

The Pattern of Principal Instructional Leadership at Indonesian Senior High Schools

Rahayu, S¹, Usman, H², Wibawa, S³

^{1,2}Yogyakarta State University, ³Sarjanawiyata University

¹yustinasrrh@gmail.com, ²husainiusman@gmail.com ³sutrish@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aimed to find an effective pattern of instructional leadership for high school principals. This research was conducted using the qualitative approach. This research was conducted by analyzing and discussing effective instructional leadership practices in reference schools, as well as to find best practices that could have an impact on other schools. This research used the research object at the referral high schools in the Special Province of Yogyakarta, Indonesia, to determine what characteristics made effective instructional leadership in some of these reference schools. This research found that the principals inclusively carried out the instructional leadership in establishing the vision, instructional program, instructional supervision, and instructional evaluation by involving and giving greater autonomy to the staff, and indirectly executed through the development of a conducive culture and climate. Generally, instructional leadership practice starts from a complete understanding of the learning vision, communicating the vision, and then realizing the vision through the culture and school climate. The following vision is realized in the instructional program, instructional supervision, and instructional evaluation that are carried out inclusively by involving and giving greater autonomy to vice-principals, teachers, and staff. Monitoring and evaluation activities are carried out, including ensuring teachers teach the required curriculum, encouraging them to involve students in activities, meeting teachers individually to discuss student progress issues, discussing student learning outcomes with teachers, and requesting teachers to send reports on student progress to parents. Overall, learning evaluation is carried out jointly between the principal, teachers, and staff, both mutually (in formal meetings) and in personal consultations.

Keywords— Principal Instructional Leadership, Effectiveness, Senior High School

Introduction

Instructional leadership is one of the school leadership models that has become a research topic in the last few decades (Hallinger & Hosseingholizadeh, 2019). The early concept of instructional leadership was developed in the effective school movement in the 1980s in the United States (Hallinger, 2018). Early research in the 1980s demonstrated the vital role of principals in learning success (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Instructional leadership focuses on student learning processes and outcomes, deep and ongoing involvement in learning and curriculum issues, and having a stake in various

activities to improve teaching and learning in schools (Shaked, 2020; Brazer & Bauer, 2013; Neumerski et al., 2018). The application of instructional leadership has been shown to positively correlate with student academic outcomes (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2017). Although the principal's instructional leadership has a direct and low impact on student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 2011a, 2011b; Heck & Hallinger, 2014), it contributes to higher student achievement growth than other leadership styles (Bush & Glover, 2014; Murphy, Neumerski, Goldring, Grissom, & Porter, 2016; Hallinger, 2003). As a senior

teacher, a principal plays an essential role in the administrative aspect and as a leader who provides direction in achieving learning goals (Shaked, 2020). The learning goals are students' academic success, such as their knowledge breadth and depth in various disciplines, creative and analytical thinking skills, building a love for learning, and sparking curiosity (Pritchard, 2013).

Early studies (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985) revealed that the personality characteristics (trait theory) of ideal principals (strong mindset, directives, top-down management, and charisma) determine the effectiveness of the learning process in schools. During the 1990s, the instructional leadership model was widely criticized for focusing too much on the heroic role of individual principals. In recent studies, the concept of instructional leadership has developed not only to focus on the ability of principals (exclusive) but also inclusive leadership, such as involving staff, shared leadership (Breyer, 2014; Seobi & Wood, 2016), distributed leadership (Almarshad, 2017), internal and external collaboratives (Erdal et al., 2016; Kaparou & Bush, 2016), and transformational leadership (Quin et al., 2016; Nedelcu, 2013; Almarshad, 2017).

Studies of recent years have also found that the instructional leadership effectiveness on learning processes and outcomes is not performed directly yet indirectly, such as by building school culture and school climate: such as by regulating work processes, relationships, and involvement (Heck & Hallinger, 2014; Hallinger & Hosseingholizadeh, 2019). Another study (McNeill et al. 2018) suggests the importance of principal's instructional leadership in the practice of scientific learning. This study found that principals' leadership practices focused more on imparting knowledge; however, few focused on scientific learning practices.

Instructional leadership or teaching leaders is different from a principal's duties as a regulator or a manager in many ways. A principal who focuses as a manager is generally too focused

on strict administrative tasks than a principal who acts as an instructional leader. The latter role involves setting clear goals, allocating resources for instruction, implementing curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. In contrast, Instructional Leaders prioritize the quality of teaching as a school's top priority and strive to set that vision into reality (Lunerberg & Irby, 2006).

Murphy (1988) suggests four critical dimensions for instructional leadership: 1) Developing mission and goals, 2) Managing the educational production function, 3) Promoting an academic learning climate, and 4) Developing a supportive work environment. Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond (2004), through a literature study, identified that instructional leadership has several functions: 1) building a learning vision, 2) developing and managing a conducive school culture, 3) procuring and distributing resources, 4) supporting growth and teacher development both individually and collectively, 5) providing supervision and learning innovation both summative and formative, and 6) building a school climate. Hallinger (2011) developed indicators and instruments for the practice of instructional leadership known as the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), consisting of three dimensions. The first dimension relates to school leadership's role in formulating the learning process's objectives and academic outcomes that are easy to understand and assess; the principal must also socialize these goals to various stakeholders. The second dimension is to manage instructional programs, which relates to the role of school leaders in planning, monitoring, and evaluating the implementation of learning. The third dimension is to develop a positive school learning climate and culture.

This research aims to find an effective instructional leadership pattern for high school principals. Hallinger (2018) suggests that the effectiveness of a principal's instructional leadership can differ depending on the context. This research discusses the principal's

instructional leadership at high schools. Principal leadership in high schools plays a role as learner leadership to prepare future generations to be more dynamic, complex, and uncertain. School leadership plays a role in developing the future generations' characters: religious, active, creative, innovative, and solutive in facing various opportunities and challenges in the digital era, complexity, and environment dynamics (Kemendikbud, 2014). Pattern-oriented leadership focuses on personal leadership and antecedents (influence factors) and their impacts (Arnold et al., 2017; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982). Pattern is an arrangement or configuration of regular shapes through repetition, similarity, consistency, modularity arrangement, and interrelated components. It is a technique of matchmaking, dominant, integrated, or central characteristics (Creswell, 2014).

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used a qualitative approach through interviews with five principals at high schools in the Special Region of Yogyakarta province, Indonesia. A sampling of five regions to represent the region's various socio-cultural, economic, and geographical statuses. Referral schools were schools that had met or exceeded the National Education Standards and developed programs of excellence following the school's potential and the needs of the community. This research used the research object of reference schools to know what characteristics made effective instructional leadership in some of these referral schools. The qualitative analysis was to delve deeper into the practice of instructional leadership in the schools. The data collection activities through observations and interviews were carried out from September 2019 to January 2020. The research subjects were the Principals (Key Informant), vice-principals, and teachers in the five high schools. In-depth individual interviews, lasting an average of one hour each, were conducted in each of the five schools. In each school, researchers interviewed the principals and senior teachers. The senior teachers were selected in each school based on

years of experience working with the current principals. The qualitative data analysis was continued with developing an initial description of the instructional leadership practices that each principal often applied. This was done by comparing the perceptions of principals, vice-principals, and teachers to see the extent to which the interviewees had agreement or disagreement. Furthermore, a comparative analysis was carried out among the five schools.

RESULT, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This research found that several common characteristics made instructional leadership effective in several reference schools. They were: (1) the learning was started from the school's vision and curriculum, which were implemented through a conducive culture and climate; (2) the curriculum implementation planning, and learning supervision and evaluation were carried out inclusively through guidance, discussion, consultation, collaboratively.



In carrying out the general instructional leadership, the principals of the referral high schools started from a complete understanding of the vision of both the school vision and the national education vision implemented in the curriculum. The school's vision was prepared jointly by school leaders, teachers, education staff, including soliciting input from students' parents through the school committee; hopefully, the vision was compiled into a shared vision. (P1d, 05/09/2019). The teachers were required to implement the school's vision and mission during teaching and learning

activities. *"Our vision is the spirit; it must be the soul of every human being in this school"* (P1c, 03/10/2019). *"The school's vision is a spirit that will provide energy for us to make it happen. Every member of the school must live this vision"* (P1d, 05/09/2019). Every principal hoped that teachers had a vision and mission in learning. Through vision, teachers would have the ability to innovate to realize the school's vision and education vision in the learning curriculum (P2c, 04/10/2019).

The next vision was realized through culture (habitation) and a conducive climate in both academic and non-academic programs. The communication on the vision and cultural development in the five reference schools was carried out at every event, for example, in ceremonies, displayed in the front hall, through writing on posters and pamphlets, pictures, articles on wall magazines, and written documents in announcements or circulars (P2a, 04/09/2019; P1c, 03/10/2019), so that teachers, students, parents, and school stakeholders could see it easily (P2a, 04/09/2019). Principal C used the slogan *the school of leadership* and continuously conveyed it. Hence, it became the vision of every school community to lead graduates to become future leaders, leaders in all fields, and useful for development.

The next vision was realized in program planning, supervision, and evaluation of instructional programs. In general, the principal's role in successfully implementing the new curriculum was not carried out exclusively, namely principal-centered leadership. However, it was carried out inclusively by involving the vice principal in the field of curriculum, teachers, school committees, and parties related to developing curriculum at the education unit level. Democratization, the implementation of curriculum management, placed managers, implementers, and students in the proper position in carrying out their duties with full responsibility to achieve curriculum goals. School resources, in this case, teachers, staff, and special service officers as educators and

education staff, were optimized in the division of tasks by teaching according to their educational background and competency skills (P1a, 03/09/2019). The principals gave full autonomy to the teachers to develop teaching materials, teaching materials, learning models, teaching methods, and learning media, while still referring to the applicable provisions or curriculum; if there are difficulties, they were discussed in the Subject Teacher Consultation and consulted with the principal and/or supervisor" (P1a, 03/09/2019). Of course, this was done by monitoring the principals and supervisors under applicable regulations

1.1 Instructional Program

Schools responded to policies related to curriculum changes with work programs in the field of curriculum, including management of instructional resources (inputs), teaching and learning process (throughput), and performance monitoring (output). The resource management included: procurement of curriculum tools, workshops on learning preparation, workshops and revision of Education Unit Level Curriculum, procurement of learning tools, improvement of teacher competencies related to 4C competencies (Critical Thinking, Communication, Collaboration and Creativity, and Innovation), increasing teacher capabilities with information technology, and the evaluation tools learning (P1b, 11/10/2019), in collaboration with supervisors, as well as reference school resource persons (P2b, 11/10/2019). Regarding teacher readiness, the schools have sent teachers to attend training (workshops). Many teachers were left behind in the early stages of changing and revamping the new curriculum; however, by workshops and mentoring, students and teachers finally got used to the curriculum (P1a, 03/09/2019; P1b, 11/10/2019). The schools also facilitated continuous professional development activities for teachers, especially subject teacher deliberations at the schools and regency levels. The innovations related to improving learning were e-report workshops, stem workshops,

(Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS)-based assessment workshops, and classroom action research assistance (P3a, 29/01/2019). The learning and assessment workshops were held, including the preparation of HOTS questions and computer-based questions” (P1c, 03/10/2019; P2a, 03/09/2019). Planning for infrastructure played an essential role in implementing learning, culture, and a favorable school climate. The principals acted as facilitators to prepare facilities and infrastructure that supported the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum by gradually budgeting in the activity plans and school budgets, such as procurement of textbooks both teacher and student books, procurement of LCDs, printers, laptops, wi-fi networks, and learning media (P1a, 03/09/2019). The financial resources were managed well by the treasurers under their jobs; the funds from the Committee and Regional School Operational Assistance were accounted for periodically” (P1a, 03/09/2019).

In terms of throughput, the instructional program consisted of programs of academic and non-academic activities. The knowledge improvement was carried out through academic programs. The skills improvement was carried out at extracurricular activities, both individually and in groups. The attitudes and behavior improvements were through motivation, exemplary, and school culture and climate development. The principals of the five high schools emphasized that it was also essential to create an excellent atmosphere to create excellent and conducive learning conditions. The principals in the five referral high schools had strategies in agendas (activities) for learning activities implemented by building an organizational culture that could be seen in the habits.

Academic programs were mandatory programs carried out by reference schools, namely: Quality Improvement and National Standard Fulfillment, which consisted of syllabus analysis and learning implementation plans; development of assessment based on information and communication technology; development of HOTS questions; the Ministry

of Education and Culture's Policy Implementation Program which included Character development; and Implementation of local content development. Various activity programs for academic achievement development at School A (P1a, 03/09/2019): material deepening, providing achievement motivation, try out, scientific competitions, National Science Olympiad assistance, literacy movement, reading culture, ready for university mentoring, mastery learning program, e-report, and e-library. various program activities for developing non-academic achievements: referral schools, healthy canteens, accredited libraries, e-report, Training of Trainers (ToT) program in team teaching, Extras based on talent and demand, schools based on arts and culture, and the talent development for sports and artistic achievements.

The strategies carried out by the principals in building scientific attitudes and behavior (solving scientific-based problems) were to build a climate and culture, such as through habituation, motivation, and exemplary in both academic and non-academic activities (P1a, 03/09/2019; P1b. 11/10/2019; P1c, 03/10/2019). Scientific learning started from observing the environment, identifying problems (inquiring), reasoning (finding theories to solve problems, solving problems, and finally, the communication process and forming networks.

The five schools built a positive culture and climate by encouraging the students to respect humans and the environment. The culture was developed in writings, slogans, and mottos needed to build awareness and good habits (P1a, 03/09/2019; P1b. 11/10/2019; P1c, 03/10/2019), and exemplary (P2a, 04/09/2019). Various program activities for the development of academic achievement at School B (P2b, 20/01/2020): the healthy school program, the services for students with extraordinary intelligence, and the guide to be success in national exams and passing universities. Furthermore, to develop the talents and interests of our students, we developed compulsory and optional extracurriculars.

School C developed the *safe school* program, school of leadership program, and the entrepreneurial spirit; “safe” schools are schools where the students and other school members feel comfortable and happy to be in the school environment performing learning activities, both curricular and extracurricular. The School Literacy Movement existed in three schools. The School Literacy Movement is a comprehensive effort to make schools a learning organization whose citizens are lifelong literate through public involvement. School D carried out continuous development for students in addition to classroom learning according to the curriculum. The school gave priority to academic activities through tutoring, training to improve achievement in subject and scientific competitions, optimizing information and communications technology-based learning in schools, and English (P1d. 11/09 2019).

The discipline culture in the five schools was instilled through daily activities such as getting to school on time, entering class on time, not being late at the flag ceremony, and fully dressed according to the daily provisions. School C applied a point system for the students covering several aspects of discipline (P1a, 03/09/2019). At the same time, School A used a fingerprint system (P1a, 03/09/2019).

The clean-and-healthy-living culture was developed through habituation activities such as the healthy culture by washing hands and throwing garbage in its place and, according to its type, the culture of loving the environment (P1a, 03/09/2019; P1b. 11/10/2019; P1c, 03/10/2019). The events held by the schools were almost entirely the responsibility of the students who were also the members of the events, thus training their independence and responsibility. The human respect culture was built with the culture of smile, greeting, salutation (P1a, 03/09/2019). The positive school cultures were built on a shared commitment by all school members. The exemplary came from the principals and teachers as parents. (P2a, 04/09/2019). The development of attitudes, caring, creative, and innovative behavior was

manifested in a culture (habituation) and conducive climate, therefore the student character development did not stop at school but became habituation in the family and community (P1a, 03/09/2019; P1b. 11/10/2019; P1c, 03/10/2019). The skills improvement should have been carried out at extracurricular activities. The principals emphasized that it was also vital to create a good atmosphere at school to create excellent and conducive learning conditions.

Various program activities for the development of academic and non-academic achievements in schools were written in the School Work Plan, and were socialized to all school members, committees, teachers and parents, so that all parties supported these activities (P1a, 03/09/2019; P1b. 11/10/2019). The principals played a role in socializing the new curriculum, preparing and developing human resources, preparing infrastructure, and providing instructional strategy directions. The socialization was carried out, such as at flag ceremonies and meetings. The preparation and development of human resources were through training and mentoring. The schools carried out workshops and mentoring themselves as well as mentoring by supervisors. The principals guided teachers in implementing the Curriculum and were further strengthened in classroom supervision and direct direction by the principals themselves. Indeed, learning implementation plans cannot be separated from the syllabus because the syllabus is a guideline for making learning implementation plans. Principals are usually only direct input/direction from them regarding the components of the learning implementation plan, namely an identity that includes the name of the school, theme, sub-theme, learnings, time allocation, basic competencies, material indicators, methods, learning media, and learning steps. There are initial, core, and final activities; the last one is to conduct an assessment. Principals always encourage teachers to have better teaching plans, communicative teaching methods according to the new curriculum,

participate in professional development activities, and achieve higher education (P1b, 11/10/2019).

1.2 Instructional Supervision

The principals conducted academic supervision in collaboration with the School Supervisor, and were assisted by the Supervisor Team doubled as the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) Team. The supervision was scheduled once a semester, while the TPA was carried out twice annually. The monitoring was carried out in every aspect of activities to ensure activities could be carried out under the program (P1c, 03/10/2019). The principals carried out the monitoring in senior teachers, including TPA Assessors. The TPA Assessor Team assisted the principals in supervising both planning and implementation (P2c, 04/10/2019). The monitoring was done through CCTV, performed by the IT admins who monitored the student attendance, the picket teachers who monitored and handled learning per class to ensure that it ran well, and the principals and vice-principals of curriculum division. The supervision was carried out by school principals and supervisors, and the TPA assessment by the school principals and the TPA assessor team, every November each year. According to P1c, the supervision was carried out once a year through TPA, learning documents, and classroom implementation. The student attendance was monitored through fingerprints by the IT admin, which was then reported on the condition of student attendance through the discipline group, the picket teachers who monitored and handled learning per class to ensure it ran well, and the principals and vice-principals of curriculum division; using CCTV. The teachers were free to choose and innovate their learning models (P1c, 03/10/2019). The monitoring was carried out in every aspect of activities to ensure they could be carried out under the program. *"We evaluate learning performance with the PKG teachers, both formative and summative"* (P2c, 04/10/2019).

The principals provided simple directions on implementing scientific learning, especially the importance of student's motivation, critical, active, creative, and innovative attitudes and behavior towards knowledge of theory and practice in life rather than just theoretical knowledge (memorization). The teachers and employees were managed and encouraged to have better teaching plans, communicative teaching methods according to the demands of curriculum participated in professional development activities, and achieved higher education (P1b, 11/10/2019). The principals routinely received monitoring in the preparation of learning tools, even starting at the beginning of the semester by signing the learning planning document. Then periodically, the teachers were also monitored by the principals and supervisors in verifying the planning and implementation of learning documents (P1c, 03/10/2019). The learning was monitored from the preparation carried out by the teachers to the reporting. "As a reference school, our documents are complete because one of our functions is as a reference for other schools" (P1d, 05/09/2019). The issue of monitoring and evaluation was fundamental related to maintaining school quality. "We carry out monitoring assisted by the vice-principal, and we carry out joint evaluations periodically" (P1e, 07/10/2019).

After supervising, the principals then analyzed possible ways to improve the school successfully. Principal A, among others, always supported and encouraged the teachers and students to create better school programs in the future (P1a, 03/09/2019). The principals carried out this feedback activity to strengthen and coach learning activities that have been supervised previously. In the implementation of this supervision, the main target of feedback activities was teaching and learning activities. The principals analyzed the observations so that they could be used as improvement programs to improve teacher performance. Feedback activities were utilized for the development of teaching skills and teacher professionalism. With feedback, it would provide an opportunity

to encourage teachers to improve their appearance and performance.

The principals applied distributed leadership by giving the teachers full authority in the learning process in the classroom. Teachers are leaders in their respective classes (P3a, 29/01/2020). Class visits. The indirect supervision through CCTV, and meetings held by the principals, made this supervision implementation improve in learning. The principals always had discussions with the teachers to observe and supervise the difficulties in improving the quality of learning because, in this way, the principals could get information about the weaknesses and strengths of the learning in the classroom.

The principals observed directly and indirectly (through) to provide input to teachers about teaching methods and students. The principals communicated the barriers with the teacher (P1a, 03/09/2019). Communication is the main thing to do to overcome obstacles. Likewise, with school B, the principal discussed the obstacles with the teachers, staff, and the school community (P1b, 11/10/2019). The supervision results were evaluated with the help of school supervisors, and used for improvement in the following semester. The vice-principal of the curriculum division coordinated these activities and assisted in implementing and reporting (P2a, 04/09/2019). "We verify the RPP with the PKG Team on the RPP components, both KI, the appropriate KD, learning models, Learning Media, and their assessment. We are accompanied by the school supervisor, too" (P1b, 11/10/2019).

In implementing the supervision, the principals treated the teachers as the people who could progress and develop better. The Supervision implementation was not just carrying out tasks, looking for teacher mistakes, or being patronizing. However, it was a systematic and sustainable coaching process. In supervising, the principals were not autocratic but required a creative attitude in solving various problems in the learning. In this case, the principals always listened to the teachers' input when conducting

the supervision. The principals always created situations where the teachers felt comfortable and accepted as subjects who could develop themselves. The difficulties and complaints of teachers were addressed by the existence of IT improvement workshops, mastery of learning methods, assessment, questions writing, and the fulfillment of infrastructure related to the learning (P2a, 04/09/2019).

The principals supervised learning with the concept of controlling (supervising) the learning process without the teachers feeling supervised and without the impression of being *teachers*. The supervision was the learning process in the classroom and the attitudes and behavior of students outside the classroom. This was done through CCTV, for instance. The monitoring and evaluation were carried out by ensuring the teachers teach the required curriculum, encouraging them to involve students in activities, meeting with teachers individually to discuss student progress issues, discussing student learning outcomes with teachers, requesting teachers to send reports on student progress to parents. Whenever the teachers felt difficulty implementing the curriculum learning, the principals guided them through discussions about the obstacles and challenges in curriculum implementation; especially, the new 2013 curriculum, whose characteristics are different from the previous curriculum.

1.3 Instructional Evaluation

Schools have regular agendas of official meetings, plenary meetings, and limited meetings to discuss programs that will be implemented, whether programmed or not, and evaluate activities that have been carried out. Principals arrange regular meetings with all teachers to discuss future planning. For the most part, they revise the goals of existing schools. Principals hold a special meeting to design a school plan together with the teachers. In this meeting session, principals and the teachers shared the teachers' ideas (P2a, 04/09/2019).

The curriculum requires that the evaluation of student learning outcomes use authentic assessment. Authentic assessment is more focused on complex or contextual tasks. Conventional assessments used to measure achievement, with multiple-choice, true-false, matchmaking, and so on, have failed to determine students' actual performance. Such tests are seen as failing to obtain a complete picture of students' attitudes, skills, and knowledge concerning their real lives outside of school or society. Types of authentic assessments, which include: (1) performance appraisal, (2) project appraisal, (3) portfolio assessment, and (4) written assessment. Principals open up vast opportunities for teachers to develop the development of learning evaluation tools. The teacher stated that they would prefer the principals to give her a target with the freedom to create their teaching methods and develop their learning evaluation tools. Good cooperation between principals and the teachers can be created when the principals provide flexibility in teaching and learning activities, such as autonomy in making their learning evaluation tools.

Learning evaluation is carried out qualitatively and quantitatively; it can differ according to their talents and interests, which becomes a challenge for teachers. Principals and teachers need to carry out continuous process evaluations through close monitoring of processes and achievements. Assessment is based on the student's progress in learning (relative to himself in the previous period). Overall, learning evaluation is carried out jointly between the principal and teachers and staff both jointly (in meetings) and personal consultations. Learning evaluation is carried out to evaluate achievements, process barriers for continuous improvement.

Evaluation of learning performance is carried out using Teacher Performance Assessment, both formative and summative. Evaluation determines the value and significance of the activity. The evaluation also helps schools to develop existing school programs or create new ones. Each school principal conducts regular

evaluations through school meetings with teachers and school stakeholders. Principal A tries to innovate by making feedback forms for teachers and students to fill out (P1a, 03/09/2019). Forms are distributed at the beginning and end of the school semester, consisting of; (1) supervisor form, filled out by the principal, (2) teacher reflection form, filled out by the teacher, (2) student reflection form, filled out by students.

The principal in providing feedback using instruments that have been prepared previously, the principal himself is expected to be able to provide feedback and evaluation so that the results of the implementation of supervision are clear. The principal analyzes the results of the implementation of supervision to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the supervised teachers as a reference for providing feedback. Weaknesses and the advantages of teachers in carrying out learning, the level of mastery of teacher competencies, then sought solutions for coaching and feedback so that teachers can correct existing deficiencies while maintaining excellence in carrying out learning. Therefore, with feedback in the implementation of academic supervision, the principal will provide improvement programs to teachers to correct their shortcomings during the implementation of subsequent academic supervision.

School principals involve teachers in developing learning evaluations. This is because the teacher is the party who best knows the ability or progress of student learning, not the principal, supervisor, or structural officials in the Department or Service. This is partly because it is the teachers who communicate and interact with students in the classroom and the school environment daily. The principal gives very flexible authority to teachers to assess student learning outcomes. Reports on the results of the assessment by the teacher are submitted to the principal and other related parties (eg homeroom teachers, Guidance and Counseling teachers, and parents/guardians) within the specified period. Principal A (P1a, 03/09/2019) held an evaluation meeting with his teachers to discuss the progress of the

school program. Meetings take place regularly or spontaneously. The principal holds regular meetings with his teachers to evaluate the teacher's work. During the evaluation, they discussed the results of several school activities based on the standards set by the principal as well as the teachers.

The principal and the team evaluate learning to ensure that the class gets learning according to the schedule (P1a, 03/09/2019). At the beginning of the semester, by collaborating with supervisors, the principal ensures that teachers are ready with learning planning documents, namely semester programs, syllabus assessment programs, and lesson plans, by verifying teacher learning planning documents. Then further monitor learning in class directly with class visits and indirectly through teacher picket reports and the use of CCTV in classrooms (P1a, 03/09/2019).

Conclusions

The results of this study in general also found that the Principals of the Referral High School in DIY were very effective in implementing Instructional Leadership, from establishing a vision, curriculum development, supervision, and evaluation development. The Principals of the Referral High School in DIY in carrying out instructional leadership in general starts from a complete understanding of the vision of both the school vision and the national education vision implemented in the curriculum. The vision is then communicated to all school members, manifested in a conducive culture and climate. Principals in the planning curriculum implementation, supervision, and evaluation are inclusively involved and gave greater autonomy to waka, teachers, and staff. The problems of learning leadership are curriculum changes, teacher and principal transfers, teacher workloads, diverse student abilities, Solutions to overcome the problems of curriculum changes, teacher and principal transfers; teacher workloads are by: involving teachers in workshop programs, consultations, and guidance. The solution to overcome

students' diverse abilities is with remedial and enrichment programs for students with below-average abilities and multiple intelligences and material deepening for students with above-average abilities.

This study has implications for effective principals' instructional leadership patterns amid curriculum changes, emphasizing the importance of scientific learning and building character (religious, active, creative, innovative). The effectiveness of instructional leadership in setting vision, planning curriculum implementation, supervising learning, and evaluating learning can be achieved through distributed leadership, shared leadership, and indirect leadership. Indirect leadership is through the development of school culture and climate. Distributed leadership, shared leadership, and indirect leadership are needed as a driving force and controller for students, teachers, and stakeholders in shaping students' character in a sustainable learning process anywhere and anytime.

This study has several limitations. First, the research was conducted with a qualitative approach so that further research is needed in developing instructional leadership assessment indicators such as through confirmatory factors analysis. Second, the relationship between research variables, such as the impact of instructional leadership activities on the quality of learning such as: target behavior, culture, and student achievement, cannot be measured and identified. Third, the research was conducted in several public high schools, which are reference schools in Special Province of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The research object was carried out in several reference schools in Special Province of Yogyakarta, Indonesia, to accommodate regional and cultural differences. However, the research results have the opportunity not to be applied (as a reference) for schools with different levels, private schools, informal or formal schools, and homeschooling. Best practice may also exist in the school model.

Further research can be carried out on different levels of school, private schools, other model

schools (boarding schools, informal schools). Fourth, the research was conducted on conditions before and after the COVID-19 pandemic. On the one hand, Pandemic conditions provide a research context on environmental dynamics. However, on the other hand, they can affect the constraints and effectiveness of instructional leadership practices. In pandemic conditions, the learning process is often carried out through online media. This facilitates dynamic learning; namely, learning can be done anytime and anywhere and gives students autonomy and independence in learning. However, students' attitudes and behavior cannot be fully controlled through camera media on gadgets. This becomes an obstacle in learning. The research results have the opportunity not to be applied (become a reference) for different environmental conditions, other technological developments, and different government policies.

References

1. Abonyi, U.K., & Sofo, F., (2019) Exploring instructional leadership practices of leaders in Ghanaian basic schools, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13603124.2019.1629628
2. Almarshad, Y. O. (2017). The Effects of Instructional, Transformation and Distributed Leadership on Students' Academic Outcomes: A Meta -Analysis. *International Journal of Education*, 9(2), 1. doi:10.5296/ije.v9i2.10263
3. Alsaleh, A. (2019) Investigating instructional leadership in Kuwait's educational reform context: school leaders' perspectives, *School Leadership & Management*, 39:1, 96-120, DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2018.1467888
4. Andrews, R. L., Basom, M. R., & Basom, M. (1991). Instructional leadership: Supervision that makes a difference. *Theory into Practice*, 30(2), 97–101. DOI: 10.1080/00405849109543484
5. Arnold, K.A., Connelly, C.E., Gellatly, I.R., Walsh, M.M., Withey, M.J., (2017), Using a pattern-oriented approach to study leaders: Implications for burnout and perceived role demand, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, J. Organiz. Behav. Published online in Wiley Online Library* (wileyonlinelibrary.com) DOI: 10.1002/job.2182
6. Barrett, C.E., & Breyer, R. (2014). The Influence of Effective Leadership on Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, 1, 3. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2541105
7. Berkowitz, M. W. (2021). Implementing and Assessing Evidence-Based Character Education. *Journal of Education*. DOI:10.1177/00220574211026908
8. Beytekin, O.F., Toprakçı, E., & Chipala, H.C. (2016). A Case Study of Instructional Leadership in Malawian Secondary Schools. DOI:10.17679/INUEFD.17314606
9. Brazier, S. D., & Bauer, S. C. (2013). Preparing Instructional Leaders: A Model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(4), 645–684. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13478977>
10. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership and Management*, 34(5), 553–571. DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2014.928680
11. Creswell J (2014) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
12. Duke, D. L. (1982). Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness. *NASSP Bulletin*, 66(456), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658206645601>
13. Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). London, UK: Pearson.
14. Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon (2007), *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership*:

- A Developmental Approach*, 9th Edition. Pearson
15. Hallinger, P., & Hosseingholizadeh, R. (2020). Exploring instructional leadership in Iran: A mixed methods study of high- and low-performing principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219836684>
 16. Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005>
 17. Hallinger, P. (2015). The Evolution of Instructional Leadership. Assessing Instructional Leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale, 1–23. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-15533-3_1.
 18. Hallinger, P. (2018). *Principal Instructional Leadership*. *The Wiley Handbook of Teaching and Learning*, 505–528. doi:10.1002/9781118955901.ch21
 19. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the Principal's Role in School Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X96032001002>
 20. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the Principal's Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157–191. DOI:10.1080/0924345980090203
 21. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011a). Conceptual and methodological issues in studying school leadership effects as a reciprocal process. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(2), 149–173. DOI: 10.1080/09243453.2011.565777
 22. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011b). Exploring the journey of school improvement: Classifying and analyzing patterns of change in school improvement processes and learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(1), 1–27. DOI:10.1080/09243453.2010.536322
 23. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. DOI:10.1086/461445
 24. Heck, R. H. (1992). *Principals' instructional leadership and school performance: Implications for policy development*. Ronald H. Educational Evaluation
 25. Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the effects of school leadership on teaching and learning over time. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(5), 653–681. DOI:10.1108/JEA-08-2013-0097
 26. Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional Leadership and School Achievement: Validation of a Causal Model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(2), 94–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X90026002002>
 27. Kaparou, M. and Bush, T. (2016), "Instructional leadership in Greek and English outstanding schools", *International Journal of Educational Management* 30(6), 894-912. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2015-0025>
 28. Kemendikbud (2014) *Konsep dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Paparan Wakil Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan R.I Bidang Pendidikan
 29. Lunenburg FC and Irby BJ (2006). *The principalship: Vision to action*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
 30. Marsh, D. D. (1992). Enhancing Instructional Leadership: Lessons from the California School Leadership Academy. *Education and Urban Society*, 24(3), 386–409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124592024003006>

31. McClelland, D.C., & Boyatzis, R.E., (1982) Leadership Motive Pattern and Long-Term Success in Management, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67(6), 737-743. DOI:10.1037/0021-9010.67.6.737
32. McNeill, KL, Lowenhaupt RJ, Katsh-Singer R., (2018), Instructional leadership in the era of the NGSS: Principals' understandings of science practices. *Sci Ed.*;1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21336>
33. Mulyasa, E. (2005). *Menjadi Guru Profesional*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosda Karya .
34. Murphy, J. (1988). Methodological, Measurement, and Conceptual Problems in the Study of Instructional Leadership. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(2), 117–139. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737010002117>
35. Murphy, J., Neumerski, C. M., Goldring, E., Grissom, J., & Porter, A. (2016). Bottling fog? The quest for instructional management. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(4), 455–471. DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2015.1064096
36. Nedelcu, A. (2013). Transformational Approach to School Leadership: Contribution to Continued Improvement of Education. *Manager Journal*, 17, 237-244.
37. Neumerski, C. M., Grissom, J. A., Goldring, E., Rubin, M., Cannata, M., Schuermann, P., & Drake, T. A. (2018). Restructuring instructional leadership: How multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems are redefining the role of the school principal. *The Elementary School Journal*, 119(2), 270–297. DOI:10.1086/700597
38. Pritchard, D. (2013). Epistemic virtue and the epistemology of education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 47(2), 236–247. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9752.12022
39. Quin, J., Deris, A.R., Bischoff, G., & Johnson, J.T. (2015). Comparison of Transformational Leadership Practices: Implications for School Districts and Principal Preparation. *The Journal of Leadership Education*, 14, 71-85. DOI:10.12806/V14/I3/R5
40. Seobi, Boitshepo Audrey, & Wood, Lesley. (2016). Improving the instructional leadership of heads of department in under-resourced schools: A collaborative action-learning approach. *South African Journal of Education*, 36(4), 1-14. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15700/saje.v36n4a1326>
41. Shaked, H. (2020), "A paradoxical approach to instructional leadership", *International Journal of Educational Management* Vol. 34 No. 10, pp. 1637-1646. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2020-0181>
42. Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond (2004) Towards a theory of leadership practice: a distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34. DOI: DOI:10.1080/0022027032000106726
43. Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A Review of School Climate Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 357–385. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907>