

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BANDA ACEH, INDONESIA

MOHAMAD JOHDI SALLEH, PHD

johdisalleh@gmail.com

International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM)

MUHAMMAD HATTA

University Negeri of Aceh Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The study presents the relationship between principals' instructional leadership practices and students' academic achievement of secondary schools in Banda Aceh, Indonesia. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) modified by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Latip (2006) was used as the data collection instrument through survey questionnaire. The respondents of this study were 12 principals and 163 randomly selected teachers of secondary schools Banda Aceh. The study used correlation statistical analysis based on interpretation of the Pearson Correlation (r) which provides the direction, significance, strength, and, considered as the most stable measure of correlation (Gay, 1992; Creswell 2008). There were twelve null hypotheses were formulated to examine the correlation of the two variables. This study found that there were only three job functions, namely, monitoring student progress, maintaining high visibility, and, developing and enforcing academic standards which had a significant relationship with students' academic achievement. It is hoped that this research will provide useful findings which will effectively assist the process of instructional leadership enhancement among principals and teachers of secondary schools in Banda Aceh in order to improve students' academic performance.

Keywords: *principals' instructional leadership – relationship - students' academic achievement*

INTRODUCTION

The changing demands on schools in the twenty-first century require leaders who can challenge staff to mobilize their energies and adapt to changing requirements while controlling the stability and efficiency of the school organization as a whole. Leaders need to respond to the needs of diverse populations while maintaining high standards for instruction, which result in high levels of achievement. Leaders play a critical role in creating a school environment that ensures learning activities are relevant to students' needs in order to accomplish high achievement. There is no doubt that school leaders require extensive knowledge about instruction to deliver the curriculum to the students in proper ways. Therefore, it is deemed important to study and identify the practice of instructional leadership among the principals of secondary schools in Banda Aceh and the roles of instructional leadership in contributing towards students' academic achievement in fulfilment of the aspirations, vision and mission of the Ministry of National Education Indonesia against the backdrop of the more comprehensive and competitive state development principles against the wave

of globalization. Meanwhile, education is an important entity in determining the strength of an individual and the nation to face the challenges and the stiff competition in this era of globalization.

Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, with its three special privileges in terms of religion, culture, and education, is facing low quality of education as well as low students' academic achievement especially in the national examination grades. According to data provided by the Department of National Education of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam ranks 22nd out of the 33 provinces in Indonesia in terms of the quality of education (Ministry of National Education Republic of Indonesia, 2009). Even though there are various factors contributing to the low quality of education in Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, principals as instructional leaders play a vital role in determining the success of the education in their schools. Major findings on the subject indicate that principals who are strong in these areas make a considerable impact on the function of the school (Quinn, 2002).

From the above facts, it is clearly seen that a study to investigate the practice of instructional leadership among the principals in selected secondary schools in Banda Aceh is badly needed in order to discover to what extent Banda Aceh secondary school principals have implemented the concept of instructional leadership and its relationship with students' academic achievement.

Definition of Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership refers to actions undertaken with the intention of developing a productive and satisfying working environment for teachers and desirable learning conditions and outcomes for children (Greenfield, 1987; Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Green, 2005). Wildy & Dimmock (1993) defined instructional leadership as comprising the following tasks: defining the purpose of schooling; setting school-wide goals; providing the resources needed for learning to occur; supervising and evaluating teachers; coordinating staff development programmes; and creating collegial relationships with and among teachers.

Leithwood (1994, as cited in Quinn, 2002) described instructional leadership as a series of behaviour designed to affect classroom instruction. McEwan (2003) shared the definition she got from two principals she had interviewed: Instructional leadership is the creation of a climate where the principal, faculty, students, parents, and school board are able to work together to accomplish the task of education. Instructional leadership is a development process. One cannot be trained to be an instructional leader. Through course work and "on-the-job" learning experiences one can develop into an instructional leader. McEwan (2003) added that instructional leaders must be knowledgeable about learning theory, effective instruction, and the curriculum. In addition, instructional leaders must be able to communicate and represent to students, teachers, and parents what is of import and value in the school. Finally, instructional leaders must be skilled in the actual construction of a culture that specifically defines what a given school is all about.

It is clear that all of these reviews outline the nature and character of instructional leadership. They show closely concerned with teaching and learning, including the professional learning of teachers as well as student growth, particularly the students' academic achievements.

The research framework of this study is based on the Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) conceptual frameworks. Leithwood in Southworth (2002) believes that the most fully tested model of instructional leadership is the one developed by Hallinger and his associates.

Conceptual Model of the Study

Dwyer (1984) introduced a model that describes the principal's role as an instructional leader. Leadership behaviour relates to the routine behaviour of the principal within the school such as defining the school mission, planning, supervising, and evaluating students' achievement and teachers' performance. Leadership behaviour is strongly related to input variables, i.e. the community, principal's beliefs and experiences, and the institutional context. All of these three variables impact on the principal's instructional management behaviour. Furthermore, a principal's instructional management behaviour will affect the school climate and instructional organization that will affect student outcomes.




Figure 1: The Hypothesized Model of the Study
 Source: Modified from Dwyer's Model (1984),

Conceptual Framework of Hallinger and Murphy (1985), and Latip (2006)

As shown in Figure 1, the hypothesized model of this study is based on Dwyer's Model (1984), Hallinger and Murphy's (1985), and Latip (2006) conceptual framework.

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) who support Dwyer's model, proposed a conceptual framework that shows how the principal actually manages the instructional activities in school. Based on this conceptual framework, the principal's instructional leadership strongly affects the school climate and school organization.

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Latip (2006) suggested in their theory that the instructional management role of the principals can be subdivided into three general dimensions: defining the school mission, managing the instructional programme, and promoting a positive learning climate, as discussed in the following section.

Dimension 1: Defining the School Mission

All school communities, especially staff and teachers as well as students need to understand the school goals to enable them to contribute to developing school achievement and achieving the school mission. Krug (1992 as cited in Terry, 1996) stated that operating without a clear mission is like beginning a journey without having a destination in mind. Chances are you will not know when you will get there.

Framing school goals

This function refers to a principal's role in determining the areas on which the school staff will focus their attention and resources during a given school year. Instructionally effective schools often have clearly defined goals that focus on student achievement and expressed in measurable terms (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The emphasis is on fewer goals around which staff energy and other school resources can be mobilized. A few coordinated objectives, each with manageable scope, appear to work best. McEwan (2003) stated that the framing should incorporate data on past and current student performance, staff responsibilities, and parents' commitments.

Communicating school goals

This function is concerned with the ways in which the principal communicates the school's important goals to teachers, parents, and students. Principals can ensure that the importance of school goals is understood by discussing and reviewing them with staff periodically during the school year, especially in the context of instructional, curricular, and budgetary decisions. Both formal communication (e.g. goal statements, staff bulletins, articles in the principal or cite-council newsletter, curricular and staff meetings, parent and teacher conferences, school handbook, assemblies) and informal interaction (e.g. conversations with staff) can be used to communicate the school's mission (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). This allows the school to direct its resources and shape its functioning towards the realization of those goals (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

Dimension 2: Managing the Instructional Programme

This dimension of instructional leadership involves working with teachers in areas specifically related to curriculum and instruction.

Supervising and evaluating instruction

This involves coordinating the classroom objectives of teachers with those of the school, providing instructional support to teachers, and monitoring classroom instruction through numerous informal classroom visits. Feedback to teachers for both supervisory and evaluative purposes is concrete and related to specific instructional practices carried out by the teachers (Stallings, 1980 as cited in Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Sergiovanni (1996) stated that there are three important points of supervising and evaluating instruction, namely to control school quality, professional development and teacher motivation. Through this task, the principal can determine that the minimal standard has been achieved. According to Johnson and Kardos (2002), through supervising and evaluating instruction, principals can support teacher instruction, contribute through their skills in developing teacher professionalism and giving feedback regarding teacher instruction.

Coordinating the curriculum

A characteristic that stands out in instructionally effective schools is the high degree of curricular coordination. School curricular objectives are closely aligned with both the content taught in classes and with achievement tests. There appears to be a fairly high degree of continuity in the curriculum across grade levels. This aspect of curricular coordination is often supported by greater interaction among teachers within and across grade levels on instructional and curricular issues (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). By coordinating the curriculum, all activities and programmes within school instruction can be done according to the school goals.

Monitoring student progress

Student progress monitoring is a practice that helps teachers use student performance data to continually evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and make more informed instructional decisions. The teacher determines a student's current performance level on skills that the student will be learning that school year, identifies achievement goals that the student needs to reach by the end of the year, and establishes the rate of progress the student must maintain to meet those goals. The teacher then measures the student's academic progress regularly (weekly, monthly, or semesterly) using *probes*—brief, easily administered measures. Safer and Fleischmans (2005) emphasized that in today's education climate, school success is defined as ensuring achievement for every student. Educators need tools to help them identify students who are at risk academically and adjust instructional strategies to better meet these students' needs.

Dimension 3: Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate

The school learning climate refers to the norms and attitudes of the staff and students that influence learning in the school. This dimension consists of primarily indirect, though important, activities. The principal communicates expectations for students and teachers through the policies and practices promulgated by the school.

Protecting instructional time

The role of the principal here is to ensure that instructional time is not interrupted by other school activities which are not related to the instructional process. Teachers' classroom management and instructional skills are not used optimally if instruction is frequently interrupted by announcements, tardy students, and requests from the

office. The principal can control this area of activity through the development and enforcement of schoolwide policies. Principals who successfully implement policies that limit interruptions of classroom learning time can increase allocated learning time and, potentially, student achievement (Stallings, 1980 quoted in Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

Maintaining high visibility

According to DuFour (2002), educators are gradually redefining the role of the principal from that of an instructional leader with a focus on teaching to a leader of a professional community with a focus on learning. Meanwhile, the principal should act as an agent of change to help the teaching process become a learning process. Thus, in this context, principals should be visible on the campus and in the classrooms. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) stated that although a significant portion of their time is taken up by mandatory meetings and functions, principals can set priorities for how their remaining time is to be spent. Visibility on the campus and in the classrooms increases interaction between the principal and students as well as with teachers. Informal interaction of this type provides the principal with more information on the needs of students and teachers. It also affords the principal, opportunities to communicate the priorities of the school. This can have positive effects on students' and teachers' attitudes and behaviour.

Providing incentives for teachers

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) emphasized that an important part of the principal's role in creating a positive learning climate involves setting up a work structure that rewards and recognizes teachers for their efforts. These may be expressed in specific types of behaviour such as making suggestions, giving feedback, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, giving praise for effective teaching, and, public recognition (Blasé and Blasé 2000). Providing incentives for teachers is one of the factors to help and develop the teaching and learning process in the classrooms and conducive learning environment.

Promoting professional development

Promoting teachers' professional development, according to Sheppard (1996, as cited in Enueme & Egwunyenga, 2008) is the most influential type of instructional leadership behaviour at both the elementary and high school levels. Supporting this statement, Obi (2002, quoted in Enueme and Egwunyenga, 2008) noted that to be a successful instructional leader, the principal must give primary attention to the programme of staff improvement, which comprises leadership techniques and procedures designed to change the teachers' role performance. Obi (2002) stated that the principal's roles in this include: classroom visits, observation, conferences, seminars, and workshops, professional associations, in-service educational programmes etc. The principal is expected to provide the appropriate leadership which will assist each staff member to make a maximum contribution to the schools' effort to provide quality and up-to-date education (Enueme and Egwunyenga, 2008).

Developing and enforcing academic standards

Clearly defined, high standards reinforce the high expectations necessary for improving student learning. Jamentz (2002) notes that principals must be able to recognize whether lessons are aligned with standards, develop classroom

assessments consistent with standards, and evaluate student work for evidence that standards have been achieved. Their knowledge should be deep enough to let them coach teachers using explanations, practical examples, and demonstration lessons. Just as important, leaders must demonstrate the same learning traits that they expect in teachers: openness to new ideas, willingness to be driven by results, and persistence in the face of difficulty.

Providing incentives for learning

According to Noddings (1992), schools, like families, are multipurpose institutions. Although academics are the focus of schools, students need adults to care about their personal interests. To meet this need, according to Harris and Lowery (2002), the principal can be accessible to students, reward them, be an advocate for them, and, provide them with a safe, secure learning environment. The principal is a key actor in linking classrooms and school reward systems, ensuring that they are mutually supportive (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Principals who are accessible to the students contribute to a positive climate for students. Harris and Lowery (2002) also mentioned that principals who take extra time to praise students for their achievements over the intercom, in the newspaper, or with personal notes and e-mails create a positive school climate. Principals can also award such rewards by extending lunch time, sponsoring field trips, letting students eat lunch outside, and hosting awards assemblies.

These job functions constitute the conceptual definitions for the principal variables examined in this study. These definitions and explanations will be used to help generate the specific policies, practices, and behaviour that form the questionnaires which will be used to collect data on the practice of instructional leadership among principals of secondary schools in Banda Aceh. These functions have been mentioned in the hypotheses model of the research.

According to this model, shown in Figure 1, there are input, process and output. Input is referred to the policy of the Ministry of National Education Indonesia, principal's beliefs and experiences, and support from the community. Process refers to three dimensions of instructional leadership that are subdivided into eleven job functions, namely: Framing School Goals, Communicating School Goals, Supervising and Evaluating Instruction, Coordinating Curriculum, Monitoring Student Progress, Protecting Instructional Time, Promoting Professional Development, Maintaining High Visibility, Providing Incentives for Teachers, Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards, and Providing Incentives for Learning. All of these eleven job functions may affect students' academic achievement as a result or output of this process.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to analyze the relationship between principals' instructional leadership with students' academic achievement. More specifically, this study attempt to answer the following research question:

Is there any significant relationship between principals' instructional leadership of the eleven jobs functions and students' academic achievement of secondary schools in Banda Aceh, Indonesia?

Hence, the study proposed twelve hypotheses to answer the above research question:

Hypotheses:

HO 1: There is no significant relationship between instructional leadership and students' academic achievement.

HO 2: There is no significant relationship between framing school goals and students' academic achievement.

HO 3: There is no significant relationship between communicating school goals and students' academic achievement.

HO 4: There is no significant relationship between supervising and evaluating instruction and students' academic achievement.

HO 5: There is no significant relationship between coordinating curriculum and students' academic achievement.

HO 6: There is no significant relationship between monitoring student progress and students' academic achievement.

HO 7: There is no significant relationship between protecting instructional time and students' academic achievement.

HO 8: There is no significant relationship between maintaining high visibility and students' academic achievement.

HO 9: There is no significant relationship between providing incentives for teachers and students' academic achievement.

HO 10: There is no significant relationship between promoting professional development and students' academic achievement.

HO 11: There is no significant relationship between developing and enforcing academic standards and students' academic achievement.

HO 12: There is no significant relationship between providing incentives for learning and students' academic achievement.

Significant of the Study

The research findings clearly examine the practice of instructional leadership among the principals of secondary schools in Banda Aceh and its relationship with students' academic achievement. Therefore, this study will help the principals of secondary schools in Banda Aceh to recognize consciously and evaluate the functions of instructional leadership which are required to be implemented and enhanced in their schools, particularly, to improve students' academic performance.

Research Methodology

This study employed a survey research design and the descriptive statistics used were statistical surveys and correlational studies. According to Cohen and Manion (1994) and Creswell (2008), the survey is among the most common methods of research in education. McMillan and Schumacher (1993) say it is used to determine or learn about people's perceptions, attitudes or beliefs, values, demographic facts, habits, desires, ideas about a situation being studied and other types of information.

Population, Sample, and Instrumentation of the Study

In this study, all principals and teachers of secondary schools in Banda Aceh were the population of this study. The researcher obtained a list of principals and teachers from the Admissions of Records Division of the Department of National Education Banda Aceh (Ministry of National Education Republic of Indonesia, 2009). The final sample size of this study was 12 principals and 163 randomly selected teachers (Cohen & Manion 1994) of secondary schools in Banda Aceh and the total is 175 respondents. Questionnaires adapted from the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) formulated by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) was used as the data collection instrument in this study to assess the practice of instructional leadership. The PIMRS was distributed to all principals and randomly selected teachers of secondary schools in Banda Aceh.

In fact, this study is limited to the twelve secondary schools in Banda Aceh, the capital city of the province of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, located in the Island of Sumatera, Indonesia. Moreover, factors like time constraints, travelling and costs also influence the choice and limitation of the area of the study. Therefore, the findings of the study may not be generalized to all the states of Indonesia. The study is only conducted to examine the practice of instructional leadership functions among the principals of secondary schools in Banda Aceh and its relationship with students' academic achievement. It does not discuss the input which is referred to in the policy of the Ministry of National Education Indonesia, principal's beliefs and experiences, and support from the community as was mentioned in the hypotheses model, but it only focuses on the process which is referred to eleven job functions of instructional leadership and on the output which is referring to students' academic achievement. The students' academic achievement in this study is only limited to the result of national examination in the academic year 2008/2009.

Demographic Background of Respondents

Principals' Demographic Background

The principals' demographic background contains the five variables of gender, age, academic qualifications, teaching experience and years of experience as principal. Table 1 presents an analysis of the demographic background of secondary school principals in Banda Aceh.

Table 1: Analysis of Demographic Background of Secondary School Principals in Banda Aceh

	Demographic Background	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	10	83.3
	Female	2	16.7
Age	35-40 Years	2	16.7
	41-45 Years	1	8.3
	46-50 Years	5	41.7
	51 Years and above	4	33.3
Academic Qualifications	Bachelor	7	58.3
	Master	5	41.7
Teaching Experience	11 Years and above	12	100
Years of Experience as Principal	1-5 Years	7	58.3
	6-10 Years	5	41.7

It is found that male principals represented the majority of about 83.3% of the 12 respondents, while female principals were only 16.7% of the 12 respondents. It also indicates that a great percentage of 41.7% (5 principals) of the 12 principals were between 46 - 50 years old. In addition, 33.3% (4 principals) were 51 years old and above. Meanwhile, 16.7% (n = 2) of the principals were between 35 – 40 years old. Finally, the lowest percentage of about 8.3% (only one principal) was between 41 – 45 years old. In addition, the majority of those principals or about 58.3% (n = 7) held Bachelor's degrees, while another 41.7% (n = 5) had Master's degrees.

Furthermore, the table shows that 100% (n = 12) of the principals had teaching experience of 11 years and above. Finally, the table shows that about 58.3% (N = 7) of the principals had experience as principals of between 1 to 5 years, while another 41.7% (N = 5) had experience as principals of between 6 to 10 years.

Teachers' Demographic Background

The teachers' demographic background contains the four variables of gender, age, academic qualifications, and teaching experience.

The result shows, 163 teachers from secondary schools in Banda Aceh were selected randomly as the respondents of this study. Female teachers represented the majority with about 74.8% of the 163 of respondents, while male teachers were only 25.2% of the 163 of respondents. In addition, it indicates that a great percentage (35.6% or 58 teachers) of the 163 teachers were between 35 - 40 years old. In addition, 28.2% (46 teachers) were between 41 - 45 years old, whereas 20.9% (n = 34) of the teachers were between 46 – 50 years old. Finally, the lowest percentage of about 15.3% (n = 25) were 51 years old and above.

Furthermore, the table shows the distribution of the academic qualifications of teachers from secondary schools Banda Aceh. About 93.3% of the teachers (n = 152) were Bachelor's degree holders, while 6.1% (n = 10) had Master's degrees. Only 0.6% (n = 1) held a Doctorate. Finally, the table shows that 53.4% (n = 87) of the teachers had teaching experience of 11 years and above. In addition, about 23.9% (n = 39) of the teachers had teaching experience of between 6 to 10 years, while another 22.7% (n = 37) had teaching experience of between 1 – 5 years.

The following section presents the analysis of the practice of instructional leadership and its eleven job functions measured based on the interpretation of mean score classification levels by Latip (2006).

Analysis of the Practice of Instructional Leadership

The practice of instructional leadership among the principals is analyzed generally and specifically according to each of the eleven job functions based on principals' and teachers' perceptions. The instructional leadership and its eleven job functions are considered implemented if their mean scores are between 2.001 to 5.000. It is considered as not implemented yet if the mean score is between 1.000 and 2.000. Generally, the practice of instructional leadership and its eleven job functions can be measured based on the interpretation of mean score classified into 4 levels (Latip, 2006). Those 4 levels are low level or not implemented (x = 1.000 – 2.000), simple low level (x = 2.001 – 3.000), simple high level (x = 4.001 – 4.000), and high level (x = 4.001 – 5.000).

Result and Finding of the Research Question:

Research Question: Is there any significant relationship between instructional leadership and its eleven job functions with students' academic achievement in secondary schools in Banda Aceh?

In order to answer this research question, hypotheses had been created and tested by information gathered from questionnaires which had been completed by principals and teachers from secondary schools in Banda Aceh.

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between instructional leadership and students' academic achievement.

The researcher used correlation statistical analysis to identify the relationship between these two variables, namely instructional leadership as the independent variable, and students' academic achievement as the dependent variable.

Generally, the strength of the relationship between these two variables in this study was measured based on interpretation of the Pearson Correlation (r). The Pearson Correlation (r) provides the direction, significance and strength of a relationship. Since it takes into account each and every score of both distributions, the Pearson r is also the most stable measure of correlation (Gay, 1992).

As demonstrated in Table 1, data analysis shows the overall correlation between instructional leadership, in general, and its eleven job functions with students' academic achievement. The result of the data analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between instructional leadership and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation showed $r = 0.129$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho1 was true and accepted.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between Framing School Goals and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as shown in Table 1 indicates that there was no significant relationship between framing the school goals and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.081$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, the null hypothesis Ho2 was true and accepted.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between Communicating School Goals and students' academic achievement.

The result of data analysis as shown in Table 1 indicates that there was no significant relationship between communicating school goals and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.105$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho3 was true and accepted.

Ho4: There is no significant relationship between Supervising and Evaluating Instruction and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as seen in Table 2 indicates that there was no significant relationship between supervising and evaluating instruction and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.000$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho4 was true and accepted.

Table 1: *Relationship between the Principals' Instructional Leadership and Its Eleven Job Functions with Students' Academic Achievement*

Ho	Instructional Leadership & Its Eleven Job Functions	N	Pearson Correlation	Sig. p	Level of Significant	Null Hypothesis
Ho1	Instructional Leadership among Principals	175	0.129	0.088	$p > 0.05$	Accepted
Ho2	Framing the School Goals	175	0.081	0.289	$p > 0.05$	Accepted
Ho3	Communicating School Goals	175	0.105	0.168	$p > 0.05$	Accepted

Ho4	Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	175	0.000	0.999	p>0.05	Accepted
Ho5	Coordinating Curriculum	175	0.112	0.140	p>0.05	Accepted
Ho6	Monitoring Student Progress	175	0.207	0.006	P<0.05	Rejected
Ho7	Protecting Instructional Time	175	0.113	0.137	p>0.05	Accepted
Ho8	Maintaining High Visibility	175	0.191	0.011	P<0.05	Rejected
Ho9	Providing Incentives for Teachers	175	-0.022	0.768	p>0.05	Accepted
Ho10	Promoting Professional Development	175	0.083	0.275	p>0.05	Accepted
Ho11	Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards	175	0.171	0.023	P<0.05	Rejected
Ho12	Providing Incentives for Learning	175	0.130	0.086	p>0.05	Accepted

Ho5: There is no significant relationship between Coordinating the Curriculum and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as shown in Table 1 indicates that there was no significant relationship between coordinating the curriculum and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.112$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho5 was true and accepted.

Ho6: There is no significant relationship between Monitoring Student Progress and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as shown in Table 2 indicates that there was a significant relationship between monitoring student progress and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.207$, $p < 0.05$. Thus, null hypothesis Ho6 was rejected. Meanwhile, there was a positive correlation between monitoring student progress and students' academic achievement. It could be interpreted that the higher the monitoring of student progress, the higher students' academic achievement.

Ho7: There is no significant relationship between Protecting Instructional Time and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as shown in Table 3 indicates that there was no significant relationship between protecting instructional time and students' academic

achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.113$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho7 was true and accepted.

Ho8: There is no significant relationship between maintaining high visibility and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis, indicates that there was a significant relationship between maintaining high visibility and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.191$, $p < 0.05$. Thus, null hypothesis Ho8 was rejected. Meanwhile, there was a positive correlation between maintaining high visibility and students' academic achievement. It could be interpreted that the higher the visibility maintained, the higher students' academic achievement.

Ho9: There is no significant relationship between providing incentives for teachers and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as shown in Table 1 indicates that there was no significant relationship between providing incentives for teachers and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = -0.022$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho9 was true and accepted.

Ho10: There is no significant relationship between Promoting Professional Development and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as seen in Table 1 indicates that there was no significant relationship between promoting professional development and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.083$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho10 was true and accepted.

Ho11: There is no significant relationship between Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as shown in Table 1 indicates that there was a significant relationship between developing and enforcing academic standards and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.171$, $p < 0.05$. Thus, null hypothesis Ho11 was rejected. Meanwhile, there was a positive correlation between developing and enforcing academic standards and students' academic achievement. It could be interpreted that the higher the development and enforcement of academic standards, the higher students' academic achievement.

Ho12: There is no significant relationship between providing incentives for learning and students' academic achievement.

The result of the data analysis as seen in Table 1 indicates that there was no significant relationship between providing incentives for learning and students' academic achievement. This is clear when the Pearson Correlation shows $r = 0.130$, $p > 0.05$. Meanwhile, null hypothesis Ho12 was true and accepted.

Cotton (2003) has asserted that the following types of behaviour by a principal have a significant impact on student achievement:

1. The establishment of a clear focus on student learning by having a vision, clear learning goals, and high expectations of learning for all students.
2. Interaction and cordial relationships with relevant stakeholders with communication and interaction, emotional and interpersonal support, visibility and accessibility.
3. Developing a school culture conducive to teaching and learning.
4. Providing instructional leadership through discussions of instructional issues, observing classroom teaching and giving feedback, supporting teacher autonomy and protecting instructional time.
5. Being accountable for affecting and supporting continuous improvement through monitoring progress and using student progress data for programme improvement.

Furthermore, the review of literature indicated and reported that the principal's role as an instructional leader has a significant impact on creating more effective schools leading to higher levels of student achievement (Quinn, 2002; Cotton, 2003; Gamage, Adams, & McCormack, 2009).

An early school effectiveness study concluded that strong administrative leadership was a characteristic of instructionally effective schools (Edmonds, 1979). Other more recent studies have also indicated that principals can, and do, make a difference both to teachers and to students, through their skills as instructional leaders (Mulford, 1996). In addition, the importance of the principal's role as an instructional leader and its direct relationship to improve student performance has been researched extensively (Quinn, 2002). As an instructional leader, the principal is the pivotal point within the school who affects the quality of individual teacher instruction, the degree of efficiency in the functioning of the school, and, the degree of student achievement.

CONCLUSION

The study reveals that the principals of the secondary schools in Banda Aceh have implemented the instructional leadership concept within their schools. Descriptive analysis of the practice of instructional leadership has shown that the implementation of instructional leadership among the principals of the secondary schools in Banda Aceh is at simple high level with a mean score of 3.836. The practice of instructional leadership, in general, has no relationship with students' academic achievement, except in three functions, namely monitoring student progress, maintaining high visibility, and developing and enforcing academic standards. Meanwhile, only these three functions have a positive correlation with students' academic achievement. It could be interpreted that the higher these three job functions are, the higher the students' academic achievement will be in the secondary schools in Banda Aceh.

It is hoped that this research will provide useful findings which will effectively assist the process of instructional leadership enhancement among principals and teachers of secondary schools in Banda Aceh in order to improve students' academic performance.

REFERENCES

- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers perspective on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130-141.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education*. (4th ed). London: Routledge.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement*. Melbourne: Hawker Brownlow Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research*. (2nd ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership* 59(8), 12-15.
- Dwyer, D. C. (1984). The search for instructional leadership: Routines and subtleties in the principal's role. *Educational Leadership* 41(5), 32-37.
- Enueme, C.P., & Egwunyenga, E.J. (2008). *Principals' instructional leadership roles and effect on teachers' job performance: A case study of secondary schools in Asaba Metropolis, Delta State, Nigeria*. Retrieved on May 17th, 2009,
- Gamage, D., Adams, D., & McCormack, A. (2009) *How does a school leader's role influence student achievements? A review of research findings and best practices*. Retrieved on July 27th, 2009, from <http://cnx.org/content/m19751/latest/>
- Gay, L.R. (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. (4th Ed.). New York: Macmillan Publication.
- Green, R.L. (2005). *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards*. (2nd ed). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Greenfield, W.D. (1987), Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues, and Controversies. In Celikten, M. (2000). The instructional leadership tasks of high school assistant principals, *Journal of Educational Administration* 39(1), 67-76.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal* 86(2), 217-247.
- Harris, S.L., & Lowery, S. (2002). A view from the classroom. *Educational Leadership* 59(8), 64-66.
- Jamentz, K. (2002). *Isolation is the enemy of improvement: Instructional leadership to support standards-based practice*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Johnson, S.M., & Kardos, S.M. (2002). Keeping new teachers in mind. *Educational Leadership* 59(6), 12-17.
- Latip Muhammad (2006). *Pelaksanaan kepemimpinan pengajaran di kalangan pengetua sekolah di negeri Selangor Darul Ehsan*. Tesis Doktor Falsafah, Fakulti Pendidikan, Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. London: St. Edmundsbury Press.
- McEwan, E. K. (2003). *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership*. (2nd ed.). California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. (3rd ed). New York: Harper Collins College Publication
- Ministry of National Education Republic of Indonesia. Retrieved on May 20th, 2009 from <http://www.depdiknas.go.id/>

2nd Regional Conference on Educational Leadership and Management – RCELAM 2011. Institute Aminuddin Baki, Darul Aman, Kedah. 5 – 7 July 2011.

- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. (1983). Effective school: A review. *The Elementary School Journal* 83(4), 427-452.
- Quinn, D.M. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration* 40(5), 447-467.
- Reeves, D.B. (2004). Evaluating administrators. *Educational Leadership* 61(7), 52-58.
- Safer, N., & Fleischman, S. (2005). How student progress monitoring improves instruction. *Educational Leadership* 62(5), 81-83.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1996). *Professional supervision in teacher education*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & Management* 22(1), 73-91.
- Terry, P.M. (1996). The principal and instructional leadership. *Annual Conference National Council of Professors of Educational Administration*. Texas.
- Wildy, H., & Dimmock, C. (1993). Instructional leadership in primary and secondary school in Western Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration* 31(2), 43-61.