

Results regarding levels of instructional leadership of secondary school heads revealed that, teachers rated their school heads higher in the area of providing learning environment and lower in supervising and monitoring the progress. These findings reflect that, the major focus of the secondary school heads is on facilitating the teaching-learning process and helping the teachers in solving their problems. This shows that school heads authorized teachers in their instructional work; they encourage, honors and keep working relationship with teachers. The highest rating obtained by item, arrangement for teachers in the absence of a teacher shows that secondary school heads mainly focus on administrative role.

Simkins, Garrett, Memon and Nazir (1998) found in their study that majority of school principals in Pakistan spend most of their time in dealing with administrative and financial tasks executing their job as administrator rather than instructional leader. Similar results were found by Arikewuyo (2007) in his study who explored the teachers’ perceptions of their principal leadership capacities, the heads of school were found more inclined towards their administrative and managerial tasks and less towards academic measures. Closely aligned with the findings of Khan, Saeed, and Fatima (2009) who found in their study which focused on assessing the
performance of secondary school heads teachers that heads of the secondary school were weak in the area of instructional leadership.

Pihie and Elias (2002) found that with regard to instructional leadership responsibilities the aspiring principals scored high on providing learning environment, but their receptiveness towards improving and evaluating teachers’ performance was low in Malaysian school leadership practice for school effectiveness. Secondary school principals were found to be more effective in developing a safe learning environment than being an instructional leader (Wahlstrom and Louis, 2008). According to Ramirez (2005) principals as an instructional leader primarily concentrates upon the supervision and evaluation of instruction. Supervision is the critical factor to assist teachers that focus directly upon teacher development (Sergiovanni, 2006). By evaluating instruction, the principal is first and foremost responsible for coordinating the curriculum and monitoring the students’ progress. In order to achieve this end, principals manage classroom objectives, offer instructional support, and observe instruction through informal classroom visits for both supervisory and evaluative purposes. Khaki (2009) commented on the basis of need assessment in the school leadership conducted by Aga Khan University, Institute of educational development that schools in Pakistan need interventions in many areas including leadership.

Reasons for this sort of findings can be explained in our local context as follows:

In elementary and secondary education department, 25% heads of school are directly recruited on the recommendation of public service commission and majority of the secondary school heads 75% are promoted on the basis of their seniority rather than their qualification and expertise in the field (Memon and Bana, 2005; Khan,
Khan (1991) argued that theoretically secondary school head in Pakistan is considered as an executive officer but practically he is an intermediary person acting between the authorities of education and teachers. He termed this role as “forwarding agency” who forwarded letters regarding the affairs of teachers to higher authorities and pass on the orders of high ups to the teachers. He has no authority in hiring and firing of teachers and not concerned in the process of curriculum development, even he is not consulted in bringing new changes in the curriculum. He is under the authority of executive district officer at district level as well as to abide by the directives of director of education at provincial level. That’s the one reason on the basis of which one can understand that having a very little authority, secondary school heads are more tilted towards providing learning environment and less towards supervising and monitoring the progress.

Another reason is that there is only one position of Head Master/Head Mistress/Principal in most of the secondary schools in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and no job of vice principal/supervisor/district superintendent like many developed countries. All the activities are to be carried out by the school principal; including correspondence to department, keeping record updates, attending the meetings, dealing with parents and visitors, handling discipline problems, financial and budgetary matters, in addition to this he is also in charge of 10 to 15 primary schools located in the vicinity of a secondary school named as “cluster”. All the major tasks like inspections of primary schools, surprise visits, drawing and disbursing
matters, conduct of annual examination, election of parent teacher council and their audit are also the responsibilities of secondary school head (Elementary and Secondary Education Department, 2010). In such a complex array of activities on daily basis and work overload, the deficiency in the areas of instructional leadership is quite clear for understanding.

The second research question was, is there any significant difference in the instructional leadership of male and female secondary school heads in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa as perceived by their teachers? Independent sample $t$-test was used to in order to answer this research question. The results of the findings regarding the gender difference in the instructional leadership of secondary school heads as perceived by their teachers indicates that overall female teachers’ rating about their principals is higher than their male counterparts (table-4.18). This pattern is consistent in the functions of supervising and monitoring the progress, developing the learning environment and formulating the educational objectives, but in the functions of protecting instructional time and promoting professional development no significant difference exists. These results show that female heads are considered more instructional leader as compared to male school heads teachers. These findings seemed to be consistent with the results of (khan, Saeed, and Fatima, 2009) who found in their study that female head teachers are better in instructional behavior, professional attitude and managerial abilities than those of their male counterparts.

The third research question was, is there any significant difference in secondary school heads’ instructional leadership in the rural and urban areas as perceived by teachers? The independent sample $t$-test was used in order to determine the difference in instructional leadership as perceived by teachers in rural and urban
areas. According to results there was no significant difference in the instructional leadership of secondary school heads in rural and urban areas.

One of the major reasons that secondary school heads do not remain stationary in a school of a given area at their own will. He is liable to transfer from one school to another in the best interest of public service i.e. from rural to urban area and from urban to rural, even his/her transfer is made intra district with in the province. His transfer is made at any time throughout the year except what is banned by the government. These continuous transfers of the school heads have vanished the rural urban differentiation. Khaki (2009) also criticized that government school heads are transferred frequently from one place to another. Secondary school head in urban area is substituted by his counterpart from rural area and vice versa, if a school head starts innovation, they may not have enough time to complete it, as their successor may have different priorities.

The fourth research question was, is there any significant relationship between instructional leadership and teacher job performance? Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (Pearson r) were calculated to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between ILQ and TJPS and between each category of both scales. Results showed that there was a positive relationship between the secondary school heads instructional leadership and teachers job performance (r=.608, p<.05). There were also many pairs of statistically significant correlations between functions of the ILQ and TJPS (table-4.25). Enueme and Egwunyenga (2008) indicated that relationship existed between principals’ instructional leadership and teacher’s performance, and perception of principal leadership was an important area to focus on executing the daily job activities. Principal offers guidance and support to solve the problems encountered so that effective teaching is achieved.
Bredeson and Johanson (2000) also discussed that principal as instructional leaders has a very important role for implementing changes in teachers’ classroom instructional practices.

The fifth research question was to what extent do teachers’ perceptions of secondary school heads’ instructional leadership practices promote their job performance? This research question was addressed by analyzing the teachers’ perceptions of secondary school heads instructional leadership as independent variable, with the dependent variable, teachers’ job performance. The linear regression analysis was used as a statistical technique for this research question. According to the results secondary school heads’ instructional leadership practices were a significant predictor of teachers’ job performance. In other words we can assert that when teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership of their school heads increase, the level of their performance is expected to increase as well. The findings of this study were strengthened by the prior research as (Adeyemi, 2010) found a direct relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job performance. Sayre (2007) also found that the successful superintendents considerably influence teacher capacity by focusing on teachers’ knowledge and practices and instructional resources, he found a predictive linear relationship between superintendents’ instructional leadership (independent variable) and teachers’ instructional capacity (dependent variable). Kursunoglu and Tanrøgen (2009) found teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership behavior of their principals and teachers attitudes towards organizational change at moderate level and there were also positive relationship between instructional leadership behaviors of their principals and teachers’ attitude towards change. The findings of the present study are also in line with (Matthews, 2007) results. Matthews (2007) conducted a study to seek an answer
a question if any relationship exists between the principal instructional leadership and teachers’ assessment practices and students’ achievement. The results of the Matthews (2007) study significantly correlate the instructional leadership and teachers’ assessment practices.

5.3. Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study;

1. Secondary school heads provide instructional leadership at moderate level in four functions of instructional leadership, except the function of developing learning environment which is carried out at high degree, clearly indicates that secondary school heads are not acting as strong instructional leaders.

2. The secondary school heads do not pay enough attention to supervising and monitoring the progress, which is an important factor for school development and their self improvement.

3. Female secondary school heads impart better Instructional leadership as compared to their male counterparts.

4. Locality does not affect the instructional leadership of secondary school heads.

5. Teachers’ job performance is positively related to the perceived instructional leadership functions of secondary school heads.

6. There are moderate relationships between instructional leadership and teacher job performance, the strength of these relationships is higher between instructional leadership functions promoting professional development and supervising and monitoring with teacher job performance.

7. Of the 20 correlations, 16 showed significant correlation among the perceived instructional leadership functions and teachers’ job performance.
8. The contribution of instructional leadership function promoting professional development in the promotion of teachers’ job is high as compared to other four functions.

9. Regardless of the degree of relationship, the fact that all the five functions of instructional leadership were found to be positively related to teachers’ level of performance. The coefficient of determination showed that 37% of the teacher job performance is promoted by all the five functions of instructional leadership operating jointly. It shows that when best instructional leadership occurs in secondary schools, teachers believe that their level of performance will also increase. Teachers look to school heads for direction and inspiration.

5.4. Recommendations for education department:

i. The findings of this study may be used in the training of secondary school heads. In-service training program may be properly arranged for improving the effectiveness of secondary school heads in the area of instructional leadership in long summer or winter vacations, so that teaching learning process becomes more effective and output oriented.

ii. A manual of instructional leadership may be framed for secondary school heads as used in the advanced countries.

iii. The present policy of seniority based promotion may be substituted by performance based. Those who show high performance, update their knowledge through continuous professional competency enhancement programs, stand high on providing instructional help to teachers and show high results of their students may be promoted to higher ranks.

iv. Teachers’ views may be given proper weightage in the policy matters of education as they are the key stakeholders of the whole education process.
v. Workshops seminars and conferences may be organized in order to having 
opportunity of interaction among principals/ head masters/ head mistresses 
and school teachers to discuss their problems for improvement in the 
teaching learning.

5.5. **Recommendations for secondary school heads:**

i. There may be an association of secondary school heads like National 
Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to discuss academic 
and supervisory matters and for sharing instructional experiences with each 
others.

ii. Secondary school heads are suggested to pay more attention to supervising 
and evaluating the staff by focusing on actual teaching and learning process in 
the classrooms. Sparing more time for this purpose they may distribute his/her 
work load by forming teachers’ committees for solving the problems so, that 
they can find more time for assessing teaching learning process.

iii. The school heads may develop the staff by provision of guidance services 
mostly in the area of modern teaching methods.

iv. The heads of schools may help the teachers in classroom management and 
teaching and suggest improvement in their instructions after their classroom 
visitation.

v. The school heads can gain the cooperation of staff by appreciating their work.

vi. The heads of school may encourage teachers for using modern methods of 
teaching and support them for these new approaches.
5.6. Suggestions for further research:

i. A follow up study utilizing qualitative methods to observe teachers in their classrooms would provide good insight and an actual student achievement data.

ii. This study may be replicated to a larger sample including teachers of all cadres as well as higher secondary schools and private school also. However this study may consider other variables that may impact teacher performance including socio economic status etc.

iii. This study may be replicated in other three provinces; Punjab, Sindh, and Baluchistan to find cross cultural variation in dependent and independent variable.

iv. This study may also be replicated as an experimental design, first by conducting personal visits and interviews of certain selected schools and then by observing the effects of their principal instructional leadership on teachers’ performance behaviors.

5.7. Summary of the study:

This study dealt with the investigation of teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership of secondary school heads in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa on the aspects of formulating educational objectives, providing learning environment, protecting instructional time, supervising and monitoring the progress, promoting professional development and relationship of these perceptions with their performance on the job. The population of the study consisted of 4488 secondary school teachers. The sample of the study consisted of 387 male and 263 female secondary school teachers randomly selected from an up to date list of Educational
Management and Information System (EMIS 2009-10) of secondary education department. Four hundred and Ninety-three teachers responded, with a response rate of 76%. Two instruments ILQ and TJPS (self) were utilized for the data collection. ILQ was developed by the researcher for teachers’ perceptions about instructional leadership of their respective school heads. Cronbach alpha value for the whole scale was (.96) and for its functions; formulating educational objectives (.87), developing learning environment (.85), protecting instructional time (.83), supervising and monitoring the progress (.87), and for promoting professional development (.88). TJPS (Self) was adapted for obtaining teachers job performance. The obtained data was analyzed by using the statistical techniques of Mean, Standard deviation, \( t \)-test, correlation and regression. According to teachers’ perceptions, Instructional leadership of the secondary school heads was found to be at moderate level in four aspects; formulating educational objectives, protecting instructional time, supervising and monitoring the progress and promoting professional development with a Mean of 3.05, 3.41, 2.86, 3.08 respectively. The Mean value of developing learning environment is higher (M=3.59) as compared to other four functions of instructional leadership. Gender wise results showed that female secondary school heads were found better instructional leaders than their male counterparts in the functions of formulating educational objectives, providing learning environment, supervising and monitoring the progress, but in the function of protecting instructional time and promoting professional development both are at the same level. Locality wise results showed that no statistical significant difference comes across the instructional leadership of secondary school heads. A positive and statistical significant correlation at moderate level was found between teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership with their job performance. There were also 16 out of 20 pairs showed positive
correlations between Perceived instructional leadership and teachers’ job performance at .05 levels of significance. Positive impact of instructional leadership was found on teacher job performance. Analysis carried out by the use of linear regression showed that according to teachers perceptions 37% of performance in their job is determined by the instructional leadership of their respective school heads. As the perceptions of teachers about instructional leadership increases their level of performance also increases. It was concluded that instructional leadership employed by secondary school heads is at moderate level and contribution of instructional leadership function promoting professional development in the promotion of teachers’ job performance is higher as compared to other four functions. It is recommended to school heads to improve their teachers’ competency by provision of guidance services in the area of modern teaching methods, encourage them for the use of new techniques and suggest improvement in their teaching after classroom visitation.
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Appendix-A

Cover letter to Teachers
Respected sir/Madam

Asslam-O-Alaikum

I am a Ph.D scholar at Institute of Education & Research Gomal University D.I.Khan, working on a topic “Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Secondary School Teachers’ Job Performance”. This survey is being conducted in the partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Ph.D. I need your assistance in this regard. Kindly read each statement carefully and respond according to your best judgment. The data obtained will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purpose. I shall be great full to you for your cooperation.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Sincerely yours

Zafar Khan

Research Scholar
Institute of Education & Research
Gomal University, D.I.Khan.
Cell # 0321-9801801
E-Mail: zafarkhan786@yahoo.com
Appendix-B

Instructional Leadership Questionnaire
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

PART “A”

1. Name of teacher (optional) _____________________________

2. Age _______ years

3. Name of School _____________________________

4. Locality of School    □ Rural □ Urban

5. Gender of teacher    □ Male □ Female

6. What is your highest Qualification   (Please tick)

   Academic          □ B.A □ B.Sc □ M.A □ M.Sc □ M.Phil

   Professional      □ B.Ed □ B.S.Ed □ M.Ed □ M.Phil

7. Total experience as a secondary school teacher ________ years

8. Experience with the present head of institution ________ years
**PART “B”**

**Note:** Please read the following statements carefully and tick (✓) that best describe your opinion. The criteria for ticking the statements are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
<th>Frequently (4)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Seldom (2)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Formulating Educational objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>calls staff meeting to set academic targets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>assigns duties to teachers in accordance with educational objectives of school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>makes plan for improving educational standard of the school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>consults teachers on subject interest for planning school timetable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>holds discussion about academic progress of students in the staff meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>develops collective vision for school by involving staff members</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Developing Learning Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>gives enough autonomy to teachers in instructional work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>develops positive working relationship among teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>honors teachers’ opinions and ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>encourages teachers for their innovative approaches in teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>appreciates teachers for their work related to student engagement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>helps teachers to solve their teaching problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting Instructional Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>does not interrupt teachers while they are engaged in teaching</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>makes an alternative arrangement for class when a teacher is late/or on leave</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>implements school rules for the effective use of time allocated to instruction</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>discusses class room activities with teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>readily available to teachers for discussing matters dealing with instruction</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>limits the interruption of extra and co-curricular activities on instructional time</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervising and Monitoring the Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>evaluates the teaching according to syllabus break up</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>visits classrooms to monitor teaching learning process</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>provides feedback to teachers after classroom observation</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>shares teaching strategies with teachers for improvement of instruction</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>observes teachers’ lesson planning and use of Audio Visual Aids</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>checks test results of students for their learning outcomes</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>nominates teachers for in-service training on need basis, whenever program is available</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>encourages teachers to improve professional qualification</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>guides teachers to improve their teaching skills</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>encourages collaborative learning among the teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>discusses matters of professional development whenever he/she meets teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>supports teachers for use of skills acquired during in-service training</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix-C

Request for use of Teacher job Performance Scale
TEST APPLICATION FORM

Name of the applicant:  Zafar Khan
Name of the Supervisor:  Prof Dr Umar Ali Khan
Institution:  Institute of Education & Research, Gomal University, D.I.Khan
Publisher:  National Institute of Psychology
Purpose:  Research
Research topic:  Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Secondary School Teachers’ Job Performance
M.Sc/M.phil/Ph.d/M.S/Diploma/Any other  Ph.D

UNDERTAKING

This is hereby specified that the above mentioned information is correct. I applied for the above mentioned scale after appropriate research and consultations with my supervisor. I am convinced that this Test/Videos/Resource Material is very relevant to my work. I also understand that I will have to follow the copy rights requirements of the test developers and not violate the ethics of research at any moment. This work is the intellectual property of the author. No part of this test may be reproduced or photocopied or disseminate or to republish without written permission from the author. I am also under obligation to share my data and research findings with the TRC of NIP.

Prof. Dr. Umar Ali Khan
L.E.R. Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan

Student

Following documents have been submitted for the test/document etc.
   a) Recommendation by the supervisor/Professor
   b) Price/Fee/charges
   c) Undertaking

Recommendation of the TRC Advisory Committee

Recommended  Not Recommended
Appendix-D

Permission for use of Teacher job Performance Scale
National Institute of Psychology
Centre of Excellence
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

September 24, 2009

Mr. Zafar Khan
Institute of Education & Research
Gomal University, D.I.Khan

Dear Zafar Khan,

In response to your request for the use of Teacher Job Performance Scale (TJPS) in your dissertation,
We would appreciate receiving a soft copy of any publications that result from your work.

Best wishes for a success in your doctoral work

Cordially,

Dr. Rubina Hanif
Assistant Professor
NIP, QAU, Islamabad

Location: Quaid-i-Azam University, (New Campus), Shahdra Road, (Off Main Murree Road), Islamabad, (Pakistan)
Telephones: 90644031, 2896013, 2896010-11; Fax: 2896012; Email: nip@nip.edu.pk; Web Site: http://www.nip.edu.pk
Appendix-E

Copy of Teacher job Performance Scale
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
Appendix-F

No of Government Secondary Schools by Location and Gender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Abbottabad</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Bannu</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Chitral</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Manshera</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Swat</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Nowshera</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Kohat</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Hangu</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Laki Marwat</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dera Ismail Khan</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mardan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Swabi</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMIS 2009-10
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