INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN BELIZEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

By

CAROL BABB

Bachelor of Science
Licentiate College of Preceptors
City, State
1985

Master of Science in Secondary Education
University of North Florida
Jacksonville, Florida
2002

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 2012

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN BELIZEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Bernita Krumm

Committee Chair

Dr. Edward Harris

Dissertation Adviser

Dr. Stephen Wanger

Dr. Marumba Mwavita

Dr. Sheryl A. Tucker

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many wonderful people assisted me in the completion of this dissertation and to all of them I am extremely grateful. Without their assistance, cooperation and prayers I would not have been able to successfully complete this study.

Therefore, it is with heartfelt appreciation that I extend my sincerest appreciation to the following persons:

My professor, Dr. Bernita Krum, who has been my guide throughout the entire process. You have been instrumental in helping me to ensure that my study was of the highest quality. To the other members of my committee: Dr. Harris, Dr. Marumba and Dr. Wagner, thanks for the advice given to improve the quality of my dissertation.

Dr. Cathryn Turrentine, who has been my inspiration and who kept reminding me that my study was "doable". I give her credit for editing my work and for her promptness in providing feedback throughout all the stages of my dissertation. Her guidance through this process kept me motivated and her direction and editorial comments were clear, precise and ever so helpful.

Hon. Patrick Faber, Minister of Education who assisted with financial aid to cover tuition cost and for always being very supportive of my work and the training of the principals that was a part of this study.

Dr. Candy Armstrong, who assisted me in editing and encouraging me to continue in times of frustration.

Ashley Young, Bryann Griffith and David Flores who assisted me in administering the survey and inputting the data.

The principals and teachers who participated in the study.

My family, especially my daughter, Candice Babb, my son, Cristian Babb, my husband Steve Babb, my sisters, and sister-in-law, Elena Babb. Thanks for your unwavering encouragement, love, understanding and support throughout the entire course of my studies.

All my friends and colleagues, especially Rose, Candy, Dian, Sheldon, Maxine, Lorna, and faculty members and departmental staff of the College of Education, Oklahoma State University especially Vallory Vencill. You were a supportive team especially in times when I felt this task was impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The role of the principal has been the focus of numerous studies over the past 30 years (Smith & Andrews, 1989). It has been said that the principal has many roles, serving as manager, administrator, instructional leader, and curriculum leader. The principal spends more time in managerial and administrative duties even though the business of school should be teaching and learning.

The role of "instructional leader" became popular as a model in the 1980s, which called for a change from principals being managers or administrators to instructional leaders. This shift came about after researchers observed that instructional leaders focused on instruction and curriculum (Lashway, 2002). Later, in the first half of the 1990s, "attention to instructional leadership seemed to waver, displayed by discussions of school-based management and facilitative leadership" (Lashway, 2002, p.1). Currently, instructional leadership is given a lot of attention because it focuses on academic standards and makes schools more accountable.

While most people would agree that instructional leadership is very important in the development of effective schools, it is rarely practiced (Flath, 1989; Fullan, 1991). Principals find it extremely difficult to find a balance in their role as manager-administrator and instructional leader (Flath, 1989; Fullan, 1991). Some reasons cited for less time given to instructional leadership are lack of training for principals as instructional leaders, lack of time to carry out the role of an instructional leader, increased paper work, and the community's expectation that the principal's role is that of a manager (Flath, 1989; Fullan, 1991).

Defining Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership is different from the administrative role of a principal or manager in many ways. Principals who are administrators spend more time in their offices doing administrative duties as compared to instructional leaders. Instructional leadership consists of those actions that a principal takes to promote student learning. Instructional leaders do the following: (a) demonstrate that all students can learn; (b) provide human and material resources for teachers to ensure success; (c) keep up with the latest development in teaching, learning, motivation, classroom managements and assessment and share best practices with teachers; (d) create an environment of high expectations in the school and respect for all teachers, students, parents and the community; and (e) recognize and celebrate academic excellence among students and teachers and reinforce a climate of academic excellence (Hoy & Hoy, 2009).

Belize and its Educational System: The Setting for This Study

The setting for this study was Belize City, former capital and largest city in the nation of Belize. Belize is an independent country, located in northeastern Central America with a coastline of about 200 miles in length, bounded on the north and northwest by Mexico, on the east by the Caribbean Sea, and on the south and west by Guatemala. The first European settlers arrived in 1637. These settlers were British crewmen who shipwrecked on the reef that guards the entire length of the coast. Belize is the only English-speaking country in Central America, and Spanish is its second language. Consequently, it is placed in a unique geographic position to connect its Spanish speaking neighbors and the English speaking Caribbean.

The total area of Belize is 22,965 square kilometers (8,867 sq. miles), divided into six districts: Belize, Cayo, Orange Walk, Corozal, Stann Creek, and Toledo. The population of

311,500 (2007) is multiethnic, consisting of Creole, Mestizo, Maya, Ketchi, Garifuna, German/Dutch, Syrian/Lebanese, and White. The largest sub-groups are the Creole and Mestizo.

The main center of commerce is Belize City; it had a population of 63,700 in 2007 (Ministry of Finance, Central Statistical Office, 2007). Belize City is the commercial capital of the nation. The city proper is divided into Northside and Southside. Belize City has the greatest number of education institutions at all levels in the nation of Belize.

Belize is said to be a developing country with potential for great economic development, although in 1991 most workers earned between $2,880 and $8,639 per annum, with an unemployment rate of nearly 60%. The American dollar is equivalent to two Belizean dollars. Twenty percent of the public sector expenditure goes to education (Ministry of Education, 1995).

At the primary level, the education system of Belize is a church-state partnership. Under this partnership, of the 254 primary schools in Belize, 78% (198) are managed by religious denominations. The church-state system was described by Thompson (1991):

> The Honduras Free School, the first school to be established in 1816, was supported by voluntary subscriptions…and subsidized by public funds… "Government- aided schools" receive 100 percent of teachers' salaries, a supplementary grant at a fixed rate per pupil, as well as 50 percent of the capital and recurrent expenditure for the schools under their management… Government schools are managed by the Ministry of Education. (pp. 33-34)

Table 1 shows the number of primary schools in Belize and the involvement of religious denominations in the management of these schools.

Table 1.

Number of Primary Schools by District, Management, and U/R Location

Management/ Urban/Rural	Belize	Cayo	Corozal	Orange Walk	Stann Creek	Toledo	Total
Government/	7	15	6	12	5	10	55
Urban	1	3	0	1	0	0	5
Rural	6	12	6	11	5	10	50
Roman Catholic/	14	26	20	15	14	30	119
Urban	6	5	2	2	2	2	19
Rural	8	21	18	13	12	28	100
Anglican/	9	4	1	1	3	2	20
Urban	5	2	1	1	1	0	10
Rural	4	2	0	0	2	2	10
Methodist/	7	0	2	0	4	3	16
Urban	5	0	1	0	1	1	8
Rural	2	0	1	0	3	2	8
Seventh Day Adventist/	5	5	6	1	2	1	20
Urban	3	3	1	1	1	1	10
Rural	2	2	5	0	1	0	10
Nazarene/	1	4	2	0	0	0	7
Urban	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Rural	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Assemblies of God/	1	1	1	0	2	0	5
Urban	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Rural	0	1	1	3	1	0	3
Private/	9	3	0	3	1	2	18
Urban	9	1	0	0	1	0	11
Rural	0	2	0	3	0	2	7
Other/	13	6	4	5	4	2	34
Urban	8	2	1	2	1	0	14
Rural	5	4	3	3	3	2	20
Total	66	64	42	37	35	50	294
Urban	39	18	7	7	8	4	83
Rural	27	46	35	30	37	46	211

Source: Planning & Projects Unit, MOE

Note: Ministry of Education (2008-2009)

Primary school education is compulsory for Belizean children between ages 5 and 14. Each primary school develops its own instructional program, using the centrally developed

curriculum guides provided by the Ministry of Education. Primary education normally covers eight years, with the average age at the end of primary school being 13 years. Grade levels are referred to as Infants One and Two, and Standard One though Six. At the completion of Standard Six, students move on to the secondary level, providing that they meet admissions criteria. The number of primary school children in Belize in 2008-2009 was 66,735 (Ministry of Education, 2008-2009). There were 34,998 male primary students and 25,648 female students. Unfortunately, no statistics are available to show the dispersal of ethnic groups throughout the education system. It is fair to assume that in a primary school population of nearly 25% of the country's total population; all ethnic groups would be represented in each primary school. All students in Belize sit two national examinations within their primary school experience. These are the Belize Junior Achievement Test (BJAT) and the Primary School Examination (PSE).

The BJAT is administered at the middle division of primary education. Students sit standardized, centrally developed tests in Mathematics and in English. These tests consist of both multiple choice and free response items. Results of this assessment are not reported to students or parents, but are analyzed to provide schools, school managers, and the Ministry of Education with information regarding numeracy and literacy competencies within the system. Following this approach, the Ministry of Education intends that analyses of student performance on the BJAT will aid providers of educational services to make informed decisions regarding resource allocation and policy issues.

The PSE was introduced in May 2000. It replaced the Belize National Selection Examination (BNSE), which was administered in previous years. Like the BJAT, the PSE is a standardized test. It is administered to children who have completed their primary education. The PSE is a criterion test while the BNSE, which it replaced, was a norm-referenced test, so the

manner in which the grades were reported has been changed. Test content is comprised of material covered in the upper division of primary education. Results of this test are used to facilitate movement from the primary school level. Movement to secondary school is not automatic; therefore, students compete for limited spaces at the secondary level (Ministry of Education, 1999-2000).

Like its first-world neighbors, Belize is concerned about declining rates of academic success for school children. According to Barrow (2001), the year 2000 overall repetition rate at the primary level was 9.3%. In absolute terms this means that 5,090 students did not meet the standard set for their class and were characterized as having failed. The *Education Statistics at Glance 2008-2009* revealed that the overall repetition rate was7.2% in 2008-2009. The pass/fail rates are determined by the school's passing grade. In most schools, the average passing grade is about 60%. Students who score far below the passing grade are usually recommended to repeat the grade level.

Problem Statement and Purpose of the Study

The literature on principals as instructional leaders consists of studies conducted in developed countries, where principals are required to have formal leadership training before assuming leadership positions. In contrast, principals in Belize are typically given leadership positions because they are good classroom teachers or are faithful members of their churches. At this time, no policy exists that teachers must complete formal training before becoming principals, so Belizean primary school principals do not generally have any training in instructional leadership. Therefore, the impact of formal training in instructional leadership is unknown. The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of a training program for instructional leadership on the instructional leadership behaviors of Belizean primary school

principals, specifically, providing general communication, monitoring instruction and testing, planning, and providing instructional feedback.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study was guided by the following research questions:

Research Question 1

Does a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically monitoring the curriculum and instruction have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers?

The null hypothesis for this research question was:

H_{01}: A training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model of principalship specifically monitoring and instruction had no effect on principals' instructional leadership behaviors as perceived by teachers.

Research Question 2

Does a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically monitoring student progress have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers?

The null hypothesis for this research question was:

H_{02}: A training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model of principalship specifically monitoring student progress had no effect on principals' instructional leadership behaviors as perceived by teachers.

Research Question 3

Does a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically supervision and supporting teachers have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers?

The null hypothesis for this research question was:

H_{03}: A training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model of principalship specifically supervision and supporting teachers had no effect on principals' instructional leadership behaviors as perceived by teachers.

Theoretical Framework

Theories of education leadership came into existence during the late nineteenth century in an effort to define the nature of school leadership. Trait, behavior and contingency theories provided the framework for the evolution of instructional leadership, and, therefore, provide the theoretical background for this study of instructional leadership.

Trait Theory

Trait theory was one of the first theories developed to study leadership. Leadership traits were studied to investigate what made great leaders. The theories that were developed were called “great man” theories because they focused on the idea that people were born with certain character traits or qualities. It was believed that great leaders like Abraham Lincoln were born with these leadership traits. The early development of the theory focused on comparing leaders to non-leaders (Bass, 1990).

An early researcher in leadership theory was Stogill (1948). He reviewed 124 trait studies from 1904 to 1947 and identified the following as leadership traits that distinguished leaders from non-leaders: intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence,

self-confidence and sociability. The findings of the survey revealed that an individual does not become a leader solely because he or she possesses certain traits, but rather the traits that the leader possesses are relevant to the situation in which he or she is performing.

Trait theory and research have provided researchers and educators with meaningful information about leadership traits and effectiveness. It is important when selecting a principal/leader for a school or region, that a balance and fit are made between the person's personal traits and the environmental situations that are involved. While many have dispelled the notion of leadership being exclusively innate and have endorsed the importance of situational variables, trait theory still impacts current views of leadership.

Behavioral Theory

By the late 1940s and early 1950s, researchers concluded there was no definite set of characteristics that made a leader, and the trait theory was becoming unpopular (Yukl, 1981). It was supplanted by behavioral theory, which proposed that leadership consisted of two types of behaviors: task behaviors and relationship behaviors. Task behaviors are those in which a leader initiates actions for the purpose of goal achievement. Relationship behaviors are behaviors in which leaders show concern for people and for interpersonal dynamics. The purpose of behavioral theory is to indicate how leaders combine these two kinds of behaviors to influence subordinates in their efforts to reach a goal (Northouse, 2007).

Situational Theory

One of the most recognized approaches to leadership is the situational approach developed by Hershey and Blanchard (Northouse, 2007). As the name of the theory implies, situational leadership concentrates on leadership in situations. The idea of this theory is that

different situations call for different actions. This theory requires the leader to change his or her style to suit the situation.

Contingency Theory

Contingency theory is a leader-match theory in which a leader's style is matched with the demands of the context (Northhouse, 2007). This type of leadership theory embraces leadership traits, characteristics of a situation, and the way these factors impact leadership effectiveness. Path-goal theory is presented as one of the important theories of contingency. The primary aim for leaders in path-goal theory is to motivate subordinates to accomplish desired goals.

The above leadership theories provide a framework for the evolution of instructional leadership. Leadership in social organizations changes as the social and political climate influence the organization. Therefore, the instructional leadership construct unites trait, behavioral, and contingency theories. The premise of instructional leadership is to facilitate development of both teachers and students to their fullest potentials.

Procedures

A mixed method design was used to collect data for this study. A repeated measures design, observations, focus groups and weekly reflections were used to determine the impact of a training program for instructional leadership on the instructional leadership behaviors of Belizean primary school principals. Hallinger and Heck (1996) noted that quantitative studies are important for examining the extent to which administrative effects are present in schools. Quantitative research is interested in relationships and is important to one's understanding of teaching and learning (McMillan, 2000). In addition, qualitative research uses the process of curiosity and discovery to help the researcher better understand the views of the participants.

The researcher explores the experiences of participants and develops new meanings from interacting with the participants (Meriam, 1998).

Twenty Two Belize City schools participated in this study. Teachers and principals completed a pre- test; principals then participated in an instructional leadership training program. After the training program, a post- test was conducted to determine if the training program had an impact on principals' instructional leadership behavior.

The researcher analyzed data from the teacher survey using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For the teacher survey, means and standard deviations for each section of the survey were calculated, as well as a grand mean for the whole survey for each school. Data analysis for the reflections, observations and focus group discussions were done by carefully examining and categorizing the emerging themes.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used:

Primary school students are children between the average ages of 5 and 14, enrolled in the first eight years of basic education.

Teachers' perception means how teachers view their principals as measured by the survey instrument.

Instructional leadership is defined as the principals' behaviors which are linked with the curriculum and instruction program in their schools to promote student achievement.

Time in this study is before and after the training of instructional leadership.

Assumptions

1. All principal participants made an effort to learn instructional leadership behaviors.
2. Teachers were honest and forthright in their survey responses.

Limitations of the Study

This study, like all research, had limitations. The population from which the sample was drawn was principals and teachers in Belize City. Therefore, the results can be generalized to Belize City primary schools; the results are not generalizable to rural primary schools or to secondary schools either in Belize or in other developing countries. While the results may not be specifically generalized beyond the setting of the study, they may be useful to educators in similar settings-primary schools in other urban centers in developing countries.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of schools is to help students live productive lives. An instructional leader is a principal who ensures students develop to their full potential (Flath, 1989). Hallinger (2007) described instructional leaders as the most effective ones; principals who are dedicated to instruction and curriculum. This study tested whether a model of leadership that is successful in developed nations can be similarly successful in a developing country. In Belize, no studies have examined the impact of a training program to teach principals the instructional leadership model. This study therefore adds to the body of literature. In addition, it adds to the very limited research in regards to training of principals' in leadership.

The findings will assist the Ministry of Education &Youth, the University of Belize and other teacher training institutions to develop instructional leadership training programs that will ensure that principals have adequate time to implement knowledge and skills learned. The study will also highlight the need for coaching and mentoring of principals since Belizean principals are not trained prior to taking on positions as principals in schools.

Universities and Junior Colleges that offer principal programs may find significance in this study. Pre-service programs need to emphasize the characteristics of instructional leaders

such as: providing human and material resources for teachers to ensure success, acquiring knowledge and skills related to curriculum alignment and teaching methods, having principals with visible presence, and monitoring the teaching learning process and supervision.

This study has significance for me as Deputy Chief Education Officer in the Ministry of Education &Youth (MOE&Y) with responsibility for the District Education Centers which are mini-ministries of education located in each district. The findings will assist me as I continue to facilitate instructional leadership workshops across the country. The study will also assist me in ensuring that the principal training program takes at least one year to make sure participants have ample time to implement the knowledge, skills and strategies shared in the training.

The study was significant because it initiated the study of instructional leadership behaviors of principals in Belizean primary schools. It also has significance for other practitioners and researchers in Belize and possibly beyond to other countries as researchers investigate instructional leadership and how it contributes to student achievement.

Summary

Chapter 1 presented a brief introduction about the role of principals and the attributes of good and effective schools, the importance of instructional leadership and the impact of instructional leadership on student achievement. A brief description of Belize, as a developing country and the primary education system was provided. The research question that will be answered by the study was identified as well as the hypotheses. Terms such as instructional leadership, teachers' perception and primary school students used in the study were defined. Some limitations of the study were identified as well.

Chapter 2 describes research about effective schools and presents information on the role of the principal in effective schools. Research is shared on the effect of a training program on

principals' behaviors as instructional leaders. Limitations on past research on this topic are presented as well. Chapter 3 describes the design and methodology used in the study including the collection and analysis of data. Chapter 4 features the results of the study. Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the results and implications of the study with suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature on school effectiveness and instructional leadership. This chapter is divided into three major sections. The first section addresses school effectiveness and the principal as one of the key elements linked to school success. The second section outlines theories of leadership. The third section focuses on instructional leadership.

School Effectiveness

Economic competiveness of a country is dependent on its ability to invest in an education system that will produce students who are prepared to compete in a global world (Hill & Crevola, 1999). Many researches confirm the value of investing in education. Evidence has shown that both primary and secondary schools contribute to economic development and growth. The research recognizes people as human capital and shows how more investment in knowledge, skills, and health provides future returns to the economy through increases in labor activity (Bils & Klenow, 2000; Cohen & Soto, 2001; Hanushek & Kimko, 2000; Krueger & Lindahl, 2000). There has been great demand to transform public education and for student performance to improve. This has translated into an agenda for school reform and accountability (Cotton, 2003).

Lashway (2001) believed that standards-based accountability was a major change in the education system. Teachers who formerly defined accountability in terms of effort now instead put greater emphasis on outcomes of tests. The great number of guidelines has presented many challenges for educators as policy makers have moved toward a system that is judged by performance standards, systematic testing, and harsh consequences for failure. Policy makers have realized that the standards and reform accountability movement have changed the role of

principals and made them more directly responsible for student performance and instructional improvements (Harris & Lambert, 2003). Principals are under pressure to manage their instructional program and improve student achievement. Now more than ever, principal leadership is acknowledged for its effect on student performance (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).

Background

The effective school concept has evolved during its more than 30 years of existence. In July, 1966, the Coleman Report (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, & Mood, 1966) posited that family background, not the school, was the major factor in student achievement. Coleman, along with other social scientists, believed that family factors such as poverty or a parent's level of education hindered students from learning regardless of the method of teaching. He stated that leadership, instruction and other school resources had less impact on student achievement. His report stimulated researchers to investigate school effectiveness.

Weber's (1971) studies of four effective schools were not in agreement with Coleman's (1966) findings. Weber's idea of an effective school was its ability to educate poor children as well as middle class children. He studied four schools with reading achievement medians that equaled or exceeded the national norm. His findings identified eight factors critical to successful schools: strong leadership, high expectations, orderly environment, focus on reading skills, evaluation of pupils, additional reading personnel, individualization, and use of phonics.

Weber (1971) is acknowledged for conducting the original effective school research on low socio-economic urban schools. In contrast to Coleman's earlier findings, Weber's research found that schools could make a difference in the lives of children. As a result of Weber's research, it is known that schools can play an important role and can positively influence children's academic growth.

Weber's (1971) findings were supported by Brookover and Lezotte's (1979) research. They studied eight elementary schools in Michigan at the request of the Michigan Department of Education. Six of the schools were consistently doing well by annual standardized, criterion-referenced assessments administered by the Michigan Department of Education in the fourth and seventh grades. Two of the schools had declining performance by the same assessments. These schools were observed and teachers were interviewed and asked to complete a questionnaire about the school. The observations and interviews were used to gather information about the differences between effective and ineffective schools. The study revealed that effective schools did the following: (a) emphasized obtaining specified reading and mathematical goals and objectives, (b) held the belief that all students could learn, (c) set high academic expectations for all students, (d) spent more time to ensure that reading and mathematics were taught effectively, (e) embraced the school and state accountability and assessment measures, and (f) had a principal that exhibited instructional leadership behavior. These results showed there were considerable differences between schools that succeeded in spite of socio-economic or family background factors and schools that did not.

Early Studies on Effective Schools

In addition to the studies cited above, research into effective schools was conducted by Ruter (1979), Wellisch, Macqueen, Carriere, and Duck (1978), and Edmonds (1979). The purposes of these studies were to identify within school factors that affect student performance. Purkey and Smith (1983) criticized these studies for their non-experimental design but nevertheless supported their findings. The Effective Schools Movement and the characteristics of effective schools (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979) have changed and the understandings of effective schools have deepened and expanded. Over the years, the characteristics have been

reviewed and refined to the following: instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, safe and orderly environment, climate of high expectations, frequent monitoring of student progress, positive home-school relations, and opportunity to learn and student time on task (Lezotte, 2001).

Defining Effective Schools

Researchers have a tendency to define effective schools by students' test scores (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Aitken, 2006). Edmonds (1979) posited that schools are effective when they believe that all students can learn. Sergiovanni (1991) believed that students' achievement in basic skills is the most important factor in defining an effective school. Lezotte (1992) stated that test scores make it easier to measure and define an effective school.

Taylor (2002) revisited the concept of effective schools and elaborated on seven characteristics. Even though these characteristics are broader than those identified by Edmonds (1979), the ideas are similar. Both Edmonds (1979) and Taylor (2002) believed that all children can learn. According to Taylor, the first characteristic of an effective school is having a clear and focused school mission. The school must decide where it wants to go and how it will get there. Secondly, the climate must be safe and orderly. Discipline must be fair and consistent to ensure the safety of all students. The third characteristic for an effective school is high expectations for students, teachers and administrators. Everyone is expected to strive to develop to their full potential in achievement, performance and leadership. The fourth criterion is the opportunity to learn and student time on task. Programs must be in place to meet the needs of all students. Administrators and staff members demonstrate instructional leadership as the fifth indicator of an effective school. Administrators and staff work together to improve the teaching/learning process. Ongoing monitoring of student progress is the sixth indicator.

Appropriate assessment methods must be developed to assess student achievement and measures be put in place to improve performance. Finally, effective schools must have a good home/school relationship. Parents must participate in their children's education (Taylor, 2009).

Leadership

Leadership is a term often used in the educational arena, but its definition has been an elusive idea (Lambert, 2002). Leadership is a word commonly used by educators, but it is not clearly defined, full of ambiguity and an array of interpretations. Educators and educational researchers have been fascinated with leadership for years, yet they still have few shared understandings of what leadership is. Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) stated that leadership is a word used very often in conversations; leadership is described using vague adjectives such as good, effective, exemplary, or poor. They also believed that the literature on leadership is very limited and the way the word is used on a daily basis is unclear.

Yukl (1994) believed that there is not a clear definition of leadership; however, he asserted that influence is a major component of leadership. Most definitions state that leadership involves one person exerting influence over another to bring structure to the group. Influence has to do with how the leaders affect followers. Without influence, leadership does not exist. Ogawa and Bossert (1995) had a different view of leadership. They felt that leadership naturally occurs within a society and is shared among the members. Leadership is, then, the property of the group rather than the individual.

Sergiovanni (2000) believed that context is important when defining leadership. He stated that what a leader does and says may be effective in one context may not be effective in another context. Leithwood and Riehl (2003) also stated that leadership cannot be separated from the context where leadership is practiced.

Northhouse (2004) contended that despite the many ways to define leadership, there are basic components of leadership. He identified these as process, influence, group context, and goal attainment. Northhouse defined leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p.3).

There are many forms of leadership, and in the past 30 years there have been many new models of leadership (Hallinger, 2007). Some of the popular models are situational leadership, servant leadership, constructivist leadership, instructional leadership, transformational leadership, and moral leadership. Table 2 outlines the leadership models that are presented in this literature review.

Table 2.

Leadership Models

Model/ Author(s)	Characteristics
Situational/ Northhouse (2007)	Assesses situations and uses the appropriate leadership styles Versatile Adaptable
Transformational/ Northhouse (2004)	Transforms and changes individuals, groups, whole organizations and even culture Charismatic Visionary Able to influence others
Servant/ Northhouse (2007)	Empathizes with followers, takes care of them and nurtures them Has responsibility for the followers
Moral/ Sergiovanni (1999) Macbeath (2003)	Models appropriate attitudes and behaviors Leaders are committed to values: Trust Reciprocity Honesty
Constructivist/ Lambert (1995)	Participants work together in a community to construct meaning and knowledge

Situational Leadership

Situational leadership, defined by Kenneth Blanchard and Paul Hersey, is one of the most widely recognized leadership approaches. As its name implies, situational leadership focuses on leadership in a particular situation (Northhouse, 2007). The model suggests that leaders assess the situation and use the most appropriate leadership style based on that assessment. For example, leaders might vary their leadership style with different employees depending on the employees' competencies and commitment to tasks. Knowing that employees' skills and motivations may change over time, situational leaders change the degree to which they are directive or supportive to meet the needs of followers. According to Northhouse (2007), situational leadership demands that a leader adjusts his or her style to meet the competence and commitment of the subordinates.

Transformational Leadership

Since the 1980s, transformational leadership has been the focus of much research. Northhouse (2004) defined transformational leadership as a process that transforms and changes individuals, groups, whole organizations, and even cultures. He stated that this form of leadership is concerned with emotions, values, ethics, and long-term goals. In this approach, the leader is able to influence the followers to do more than is expected. The transformational leader is charismatic and visionary. Transformational leadership places attention on the leader's transforming abilities rather than on personal characteristics and follower relations (Lussier & Achua, 2004).

Constructivist Leadership

Lambert, Walker, Zimmerman, Cooper, Lambert, Gardner, and Ford-Slack (1995) defined constructivist leadership as "the reciprocal processes that enable participants in an

educational community to construct meanings that lead toward a common purpose of schooling" (p. 51). Constructivist leadership is based on the same ideas that underlie constructivist learning. Adults and children learn through the processes of meaning- and knowledge-construction, inquiry, participation, and reflection.

Servant Leadership

The servant model was developed in the early1970s by Robert Greenleaf. Servant leadership focuses on the needs and concerns of the follower. The leader is expected to empathize with followers, take care of them, and nurture them (Northhouse, 2007).

Moral Leadership

Social life is complex according to Greenfield (1999). He believed that principals must use more than technical forms of administration. Moral leadership in schools seeks to bring members of that community together around common purposes in a manner that entails being deliberately moral in one's conduct toward and with others and oneself, and in the service of purposes and activities that seek to meet the best need of all children and adults (p. 9).

The moral aspect of leadership described by Sergiovanni (1999) is the modeling of important goals and behaviors and showing staff, students, and parents what is important and valued in school. The moral image of leadership develops attitudes and behaviors that support democratic practices, equity, and fairness in the school and the community. Macbeath and McGlynn (2003) described moral leadership as a commitment to values within an organization. The values are trust, reciprocity, or honesty. The moral leader would stick to these values at all times.

Educational Leadership

Davies (2005) asserted that leadership is very different from management. He argued that leadership is about direction setting and inspiring others to create new and improved schools. He further explained that educational leadership is not the responsibility of one individual but of a group who should work together in the best interests of children.

In education, the concept of leadership has become very important in recent years. Leithwood (2007) stated that leadership is a hot topic that reformers depend on. He noted that leadership is a growth industry. There has been a demand for more accountability from schools, and pressure has been placed on schools to improve the quality of education offered to students. There are many school reforms with an aim to improve teaching and learning, but the success of these reforms is dependent on the strong leadership in schools (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004).

According to Leithwood (2007), educational leadership is the internal state and overt behavior of leaders. The internal state refers to the values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge a leader possesses to lead in an effective manner. The overt behavior is the practices of the leader. Leithwood (2007) stated that there is very little research showing a relationship between leaders' internal state and their effective use of leadership practices. However, he reported that there is an abundance of empirical data on effective leadership practices.

Leithwood (2007) wrote that with all the various models of leadership that exist, it may be easy to believe that there is not sound evidence on what is good or effective leadership. He contended, however, that there is a great deal of literature about leadership behaviors, practices, and actions that have a positive effect on student performance.

While educational leadership may focus broadly on leadership toward any educational goal, the instructional leadership model focuses on leadership to improve student learning. Instructional leadership became well known during the effective school movement of the 1980s. In the effective school movement, the principal was seen as the expert in education. The school principal, as instructional leader, is held responsible for the improvement of the teaching/learning process. According to Hallinger (2007), principals are expected to act as instructional leaders and are held accountable for the improvement of student learning. School leadership, and especially instructional leadership, is acknowledged to be very important to the improvement of teaching and learning (Sheppard, 1996).

The body of research on instructional leadership is very broad and has yielded a wealth of findings on the effect of school leadership on teaching and learning (Brookeover & Lezotte, 1982; Hallinger, 2007; McEwan, 2003; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Dufour (1999) supported the importance of the principal as an instructional leader; he stated that where principals are instructional leaders, student learning improves.

Instructional leadership demands that the role of principal be changed from manager to academic leader. The shift was as a result of research that revealed that in effective schools, principals stressed the importance of instructional leadership (Brookeover & Lezotte, 1982). Research on effective schools showed that strong leaders were able to turn around poor performing schools (Purkey & Smith, 1983). As a result of this research, principals could no longer focus on managerial tasks alone but also needed to focus on student achievement.

Most recent models of educational leadership have stressed the importance of the involvement of the principal in the school's instructional program. According to Murphy and Hallinger (1992), principals need to be curriculum and instructional leaders for improvement to

become a reality. Hallinger (1992) stated that as a result of the effective school movement, principals were seen as instructional leaders and experts in the areas of program and curriculum. Hallinger and Richardson (1988) asserted that the importance of instructional leadership is widely known and efforts should be made to ensure that all administrators develop the knowledge and the skills. Findley and Findley (1992) supported the idea that if a school is to be viewed as an effective one, it will be because of the instructional leadership of the principal. Lashway (2002) argued that school improvement requires leaders who put strategies in place that will support instructional and academic programs. Bush and Glover (2005) maintained that instructional leaders must pay keen attention to teachers as they work with students. As the demand for school reform increased, instructional leadership was acknowledged as an important ingredient for school success.

Researchers agree that instructional leadership is crucial to school effectiveness, yet it is rarely practiced. Stronge (1988) stated that principals spend only about 10% of their time on activities related to instructional leadership. Some of the reasons given for giving less time to instructional leadership are lack of training, lack of time, increased paperwork, and the perception of the principal as a manager (Flath, 1989; Fullan, 1991). Elmore (2000) supported the fact that instructional practices were activities that principals least commonly performed. He found that principals who engaged in instructional activities were in the minority.

The demand for accountability and school improvement has increased, and as a result, according to Taylor (2002), instructional leadership has gained much attention. As the need to improve student performance increases, principals need to find a way to balance the roles of manager and instructional leader (Taylor, 2002).

Defining Instructional Leadership

According to Greenfield (1987) instructional leadership includes those actions a principal takes in developing a working environment for teachers and suitable learning conditions for students. Murphy (1988) stated that an effective instructional leader gives top priority to the teaching and learning process. Principals who are instructional leaders have a good understanding of the processes of teaching and learning and dedicate a considerable portion of their time to improving instructional practices.

An instructional leader is very different from a school manager or administrator. Principals who are administrators spend the greater part of their day doing managerial duties. Principals who are instructional leaders focus their attention on setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and supervising teachers. Putting it very simply, an instructional leader is a principal who ensures student development (Flath, 1989). The instructional leader makes instructional quality a priority of the school and shares that vision with all.

According to Bass (1990), definitions of instructional leadership concentrated on the importance of leadership in gaining academic success. The meaning of instructional leadership expanded toward a deeper understanding of the teaching/learning process, and toward a link between instructional leadership and student achievement. Research revealed that instructional leadership is a key factor in determining the success or failure of a school.

Hallinger's (1992) definition of instructional leadership was based on the following: (a) high expectations of teachers and students, (b) close supervision of classroom instruction, (c) coordination of the school's curriculum, and (d) close monitoring of student progress. Leithwood, et al. (1999) claimed that successful schools focused on curriculum and assessment

issues and were led by principals who paid keen attention to the teaching /learning process. Blasé and Blasé (2000) identified specific behaviors that are characteristic of instructional leadership: providing feedback, modeling effective teaching, providing professional development and giving praise for effective teaching.

In the first half of the 1990s, interest in instructional leadership dwindled and attention was given to school based-management and facilitative leadership (Lashway, 2002). However, instructional leadership made a comeback especially in these times when a lot of emphasis is placed on standards and accountability. *The National Association of Elementary School Principals* (2002) defined instructional leadership as a kind of leadership where staff meet regularly to discuss problems and work together to find solutions and student learning is given maximum attention.

The definition of instructional leadership has been expanded to include a greater emphasis on teaching and learning. As the emphasis shifted from teaching to learning, some researchers recommended a new term "learning leader" over "instructional leader" (Dufour, 2002). Researchers continue to study how leadership makes a difference, how leadership has an effect on student achievement, and the characteristics of effective leaders in promoting student learning (Leithwood, et al., 2004).

Characteristics and Functions of Instructional Leaders

Smith and Andrews (1989) described the instructional leader as a leader with good communication skills who was always visible in the classroom and a provider of human and material resources. According to Weber (1989), instructional leadership includes these functions: promoting a positive learning climate, observing and giving feedback to teachers,

managing curriculum and instruction, and assessing the instructional program. He believed that schools need to work together to build a culture of instructional leadership.

Whitaker (1997) identified four main skills for instructional leadership: (a) Resource providers: Leaders should know the strengths and weaknesses of faculty and must also recognize and appreciate the good work of teachers, (b) Instructional resource: Teachers depend on their leader to be knowledgeable about the latest trends and best practices in education, (c) Good communicator: Effective instructional leaders need to communicate important philosophies regarding teaching and learning including especially the belief that all children can learn, and (d) Visible presence: Leading the instructional program of a school, the leader must focus on the teaching/ learning process, modeling behaviors of learning and designing program and activities on instruction.

The instructional leader also needs to keep abreast of new trends and best practices in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Dufour, 2002). Principals need to be knowledgeable about educational philosophies and beliefs, curriculum sources, conflicts, and improvement. Instruction leaders need to know the various models of instruction, reasons for using a particular model, and the theories supporting the learning models. They also need to know about student assessment, assessment procedures, and assessment that aids student achievement. In addition, the leader must have a sound knowledge of how humans learn (Johnson, 1996). The primary reason for schooling is learning, and leaders must understand the various learning theories so that they may serve as a resource in improving teaching and learning.

In addition to having knowledge in education, the principal must possess certain skills to carry out the duties of an instructional leader: interpersonal skills, planning skills, instructional

observational skills, and research and evaluation skills (Lashway, 2002). Interpersonal skills help the principal develop and maintain trust and build collegiality with the staff (Brewer, 2001). Planning begins with identification of goals or vision as well as encouraging commitment and enthusiasm. The purpose of instructional observation skills is to provide teachers with feedback that will enable them to reflect. Research and evaluation skills are necessary to assess the success of the instructional program. The job of an instructional leader is not easy but rather complex and multi-dimensional. However, if principals believe that the purpose of school is student development, then it is a task worth doing.

Role of the principal. The role of the principal is complex and includes many other duties in addition to the real business of school which is the learning process. The principal also has management duties, including scheduling, reporting, handling relations with parents and the community, and dealing with multiple crisis and special situations that occur in schools (Fink & Resnick, 2001).

Hallinger (2005) acknowledged that the principal has many duties, but he believed that the effective principal finds a balance among the many roles. According to Terry (1996) the seeming division between management and leadership should not present a barrier to school success. There is the need for both management and leadership, and one should not be sacrificed for the other. Terry (1996) believed that it was the duty of the principal to integrate managerial and instructional leadership tasks for the betterment of schools.

Students need to be in an environment that is safe, clean, and well maintained. Neuman and Simmons (2001) argued that a safe and well maintained school is a part of an effective school but stated that this does not have to be the duty of the principal. Support staff can be

responsible for maintenance and other operational issues, allowing the principal to focus on instruction.

Instructional leaders are different from managers. Instructional leaders make instruction their major focus. Lezotte (1992) explained instructional leadership is strong leadership which means principals do not run the schools by themselves but have the support of their staff. According to Lezotte (1992), effective leaders lead through modeling commitment, and staff follow their good example.

The demands on today's principals make it very difficult to do the job alone. According to Lambert (2002) the days of the principal being the lone instructional leader are over. Scholars no longer believe that an administrator can serve as the instructional leader of a school without the support of other educators (Elmore, 2000; Lambert, 1998; Lambert et al., 1995; Lambert, Collay, Dietz, Kent, & Richert, 1997; Olson, 2000; Poplin, 1994; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004). Lambert (2000) stated that instructional leadership is a shared community responsibility, and leadership is the work of everyone.

In a school, the principal has the ultimate responsibility. Hoerr (1996) asserted that teachers take some responsibility for instructional leadership. This means that the principal will share power; there will be leadership teams, and teachers will assist in determining school procedures. Teachers working together will help each other to learn and grow (Hoerr, 1996). Dufour and Marzano (2009) commented that the collaborative team working together is even more powerful when members share progress reports. Fullan (2008) stated that the transparency of team members sharing student learning through common assessment is one of the most powerful tools available for school improvement.

DuFour and Marzano (2009) believed that principals need to move away from supervision of individual teachers and devote that time to building the capacity of teachers to work collaboratively in teams. This shift will aid principals in fulfilling their primary responsibility of helping more students learn at a higher level.

Blasé and Blasé (2004) described instructional leadership as leadership shared with teachers. Through coaching, reflection, study teams, and problem solving, administrator and staff work together to provide a quality service to students. Working together, principals and teachers find solutions to problems. Neuman and Simmons (2001) viewed leadership as the role and responsibility of the entire community and learning as the primary value of each member of the community. They believed that leadership should be distributed.

Leithwood (2007) agreed that shared decision making and collaboration are important to the success of schools. However, he did not see the need to call them "distributed learning". He believed that these activities should not be confused with leadership. He continued by asking if everyone is a leader, who then is the follower? Leithwood (2007) stated that leaders and followers must be looked upon as equally important since the concepts depend on each other to make sense.

According to Hallinger (2007), research has described the most effective principals as those who practice instructional leadership, a model that has the principal deeply involved with instruction and curriculum. Dufour and Marzano (2009) advocated for a new image of the principal as a learning leader. They claimed that if the purpose of school is to ensure that all students learn at high levels, then schools need learning leaders who focus on evidence of learning.

Instructional leadership models. Present-day administrators are expected to major in instructional leadership and fulfill essential management functions through skillful delegation and collaboration, while excelling in creating a learning community. Sergiovanni (1984, 1991) was the first to propose one of the earliest models of instructional leadership. He identified five leadership forces: technical, human, educational, symbolic, and cultural. The technical force deals with such traditional aspects of leadership as planning, time management, leadership theory, and organizational development. The human component covers all the interpersonal aspects of leadership such as communicating, motivating, and facilitating. Sergiovanni (1991) stated that the human and technical skills are skills that a strong leader of any organization should possess.

The other leadership forces-educational, symbolic, and cultural-are unique to the school setting and constitutes instructional leadership (Sergiovanni, 1991). The educational force is the skill in which the principal is expected to be knowledgeable about teaching, learning, and the curriculum. Principals must be a symbolic force and communicate and represent to students, teachers, and parents what is of importance in the school. As instructional leaders, principals must also be skilled in communicating the values and beliefs of the school. Sergiovanni (2001) classified the educational, symbolic, and cultural leadership as a new theory of leadership, one that focuses the school as a community and the principal as a servant. In this new model, the principal is viewed as ministering to the needs of the school.

In a study of how principals make a difference in promoting quality schooling, Smith and Andrews (1989) discovered that strong principals have high energy, assertiveness, initiative, openness for new ideas, tolerance for ambiguity, a sense of humor, analytical ability, and a practical stance toward life. This study revealed that schools operated by principals who were

seen by their teachers to be strong instructional leaders gained higher scores in reading and mathematics than those schools managed by average or weak principals (Smith & Andrews, 1989). These researchers suggested four broad areas of interaction between the principal and teachers: the principal as a resource provider, the principal as instructional resource, the principal as communicator, and the principal as visible presence.

Blasé and Blasé (2004) carried out a study to determine which characteristics of a school principal influence classroom instruction and what value of supervisor-teacher interaction enables teachers to learn and apply the learning to classroom instruction to improve student learning. The study included 800 teachers working in public elementary and high schools throughout the United States. Teachers responded to open-ended questionnaires enquiring about principals' positive and negative characteristics and how these characteristics affected teachers and their performance in the classroom. The study revealed that verbal interaction has a strong impact on teachers' instructional behaviors and that supportive instructional behavior modeled by the principal has a positive effect on classroom instruction.

Professional dialogue, a characteristic of an instructional leader, stresses that instructional leadership is a shared type of leadership. The instructional leadership capacity of the school may be shared with others such as vice-principals, assistant principals, lead teachers, department heads, learning coaches, and mentors who engage in supportive instructional behavior as they work with teachers. Blasé and Blasé (2004) also believed that supervision and instructional leadership are very closely linked. They viewed supervision as a subset of instructional leadership, and they argued that both support teacher development and increase student learning.

According to Krug (1992), instructional leadership can be described in five main categories: defining mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising and supporting

teaching, monitoring student progress, and promoting instructional climate. The first responsibility of the principal is to frame the school's goals, purposes, and mission. This mission determines how the school will go about its business of education. Managing curriculum and instruction, the leader will provide support to teachers to effectively plan for their classes, and they will also give support for curriculum development and implementation. In supervising and supporting teaching, the leader is proactive toward staff development. The fourth behavior is monitoring student progress. Strong leaders use assessment results to help teachers and students improve and to assist parents in understanding what is needed for student development. The final behavior is promoting an effective instructional climate. The main objective of this behavior is that principals are expected to motivate people to create an atmosphere conducive to learning, where teachers and students are supported for their achievements and there is a sense of shared purpose (Krug, 1992).

Hallinger and Murphy (1987) conducted research on defining instructional leadership, and their findings were very similar to Krug's (1992). Hallinger and Murphy believed that the principal's role was comprised of three dimensions of instructional leadership activity: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting the school's learning climate. In the first dimension, instructional leaders have a clear vision of what the school needs to accomplish. The principal leads the staff in developing school wide goals and communicating them to everyone. There is a sense of purpose shared by the staff, students and community. In managing the instructional program, the second dimension, the principal is involved with instructional development. This category includes development and implementation of the curriculum and instruction and monitoring student progress. Principal involvement in monitoring student progress in individual classroom and across grades is very important, but it is an area of

the principal's activity that is not emphasized sufficiently (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). The last dimension, promoting a positive school climate, refers to the practices of the school that support the teaching/learning process. Principals build the learning climate by maintaining high visibility, creating a reward system, establishing clear standards, and providing high quality professional development (Halliger & Murphy, 1987).

The above-mentioned studies all delineate similar characteristics of a school principal's behavior that make a difference in classroom instruction and that improve student learning. Sergiovanni's (1991) list of technical, human, educational symbolic and cultural forces is similar to Smith and Andrew's (1989) three broad areas of interaction between the principal and the teacher, in which the principal is a resource provider, instructional resource, and communicator. Visible presence was the fourth interaction not included in Sergiovanni's leadership forces (1991). Smith and Andrews (1989) felt that visible presence is a necessary interaction in order for principals to be effective leaders. Principals cannot be effective by staying in their offices. Blasé and Blasé (2004) indicated that supervision is a subset of instructional leadership and it would be acceptable to use supervision leadership and instructional leadership interchangeably.

Bellamy, Fulmer, and Muth (2007) had a different belief about leadership. They wrote that it is not enough for principals to use only one approach to leadership. They believed that a principal needs many different approaches to improve student learning.

Professional Development

Professional development is defined as a kind of training that helps to improve teachers' knowledge and instructional practice, as well as improved student achievement (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2001). Saxe, Gearheart and Nasir (2001) discovered that student learning improved most when teachers participated in sustained,

collaborative professional development that focused on improving teachers' knowledge and practice of teaching. Professional development is also more effective when it is continuously supported and becomes a part of a school reform initiative (Cohen & Hill, 2001; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007; Supovitz, Mayer, Kahle, 2000). For meaningful change to take place, curriculum, assessment, standards and professional learning should be coordinated and linked so there is a connection between what teachers and principals learning in professional development and what they are expected to implement in the classrooms and schools (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2001).

Providers of professional development have seen the need for coaches to make the connection between training and the implementation of skills and strategies in the classroom. Coaching models identify that if professional development is to be beneficial to teachers and principals' ongoing and specific follow-up is necessary to help teachers integrate new knowledge and skills into classroom practice (Garet et al, 2001; Guskey, 2000).

Conclusion

This literature review confirms that the role of the principal is much more demanding and challenging than in the past. The principal is expected to do much more and is being held accountable for the improvement of teaching and learning in the school. The literature review speaks to the fact that instructional leadership is the preferred model that would seem to ensure that students have the necessary skills and knowledge to compete in this very competitive world.

Professional development is also deemed very important for principals, but it must be linked to an initiative with the schools system and not seen as a one-shot workshop. It must be

conducted over a period of time, providing sufficient time for implementation and for coaching and other support to be in place.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The development of strong and effective school leadership is an important ingredient in successful learning organizations (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998). Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond (2004) asserted that to understand leadership it is necessary to go beyond roles, strategies, and traits of principals. Marzano, Walters, and McNulty (2005) argued that effective leadership practices were crucial for student academic success. Yet, there is at present no training program in Belize to equip school principals to provide effective leadership. The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of a training program for instructional leadership on the instructional leadership behaviors of Belizean primary school principals.

This chapter outlines the methods and procedures used in the research study. The variables and model, populations and samples, selection of the survey instruments, data collection and analysis procedures are discussed.

Research Design

The research design should be determined by the nature of the research question (Patton, 2002). The research question guiding this study called for mixed methods. The quantitative design used in the study was repeated measures design. A repeated measures design refers to studies in which the same measures are collected multiple times for each subject under different conditions (Gay & Mills, 2006). The dependent variable for this study was teachers' perception scores, defined here as how teachers view their principals' instructional behaviors. The dependent variable was measured by the survey instrument (Appendix D).

The qualitative methods used were observations and participants reflections. Silverstein (2003) stated that "qualitative research is a very good method to get answers to questions and

learn more about the topic" (p.4). The qualitative approach allowed reporting of the experiences of the principals before and after the training through rich description using participant voices.

Participants

The unit of analysis for this study was the school. There were 33 primary schools in Belize City. All 33 primary schools were invited to participate in the study (Appendix A). Participants were the 22 principals and the teachers in their schools.

Intervention

All primary school principals in Belize City were invited to participate in four days of training in the instructional leadership model (Appendix B). The training took place in Spring 2011. Table 3 includes the agenda for the four days of training.

Table 3

Agenda for Instructional Leadership Training

Time	Items
Day One	
9:00 – 9:45	Workshop Expectations Objectives Portfolio Reflection Outline
9:45 – 10:00	Ice Breaker: Which Leader are you?
10:00 – 10:15	Break
10: 15 – 12:00	Leadership Models: An Overview Situational Transformational Servant Moral Constructivist
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 2:15	Educational Leadership vs. Instructional Leadership Characteristics of An Instructional Leader
2:15 – 2:25	Break

2:25 – 2:45	Debriefing and Portfolio Entry
2: 45 – 3:00	Session Assignment Review and Dismissal: Reflection: How do you share leadership and decision making among staff members? Share three examples.
Day Two	
9:00 – 9:20	Ice Breaker: A Week's Work
9:20 – 9:40	Professional Dialogue
9:40 – 10:15	The Role of the Principal
10:15 – 10:30	Break
10:30 – 12:00	The Principal As an Instructional Leader
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 1:45	School Improvement Plan:
1:45 – 2:15	(Activities and Behavioral Changes in Instructional Leadership) The Instructional Leader Behavioral Checklist
2:15 – 2:25	Break
2:25 – 2:45	Debriefing and Portfolio Entry
2: 45 – 3:00	Session Assignment Review and Dismissal: Reflection: What are your school's goals, purpose and mission? How do these promote student achievement and create a conducive, instructional climate?
Day 3	
9:00 – 9:20	Ice Breaker: 5 Supervision Rules
9:20 – 9:40	Professional Dialogue:
9:40 – 10:15	Supervision: Past/Present/Future
10:15 – 10:30	Break
10:30 – 12:00	What is Clinical Supervision?
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 1:45	Group Activity: Role Playing the 'Pre' and 'Post' Conference Sessions
1:45 – 2:15	Bring out the Best in Teachers: That is What Instructional Leaders Do
:15 – 2:25	Break
2:25 – 2:45	Debriefing and Portfolio Entry Session
2: 45 – 3:00	Assignment Review and Dismissal:

	Reflection: How do you monitor alignment of curriculum with standards, school goals, and assessments?
Day Four	
9:00 – 9:20	Ice Breaker: Are you a Member of the CIA? (Quiz)
9:20 – 9:40	Professional Dialogue:
9:40 – 10:30	Importance of Monitoring the Curriculum: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Curriculum (Subjects and Disciplines) Instruction (Teaching/Learning Practices) Assessment (Assessing Student Performance)
10:30 – 10:45	Break
10:45 – 12:00	Teaching Quality and Student Achievement
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 1:45	Portfolio Presentations
1:45 – 2:15	Plenary Session
2:15 – 2:25	Break
2:25 – 2:45	Professional Expectations: Discussion on the monitoring of Action Plans and Leadership Checklist.
2: 45 – 3:00	Workshop Evaluation

After the training, the principals were given three weeks to implement the knowledge and skills presented in the training. The researcher served only as a coach and visited each principal once during the implementation. The researcher visited 10 of them individually and had each fill out the checklist that addressed the responsibilities of the instructional leader (Appendix D). The observational checklist included 60 items that are part of the instructional leadership repertoire as defined by Hoy (2000). Each visit took about half a day to observe and address questions and concerns. In addition, the researcher coached and encouraged them to continue to do their best

even though they were faced with challenges such as not having a support staff to assist them with other duties. After each observation, the researcher met with the principal and discussed observed strengths and weaknesses. Principals signed the checklist, and received a copy of the completed checklist and recommendations for their records.

After visiting the first 10 schools, the researcher realized that the visits were taking longer than anticipated and decided to meet with the other principals in focus groups of four. This was considered to be the best approach since the closing of the school year was approaching and time was not sufficient to continue with individual visits. In the focus groups, principals filled out the check list that addressed the responsibilities of the instructional leader (Appendix D).

After the individual visits and the focus groups, the researcher met with all the principals in a one day workshop. During the workshop, principals shared their experiences and the challenges they encountered. The researcher then coached them and shared ideas and strategies for time management, delegation and development of networks with each other.

Based on scholarly literature on professional development programs the principals were asked to write brief reflections on their experience. They were provided with some guiding questions that helped then to reflect on the entire process from pre-test, training and posttest. The principals were asked to submit the reflections after the posttest was completed.

Instrumentation

Quantitative data for this study were gathered through a survey of teacher observations of principal behavior. Permission was sought from Pantelides (1991) to use her instrument to measure principals' instructional leadership behaviors (Appendix E). The instrument was adapted with permission to suit the Belizean context. The instrument consisted of 60 items

representing four dimensions of instructional leadership: providing general communication, monitoring instruction and testing, planning and providing instructional feedback. Each item was a behavior that may be exhibited by a primary school principal. The instrument had five response options:

1= *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, 4 = *Agree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree.* Teachers were asked to complete the survey and indicated how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement.

Validity and Reliability

The instrument used in the study was originally developed by Pantelides (1991). Pantelides stated that she used a panel of experts consisting of professionals who had researched and written in the field of principal preparation or instructional leadership or have evaluated principals, including some practicing elementary school principals, to examine the construct validity of the items on her survey instrument. For this study, the researcher had a group of four, three educators and one practicing principal re-examined the statements on the survey instrument and made comments and suggestions on its construct validity. Using feedback from the group, the researcher changed two words and replaced them with terms that would be more appropriate and familiar to the Belizean context. Since the changes made to the instrument were not major the changes did not affect the validity of the instrument.

Data Collection Procedures

A cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and asking permission for principals and teachers to participate in the study was sent to all general managers of primary schools in Belize City (Appendix A). After obtaining permission from the general managers for principals and teachers to participate in the study, a letter of informed consent explaining the purpose of the

study and training information was sent to all principals of primary schools, inviting them to participate in the study (Appendix B). Before principals participated in the instructional leadership training, teachers in schools of participating principals completed a survey (pre-test). Personnel from the Examinations' Unit of the Ministry of Education distributed survey instruments, inclusive of cover letter, explaining the purpose of the study and participants rights; all teachers of the participating schools received the information during a staff meeting. Teachers who consented to participate in the study were then given time to individually complete the surveys. They were asked not to discuss their responses with each other. The principals were not present in the room during the administration, of the survey nor were they involved in the collection of the surveys from the teachers. When the teachers were finished, the completed surveys were collected by the ministry personnel and returned to the researcher.

On the first day of the training program, principals were encouraged to develop portfolios which would help them keep track of their growth. In this portfolio, the first section displayed their resume, history, mission and vision of their schools. They were to documents all the strategies and ideas that they implemented as a result of the training. Principals were asked to do weekly reflections and evaluate their behavior as an instructional leader. They shared their feeling and thoughts through email and written hard copies that were sent to the researcher. The researcher made observations at some schools, in the focus groups and during the training. Principals were to comment on what they had accomplished and discuss the strengths and challenges experienced during the week.

At the end of spring semester, personnel from the examinations' unit of the Ministry of Education assisted with the re- administration of the same survey (posttest), using the same procedures as were used for the pretest.

Protections for Participants

The principals who participated in the study were protected by an agreement of confidentiality covering both their comments during the training sessions, comments made during the focus group discussion and the contents of their weekly reflection papers. The researcher did not divulge any information from these to the principals' general managers, teachers, ministry officials, or others. Weekly reflection papers were kept by the researcher in a secure file cabinet and will be kept until three years after the completion of the study, and then they will be destroyed. In writing the dissertation, the researcher obscured any identifying details in describing the participants and their settings; and any subsequent reports or publications emanating from this study will also be kept confidential.

The surveys of teachers were conducted anonymously. No personally identifying information was collected, and the survey respondents were assured that their responses would not be linked individually to them. None of the participants saw completed surveys; only the finalized dissertation will be available to participants. The office of University Research Compliance granted approval to conduct this study on February 11, 2011 (Appendix F).

Data Analysis Procedures

The researcher analyzed data from the teacher survey using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. To determine if there were differences on teacher's perceptions scores for the pretest and the posttest, means and standard deviations for each section of the survey were calculated. In addition, a grand mean was calculated for each individual school. Independent sample *t*-tests were used to compare the group means of the teacher surveys for each school before and after the training.

Data analysis for the reflections and observations utilized an inductive approach. According to Patton (2002), the inductive approach is a process where themes and categories emerge from the data using the researcher's careful examination. I reduced the data from the reflections by identifying the key words and recurring words from each question and coded them. Patton (2002) referred to this process as "open coding." Open coding is the stage where categories, patterns or similarities are identified. The coded words were then sorted to identify themes.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study must be considered. The following factors and circumstances limited the results of this study:

1. The results of this study represented the perceptions of primary school teachers in Belize City who gave responses on the survey instrument. The results of this study cannot, therefore, be generalized to other areas.

2. The validity of the data obtained in this study was limited by the willingness of the respondents to respond candidly to the survey questions.

3. The study was also limited in that the researcher did not collect and triangulate data from students, parents, general and local managers. Collecting data from these additional sources would have strengthened the validity of the study.

Summary

This study investigated the impact of the training of 22 Belizean primary school principals in instructional leadership behaviors. Teachers and principals completed a survey before and after the training to determine the effectiveness of the training program.

The model, variables, and selection of the sample for the research study were discussed in Chapter 3. The data collection and analysis procedures were also summarized. The results are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents and analyzes the data. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Does a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically monitoring the curriculum and instruction have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers?

2. Does a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically monitoring student progress have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers?

3. Does a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically supervising and supporting teachers have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers?

Based on the literature from developed nations, the researcher hypothesized that the training program would significantly increase principals' instructional leadership behaviors as measured by teachers' observations.

Response Rate

The unit of analysis for this study was the school. There are 33 primary schools in Belize City. Of the 33 primary schools in Belize City, 22 consented to participate in the study. The 22 schools that participated had a total of 399 teachers. Of that number, 365 teachers completed usable pretest surveys and 399 completed usable posttest surveys. The response rate was 66.7%.

Results of the Measure of Elementary Principal's Instructional Leadership Behavior

Data for the study were gathered through the Measure of Elementary Principals' Instructional Leadership Behavior (MEPILB). This instrument was used by Judy Pantelides (1991) in her study to measure principals' instructional leadership behaviors. The instrument consisted of 60 items, and Pantelides gave permission for the instrument to be adapted to suit the Belizean context and used. The survey is divided into subscales as shown in Table 4. The four subscales represented the following general dimensions of instructional leadership: (a) providing general communication; (b) monitoring instruction and testing; (c) planning; and (d) providing instructional feedback. For the present study, one of the items, number 36, was deleted as teachers had some difficulty in reading this item due to an error in photocopying the instrument.

Table 4

Groupings of MEPILB Behaviors for creation of Subscales

Subscale	*MEPILB* Item Number
Providing General Communication	5, 11, 19, 21, 23, 27, 29 ,30 , 31, 32,33, 34,35, 39, 41,43, 45, 50, 53, 54, 55
Monitoring Instruction and Testing	1, 2, 13,18, 37, 38, 44, 56, 59
Planning	6, 14, 24, 40, 42, 46, 47, 49
Providing Instructional Feedback	26, 48, 51

Data Analysis and Results for Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked: Did a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically monitoring the curriculum and

instruction have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers in their schools? To answer this research question, means and standard deviations were calculated for each section of the survey. In addition, the grand mean for individual schools was also calculated. Independent samples *t*-tests were used to compare the group means of the teacher surveys for each school before and after the training. Table 5 displays means and standard deviations for each survey item for the pre- and post- tests. Table 6 shows the means, standard deviations and *t*-tests results for all respondents. The subscale Monitoring Instruction and Testing (MIT) included behaviors such as observing a lesson in a classroom, giving feedback to the teachers, and providing a workshop to the staff to explain how the test scores are to be used to improve student achievement. As Table 5 shows, there was no statistically significant difference in the pre- and posttest means for the MIT subscale.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Each Survey Item on Pre- and Posttest

	Pre Test			Post Test		
Survey Item	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Q1	331	3.56	1.38	388	3.44	1.33
Q2	330	3.35	1.24	388	3.47	1.18
Q3	325	3.58	1.27	388	3.63	1.19
Q4	330	3.32	1.19	386	3.35	1.13
Q5	336	4.02	1.16	388	3.93	1.13
Q6	329	3.33	1.40	388	3.41	1.18
Q7	336	3.49	1.30	388	3.44	1.25
Q8	339	3.70	1.27	388	3.85	1.21
Q9	323	3.00	1.20	385	3.28	1.18
Q10	333	3.46	1.30	388	3.62	1.19
Q11	335	3.80	1.33	388	3.74	1.24
Q12	334	3.36	1.31	387	3.48	1.19
Q13	333	3.35	1.28	387	3.49	1.19
Q14	336	3.81	1.24	388	3.82	1.18
Q15	336	3.31	1.23	388	3.37	1.17
Q16	324	3.45	1.18	387	3.53	1.10
Q17	332	3.30	1.23	387	3.36	1.18
Q18	327	3.76	1.23	387	3.81	1.12

Q19	332	3.84	1.18	388	3.86	1.13
Q20	325	3.47	1.24	386	3.43	1.16
Q21	336	3.80	1.22	388	3.85	1.12
Q22	337	3.62	1.35	388	3.47	1.18
Q23	326	3.57	1.15	388	3.68	1.08
Q24	331	3.49	1.21	388	3.48	1.19
Q25	335	3.62	1.26	388	3.73	1.15
Q26	332	3.46	1.32	388	3.48	1.23
Q27	336	4.14	1.24	388	4.02	1.20
Q28	335	3.57	1.33	386	3.47	1.28
Q29	333	3.86	1.26	388	3.78	1.22
Q30	336	3.67	1.22	388	3.63	1.18
Q31	334	3.34	1.34	388	3.19	1.29
Q32	337	3.44	1.34	388	3.40	1.29
Q33	335	3.99	1.22	388	3.95	1.12
Q34	339	4.32	1.13	388	4.30	1.05
Q35	331	3.73	1.27	387	3.59	1.23
Q37	333	3.36	1.33	388	3.43	1.34
Q38	334	3.85	1.20	387	3.82	1.15
Q39	334	3.68	1.23	388	3.68	1.18
Q40	333	2.78	1.30	388	2.96	1.30
Q41	335	3.23	1.30	388	3.11	1.23
Q42	337	3.35	1.29	388	3.41	1.23
Q43	332	3.67	1.18	388	3.70	1.11
Q44	335	3.47	1.28	388	3.47	1.19
Q45	332	3.39	1.27	388	3.33	1.21
Q46	331	2.88	1.19	388	3.04	1.15
Q47	327	3.17	1.22	387	3.28	1.16
Q48	337	3.86	1.13	388	3.84	1.08
Q49	331	3.57	1.21	388	3.61	1.13
Q50	334	3.82	1.21	388	3.74	1.12
Q51	335	3.38	1.22	399	3.44	1.16
Q52	334	3.03	1.28	388	3.25	1.93
Q53	337	3.58	1.30	388	3.56	1.22
Q54	331	3.40	1.32	388	3.53	1.26
Q55	336	3.52	1.37	388	3.57	1.29
Q56	330	3.52	1.25	388	3.55	1.23
Q57	335	3.36	1.24	388	3.43	1.19
Q58	335	3.26	1.26	388	3.32	1.21
Q59	334	3.14	1.17	388	3.27	1.13
Q60	334	3.20	1.34	388	3.40	1.25

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-test Results for All Respondents

Test Element	Test	N	M	SD	*t*	*df*	*p*
Overall	Pre	207	3.49	1.00	.86	39	.40
	Post	375	3.56	.89			
Providing General Communication	Pre	269	3.69	0.99	0.18	654	0.85
	Post	398	3.67	0.91			
Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	297	3.46	0.99	1.01	681	0.32
	Post	386	3.53	0.95			
Planning	Pre	296	3.29	0.98	1.22	681	0.22
	Post	387	3.38	0.94			
Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	325	3.57	1.03	0.24	711	0.81
	Post	388	3.59	1.01			

Data Analysis for Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked: Did a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically monitoring student progress have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers in their schools? The Providing General Communications (PGC) subscale included behaviors such as being visible in the classrooms, checking on student achievement and talking to teachers about the goals and objectives of the school. The data presented in Table 7 indicated, there was no statistically significant difference from pre- to posttest on the PGC subscale.

Data Analysis for Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked: Did a training program to teach Belizean primary school principals the instructional leadership model specifically supervision and supporting teachers have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers in their schools? This Research Question was answered by analyzing pre- and posttest data for two different subscales. The Providing Instructional Feedback (PIF) subscale included behaviors such as the principal commending the teacher for well written lesson plans and giving teachers feedback on their planning and execution of lessons. The Planning (PLAN) subscale involved supporting teachers in the development of plans to improve teaching. Table 5 shows that there was no statistically significant difference on either the PIF subscale or the PLAN subscale from pretest to posttest.

Although there were no significant differences overall on any of the subscales, it was still necessary to determine whether there were any significant differences for any individual schools. For this purpose, *t*-tests were conducted for each school that had at least 10 respondents on both pre-and posttest. These results are presented in tables 7 to 16.

Table 7

T-*test Results for Schools 1*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
1	Overall	Pre	17	4.33	.68	.86	39	.40
		Post	24	4.48	.49			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	19	4.43	.74	.79	41	.43
		Post	24	4.58	.51			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	23	4.24	.62	1.73	45	0.91
		Post	24	4.51	.47			

	Planning	Pre	21	4.03	.80	1.94	43	0.06
		Post	24	4.43	.55			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	22	4.58	.75	.64	44	0.53
		Post	24	4.43	.80			

Table 8

T-*test Results for Schools 5*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
5	Overall	Pre	10	4.29	.41	.63	19	.53
		Post	11	4.48	.49			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	10	4.49	.34	.70	19	.49
		Post	11	4.39	.25			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	11	4.41	.45	.86	20	.40
		Post	11	4.28	.23			
	Planning	Pre	11	4.07	.61	.39	20	.07
		Post	11	3.98	.48			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	11	4.09	.58	1.14	20	.27
		Post	11	3.85	.40			

Table 9

T-*test Results for Schools 11*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
11	Overall	Pre	11	1.47	.76	1.20	21	.24
		Post	12	1.91	.99			
	Providing General	Pre	12	1.66	.86	1.05	27	.30

	Communication	Post	17	2.03	.97			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	14	1.74	.89	.19	27	.85
		Post	15	1.67	.93			
	Planning	Pre	13	1.38	.64	1.06	28	.30
		Post	17	1.70	.91			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	14	1.92	1.13	.74	29	.47
		Post	17	2.25	1.30			

Table 10

T-*test Results for Schools 12*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
12	Overall	Pre	17	3.08	.44	.67	49	.51
		Post	34	3.20	.62			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	25	3.29	.64	.43	59	.67
		Post	36	3.36	.65			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	26	3.11	.62	.88	60	.38
		Post	36	3.25	.63			
	Planning	Pre	23	3.31	.67	.97	57	.34
		Post	36	3.16	.57			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	28	2.99	.78	.77	62	.45
		Post	36	3.17	1.02			

Table 11

T-*test Results for Schools 15*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
15	Overall	Pre	14	3.73	.75	1.08	43	.29
		Post	31	3.47	.76			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	25	3.77	.90	.77	54	.44
		Post	31	3.59	.83			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	27	3.22	.91	.86	56	.40
		Post	31	3.42	.81			
	Planning	Pre	28	3.27	.86	.42	57	.68
		Post	31	3.35	.75			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	31	3.51	1.07	.65	60	.52
		Post	31	3.67	.88			

Table 12

T-*test Results for Schools 16*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
16	Overall	Pre	9	2.99	1.26	.62	29	.54
		Post	22	3.24	.88			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	14	3.32	1.16	.10	34	.92
		Post	22	3.29	.97			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	17	3.08	1.14	.44	37	.67
		Post	22	3.21	.77			
	Planning	Pre	18	2.92	1.08	.81	38	.42

		Post	22	3.16	.85			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	21	3.22	1.11	.17	41	.87
		Post	22	3.17	1.08			

Table 13

T-*test Results for Schools 17*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
17	Overall	Pre	11	3.54	.83	3.81	37	.00
		Post	28	4.44	.59			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	16	3.75	.83	3.51	42	.00
		Post	28	4.48	.55			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	17	3.42	.89	5.54	43	.00
		Post	28	4.58	.51			
	Planning	Pre	17	3.18	.92	4.76	43	.00
		Post	28	4.30	.66			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	16	3.65	.94	3.04	42	.00
		Post	28	4.39	.69			

Table 14

T-*test Results for Schools 18*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*P*
18	Overall	Pre	20	4.07	.51	3.90	48	.00
		Post	30	3.43	.62			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	24	4.23	.51	3.95	52	.00
		Post	30	3.62	.60			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	27	3.93	.68	2.52	55	.02
		Post	30	3.45	.74			

	Planning	Pre	25	3.56	.83	2.53	53	.01
		Post	30	3.05	.66			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	28	4.05	.77	2.01	56	.05
		Post	30	3.68	.63			

Table 15

T-*test Results for Schools 19*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
19	Overall	Pre	7	3.46	1.01	.02	33	.98
		Post	28	3.47	.75			
	Providing General Communication	Pre	11	3.55	.97	.39	37	.70
		Post	28	3.65	.68			
	Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	10	3.34	.86	.34	36	.74
		Post	28	3.23	.90			
	Planning	Pre	12	3.14	.79	.70	38	.49
		Post	28	3.33	.84			
	Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	12	3.17	.99	.71	38	.49
		Post	28	3.39	.90			

Table 16

T-*test Results for Schools 21*

School	Test Element	Test	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
21	Overall	Pre	8	3.54	.67	.62	18	.54
		Post	12	3.79	.97			
	Providing General	Pre	11	4.00	.71	.22	26	.83

Communication	Post	17	3.93	.90			
Monitoring Instruction and Testing	Pre	15	3.67	.67	.14	31	.89
	Post	18	3.70	.79			
Planning	Pre	13	3.39	.68	.80	28	.43
	Post	17	3.63	.89			
Providing Instructional Feedback	Pre	15	3.91	.78	.05	31	.96
	Post	18	3.93				

The overall assessment for school 17 indicated that there was statistically significance in the way teachers perceived their principal after the training, with posttest scores exceeding pretest scores. For School 18 there was statistical significance in the manner teachers perceived their principal after the training in the overall assessment and in each of the four subscales, but in this school, the pretest score was significantly higher than the posttest score, a negative result.

On the first day of the training program, principals were encouraged to develop portfolios which would help them keep track of their growth. In this portfolio, the first section would display their resume, history, mission and vision of their schools. They were to documents all the strategies and ideas that they implemented as a result of the training. Principals were asked to do weekly reflections and evaluate their behavior as an instructional leader. Principals were asked to comment on what they accomplished and discuss the strengths and challenges experienced during the week.

Summary

The overall results showed that there were no significant differences in the way teachers perceived their principals after the training. However, the results showed that in individual

schools there were some differences. In school 17, the results showed that the training program had an effect on the principal's instructional behavior as perceived by the teachers, with posttest exceeding pretest. This is the only school that showed significant difference after the training and in the principal's reflection he admitted that he was exposed to the leadership styles and the information shared in the training. He also said that he was not using all the strategies he should have been using but the training helped him to incorporate the knowledge acquired in his day to day role as a principal. He said principals like himself who had previous training or exposure to educational leadership were refreshed and inspired with the latest developments in educational leadership. He mentioned that after the posttest, he gathered from his teachers that they were more knowledgeable about the role of a principal.

For school 18 there was a statistically significant difference in the manner teachers perceived their principal after the training in each of the four subscales, but in this school, the pretest scores were significantly higher than the posttest scores, that is scores went down significantly over the course of this study. After the training, in her reflection the principal stated that she spent more time in the classroom monitoring and less time doing managerial tasks. Parents and other stakeholders were allowed to meet with her only during the hours of 2:30 - 4:00pm. This drastic change could have contributed to scores going down after the training. According to Fullan (2001) change makes people fearful, confused and resistant.

For schools 1 and 5 the Planning subscale showed that principals in these schools appeared to have improved in planning but not in other areas. All of the principals complained that time was a factor that kept them back from implementing the strategies and skills shared. It could be that because of the limited time these principals spent more time working on planning than on the other areas.

CHAPTER V

Reflections and Observations

Silverstein and Aurebach (2003) claimed that qualitative research is a very good method to get answers to questions and learn more about the subject. Patton (2002) wrote that qualitative research has many methods and approaches. For this study, I used principals' reflections and observations in addition to the survey to better understand the impact of the instructional leadership training. Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding how people make sense of their experiences and how they use it in their everyday life (Merriam, 1998). Through the reflections, observations and conversations with the principals, I gained a deeper understanding of the principals' feelings about the training and their desire to improve student achievement in schools. Spending four days with the principals in the training, visiting their schools and engaging in group discussions helped me to understand how the principals felt about the training and the change they were prepared to make to improve teaching and learning in their schools.

Permission to conduct the study was granted from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) on the 11th February, 2011, and the following week, personnel from the examination unit of the Ministry of Education &Youth (MOE&Y) administered the survey to the teachers. I did not personally administer the survey because as one of the senior managers in the MOE&Y, I wanted teachers to feel comfortable to assess their principals in a free and unthreatened environment. This was the first set of data collected by the individuals from the examination unit. The data collection took about three weeks and the following week the four-day training began.

Principals' Feedback Regarding Training

At the beginning of the four day training I shared the workshop expectations and objectives which were to expose them to leadership styles, especially the model of instructional leadership and clinical supervision. I then presented some leadership models: situational, transformational, servant, moral and constructivist leadership. About three of the principals knew about the transformational and situational leadership. The other models of leadership were new to them.

According to Principal A, "this kind of training should have been given to us long ago." The majority of the principals shared their belief that if they were exposed to the various leadership models, it would have helped them, in their leadership roles. Principal B stated, "I am not sure what kind of a leader I am as I need to think and reflect on my leadership style, but I know that I should be a servant and a moral leader, if I want to be an effective leader." The principals commented that learning about the leadership models was very meaningful and the leadership models helped them to assess their own leadership styles and to think about the need to become better leaders to effect change in their schools.

After the discussion on the leadership models, the model of the principal as an instructional leader was presented. Approximately 90% of the principals indicated that they were not aware of the model. Principal C commented, "The model is an effective one, but how would this work in Belize when we do not have support staff like principals in the states?" Principal D supported that by stating that "this model works in the states because principals have been trained before entering the positions as leaders in their schools. We would need more support to make it work." I then shared that it could work, but principals would need to make better use of their time. Time management would be a key factor if principals were to practice

the role of an instructional leader. Principal E stated, "This model according to research is proven to improve student achievement, so I am prepared to inform my parents and other stake holders that consultation with the principal will be from three to four thirty each day. I would then be able to have visible presence in the classrooms."

The other principals said that they were willing to give that suggestion a try since student achievement was also very important to them. "We would also need the Ministry of education to free all principals from being classroom teachers. As in my case, I am still teaching and it is difficult to do supervision while having a class as well," stated Principal F. I informed them that the Ministry of Education is aware of the dual roles that some principals have and that it is the MOE&Y's objective to make all principals administrative principals; however, the reality is that the MOE&Y has a budget with very limited funds. This principal was advised to encourage parents and others to come in and assist so that more time is available to monitor the teaching learning process which is essential to school improvement and student achievement.

All principals affirmed that the leadership model is essential in leadership. They admitted that the instructional leader model is an ideal model for them since they wanted to raise the level of student achievement in their schools. They realized that the business of schools is to help students develop to their full capacities. They shared that they struggle with the many duties especially since most of them do not have a support staff. They commented that they would manage their time better and find a balance among the many roles that they have to execute as leaders in schools. All principals felt that they must be more visible in the classrooms to monitor and support the teaching learning process.

On the second day, the session began with an evaluation of the preceding day. According to Principal G, "Yesterday's session was very good but I think we needed more time to discuss

the models since it was the first time we are hearing about the various models." He was supported by Principal I who said:

> I agree with my colleague, we have never had any principal training before and more time was needed for us to assimilate all the new material'. It was very meaningful but I believe too many new material was introduced in one day. The various models helped me to reflect on my model and I now know which leadership model is essential for me as a principal in my school.

There was consensus that the first day training had a lot of meaning for them; it made them reflect on their own leadership style and the need for them to become better leaders in their schools.

The second day was spent focusing on the role of the instructional leader and the role of the principal. The focus was on the characteristics of the instructional leader and how they plan to make a change from being a manger to an instructional leader. Principal J acknowledged that change is necessary when he stated:

> I know that I will have to do things differently and make sure that I spend more time observing my teachers and help them to become more effective teachers. I will work on becoming an instructional leader but it will take time and I will need to make some serious adjustments in the way I do things. I believe if I delegate some of my responsibilities to other staff members it will give me time to be in the classroom.

The principals also indicated that staff involvement is important to their work. Principal K said, "I need to remember that leadership is not about the principal but about the entire staff working in harmony to attain our goals." The principals also indicated they were aware that they needed the help of parents. Principal L stated, "I will need to communicate with parents about

our new plans to raise student achievement so that they are more understanding and not demanding to meet with the principal. I will encourage parents to come in and volunteer and involve themselves in their children's education." All principals indicated they believed that if they practiced the instructional leadership model there would be significant improvement. However, they all admitted it was not an easy task as many changes had to be made and it would take some time. The principals believed that if they develop a network system and support each other it would not feel so burdensome and lonely. They felt it was doable, but it would take time and support to make the change effective.

The third day was focused on clinical supervision. Principal M claimed:

> The Ministry and school managements expect us to do supervision but we have not been trained. Clinical supervision is a model of supervision that is very effective as it allows you to get to know your teachers better and spend more time with them in the classroom. This model though seemingly effective will take time but I like it as teachers will have an input.

In addition Principal N stated, "The model would be more accepted by teachers as it is not judgmental as teachers look at supervision in a negative manner." This was the first time that the principals were introduced to clinical supervision. They liked the model, but realized it would take time, and again, they would need to make sure that they allocate the time required for it to be beneficial. Again, they lamented that they regretted not having the opportunity of having the exposure to supervision and to clinical supervision.

The fourth day was spent reviewing the entire three days and making plans to implement the knowledge, strategies and skills shared. Principal O commented that "it was a very good workshop and we learnt quite a lot." The principals shared their feeling about the entire training

and how it impacted them. “Please make sure you do the same training will all principals, I feel it will help them to improve student learning,” commented Principal P. Principal Q supported the other principals by stating, “I agree with all my colleagues it was a good four days of information, but I feel too much was covered in a short time. I am excited to share this training with all my members of my staff as I feel it will be successful if I have everyone on board.”

“Good workshop, we have only about six weeks before school is closed and I am not sure I can implement everything I have learnt,” wrote Principal R. Similarly Principal S said, “I believe that the training is very meaningful and will help to make us better principals but I think the training and monitoring should be over a longer period. I believe a year would give us more time to reflect, implement and get the much needed support.” In the closing discussion, Principal T stated that it was a “very good training and all principals deserve this kind of training to make them better principals.”

There was a resounding agreement by all participants that the workshop would help them to become better school leaders. The concern was how they would get it done with their many duties, but they were positive that they would do their best and manage the time in school to make it work. The other concern was the limited time available before the closing of school and the time it would take to implement the knowledge, skills and strategies shared. The principals welcomed and appreciated the training and felt that the training was long overdue.

At the end of the training, there was a closing ceremony and the Minister of Education &Youth, Hon. Patrick Faber was present to deliver a short address and to distribute certificates to the principals. Three of the principals were asked to give an oral reflection on the four day training. Principals U said, “It was very informative and filled with wonderful ideas and I feel that all principals should benefit from the same training.” Principal V commented, “I also feel

that the training will be very useful to me and it will definitely help me to be a better leader, but I think the entire period was too short. The training, implementation and support should take place over a one year period." Principal W stated, "In terms of an instructional leader there are so many aspects of this concept that I will need a year to implement all the ideas." The principals all agreed that the training was filled with meaningful information that would help them to hone their leadership skills. They asked the Minister to ensure that other principals get the same training to help them to improve student achievement.

Principals' Weekly Reflections

The reflections collected were guided by the following questions: Pre-test, How do you feel about this process? Training, How do you feel about the four- day training? Post-test, How do you feel about this process? Since for almost ninety percent of the principals this was their first training, I wanted to get the feedback about the effectiveness of the training program from principals about the entire process from pre-test to post-test. Principals were asked to do a reflection on the entire process from pretest, training and posttest. After much encouragement, 10 principals submitted the reflections. The submission of reflections was voluntary and the researcher did not coerce principals to participate. Many of them said that it was the end of a school year and they had many other tasks to do; with no support staff, it was difficult for them to get everything done.

Patton (2002) and Creswell (1998) stated that qualitative analysis has no set of rules to follow. However, there are set patterns of analyzing specific types of qualitative research. Creswell (1998) advised that the analysis should begin with a general review of information. The next step was to reduce the data as Creswell (1998) suggested. I read all 10 reflections submitted by the principals and jotted down the key words and recurring phrases. This process

Patton (2002) referred to as pattern recognition. I categorized the data into three areas: feelings about pre-test, reaction to training and feedback on posttest. This step Patton (1998) referred to as classification.

The general theme coming from the principals' reaction to the pre-test was that they were nervous about how their teachers would assess them. Principal X, "I am a bit anxious about how my teachers will assess me, as I am not sure they will be objective in their assessment of as an instructional leader." They also mentioned that they did not feel that all the teachers were objective with the assessment of them as leaders in schools. Principal Y, "I am afraid that my teachers will see the instructional leader in me, as the time is too short to implement the strategies learned." The consensus from the training was that it was very good, timely and necessary, and a large amount of very useful information was shared. Principal Z, "The training was very good, I enjoyed it, long overdue, but too much given in a short time to really understand." Principal AA "I like Clinical Supervision, as it will help me to get to know my teachers better. However, it is time consuming and I was only able to supervise two of my teachers." For most principals, it was their first ever training in leadership. However, too much material was covered in a short time and very little time was given to assimilate the volume of information. Principal BB, "As was said before , the training is very powerful, but it would have been better if we had done in the first term and have the rest of the school year to implement the ideas." The researcher agreed that the training was done in the third term of the school year and would have been better if it had been done at the beginning of the new school year to give more time for implementation.

The common theme from the post-test reflections was that the time was not sufficient to implement the knowledge, skills and strategies shared in the training. The principals were only

able to implement some of the ideas. In reference to clinical supervision, they were only able to supervise two or three of their teachers. Principals felt that due to limited time teachers were not able to see the change in their behavior as instructional leaders. The principals mentioned that an entire school year was needed to see any significant change.

Summary

Reflections from the 10 principals provided rich findings that focus on the instructional leadership of principals as perceived by the principals themselves. The quotations taken from the principals are representative of the group. The reflections were organized into three categories: Feelings about pre-test, reaction to the training and feedback on post-test. The results of the quotations and reflections have shown that the training was effective but teachers were not able to perceive the instructional leadership characteristics in their principals as the time was too short to implement all that was shared in the training.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of a training program for instructional leadership on the instructional leadership behaviors of Belizean primary school principals, specifically monitoring the curriculum and instruction, monitoring student progress, and supervising and supporting teachers. Previous literature examined the impact of the training of principals as instructional leaders in developed countries, where principals are required to have formal training before becoming a school principal. In Belize, principals take up leadership positions without any training. They are given these leadership positions because they are good classroom teachers. At the time of this study, there was no policy that stated principals must complete leadership training before becoming leaders in their schools.

There were 22 schools and 399 teachers that participated in the study. Responses were received from 365 teachers (66.7%). Data for the study were gathered through the Measure of Elementary Principals' Instructional Leadership Behavior (MEPILB) instrument. A copy of this instrument appears in Appendix F. The instrument was used by Pantelides in her study (Pantelides, 1991) to measure principals' instructional leadership behaviors. The instrument consisted of 60 items and was adapted to suit the Belizean context. Permission was received from Pantelides to use and adapt the instrument. The survey is divided into four subscales representing the following general dimensions of instructional leadership: (a) providing general communication; (b) monitoring instruction and testing; (c) planning; and (d) providing instructional feedback.

In addition to the survey, principals were asked to write reflections on the entire process including pretest, training, and posttest. Principals shared with their staff the instructional leadership model after the training so that teachers would be knowledgeable about the model of leadership.

No significant differences were found with principals' behavior after the training program as measured by the MEPILB. The overall results showed that teachers did report any statistically significant change in principals' behavior relating to providing general communication, monitoring instruction and testing, planning and providing instructional feedback after the training.

Information gathered from observations and the weekly reflections indicate that the training was very meaningful and informative. However, due to limited time the principals were not able to implement the knowledge and skills shared. According to Fullan (2001) any new meaningful initiative is not successful on the onset because it calls on people to change their behavior and beliefs. One of the possible reasons why teachers did not perceive any change in their principals' behavior could be attributed to the change in leadership style. According to Fullan (2001) one of the most consistent findings in education is that all meaningful initiatives take an "implementation dip" as leaders move to implement new ideas. The "implementation dip" is a process whereby performance and confidence fall as a new innovation is introduced that requires new skills and understandings. Fullan (2001) also stated that any new initiative that is meaningful will call upon people to change their behaviors and beliefs. Any new experience will create anxiety, confusion, fear and resistance. It is possible that the teachers did not perceive any change in their principals' behavior because of the new leadership style. They probably were confused, fearful and resistant because of the change.

Based on the literature from developed nations, the researcher hypothesized that the training program would significantly increase principals' instructional leadership behaviors in all four areas, as measured by teachers' observation. The results of this study supported the null hypotheses that a training program will have no effect on principals' instructional leadership behaviors as perceived by teachers. These results contradicted the researcher's hypotheses that there would be an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers. The results also contradict studies that state effective professional development can impact teachers' knowledge and practices (Hawley&Valli, 1999; National Association of Elementary School Principals 2001).

Discussion and Conclusions

To understand the findings of this study, the researcher consulted the scholarly literature on professional development programs and asked the study's participants to write brief reflections on their experience. Of the 22 participants, 10 submitted reflections. The principals were asked to submit the reflections after the posttest was completed. They were provided with some guiding questions that provided the researcher with information from the principals' perspective, about the entire process from pre-test, training and posttest. The general theme emanating from the reflections were that the training was very meaningful, but the principals felt they needed more time to implement the ideas. They also felt that since this was the first time they were getting training in instructional leadership and in leadership generally, the material covered was a lot for four days. The principals felt that more time was needed for implementation, follow-up training and providing support. The results of the study supported the conclusion that teachers were unable to see their principals displaying the characteristics of instructional leadership because the principals did not have time to implement the knowledge

and skills presented. As a result, there were no significant differences in principals' behavior after the training.

Research has shown that professional development for educators is more effective when it is not conducted in isolation or as one-shot workshops, but rather as a part of a greater plan to reform schools (Cohen & Hill, 2001; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi & Gallagher, 2007; Garet et al, 2001; Supovitz, Mayer, & Kahle, 2000). Considering this literature, the possibility is that the present study found no significant difference in principal behavior after the training simply because it was too much like a one-shot workshop and was not linked to a more consistent larger plan for change.

In a study of professional development for teachers, Supovitz, Mayer and Kahle (2000) asserted that for change to occur, curriculum, assessment, standards, and professional development must be linked to avoid confusion between what teachers learn in professional development and what they are expected to implement in their classrooms and schools. By analogy, for principals, professional development would need to be linked to the performance and reporting requirements that structure their work on a daily basis. While the researcher intended participants to use the Instructional Leadership model to orient all of their work, it is possible that this study did not find significant differences from pre- to posttest because insufficient attention was given in the training to how this model links with existing performance and reporting requirements.

In Ohio, a discovery science workshop for teachers was successful because the teachers were offered ongoing support. After six weeks of intensive training, teachers were released for six seminars throughout the year. In addition, they were given support when requested, site visits from regional leaders and contact with peers through newsletter and annual conferences

(Supovitz, Mayer, & Kahle, 2000). By contrast, the principal training held in Belize was more limited. It is possible, then, that the current study found no significant differences in principal behavior because there was insufficient ongoing support to be effective.

The coaching model of professional development for educators asserts that if professional development is to be effective, on-going follow-up is vital to integrate new knowledge into practice (Garet et al, 200; Guskey, 2000). Russo (2004) described school –based coaching as having an expert in a particular field working (in this case with principals) to improve instructional leadership skills. For the present study, the researcher was the only coach and to make the support meaningful more coaches and time were needed.

This scholarly literature provides some context for understanding the findings of this study. To understand the results further, the researcher turned to participants' comments following the training and the reflections written by the principals after the posttest.

Twenty principals reflected that the four day training was very meaningful and that it was the first leadership training for most of them. One commented that the four days training was very innovative, compact, and informative. This principal went on to state (echoing the literature cited above), "Too much material was covered in a short time and participants did not have enough time to fully assimilate the information."

In the participant reflections at the end of the study period, a common comment was that the implementation period was too short. These comments, again, echo the scholarly literature cited above. Ten of the principals stated that they were not able to put into practice what they had learned in the time available. Ten of them felt that the entire process should have been an entire school year and they needed about two school terms to implement the ideas with

opportunities for repeated observation, reflection, and improvement. They believed the training should have taken place across the entire first term which is a three month period.

Scholarly literature and the comments from participants support the idea that the present study may have found no significant difference in principals' leadership behaviors because the training program and implementation period were too brief. The literature suggests also that a more integrated approach to professional development might have been more successful.

Implications for Research

This study was the first to examine the effect of a training program for instructional leadership on the instructional leadership behaviors of Belizean school principals, specifically monitoring the curriculum and instruction, monitoring student progress and supervision and support teachers in a developing country. Findings in this study were contrary to those predicted by the existing literature. Because both the literature and the participants' comments suggested that some modifications to the training and implementation used here might have yielded different results, this study should be repeated in Belize, with a year-long training and implementation and additional supervision.

The trustworthiness of data is more powerful when it has been collected using many other data collection methods. The researcher would also recommend studies similar to this be done using oral interviews, direct observation, and gathering data from additional types of sources. Data could also be collected from other persons such as local managers, general managers and Ministry of Education officials.

Future research should also examine how the roles of principals differ in developed and developing country from those of more developed countries. Such studies might focus on how

principals in developing nations can effectively carry out the role of instructional leaders within the constraints of their own educational systems.

Researchers should also examine the role of the principal in rural schools in Belize, and compare these to findings from urban schools such as the ones in this study. Rural schools setting are very much different from urban schools. Most rural schools in Belize are multi-grade schools and most principals are teaching principals. This type of study might find that instructional leadership is not suitable for rural schools as most principals are classroom teachers in addition to being the leaders in the school.

Implications for Educational Policy and Practice

Belize's primary education system is a church- state system. In this partnership, the government pays 100% of teachers' salaries at the primary level and 75% of teacher's salaries in the secondary level (Mason & Longsworth, 2005). In the fiscal year 2006-07, the Belizean Government spent 21.2% of the entire national budget on education alone; the largest percentage of the allocation was spent on salaries (Ministry of Finance, 2008). Government also contributes to the cost of capital expenditure and assists with maintenance for grant aided schools. This then leaves very little to assist schools with much needed resources. The churches hire staff and manage the schools. These schools are known as grant-aided schools. In addition to the grant-aided schools there are primary schools managed by the government and some privately owned schools as well. In this partnership, the churches are expected to build, maintain and provide resources to schools. The churches are unable to maintain and resource schools and the responsibility of providing resources and paying utility bills become the responsibility of principals. One of the tasks of a principal in Belize is to raise funds to be able to provide the much needed resources of the school. This situation is very different in first world countries

where the principal can concentrate on the role of the instructional leader. If-- as the literature suggests-- instructional leadership is critical to the teaching learning process, then the MOE&Y, churches and other stake holders need to find a way to support schools so that principals can spend more time as instructional leaders.

There is another way that the Belizean education system differs from that of developed countries that would influence the possibility of implementing the instructional leadership model in Belize. In Belize, principals at the primary level do not have support staff except for very large primary schools that have a secretary. In other schools, the principal is the secretary, receptionist, and does other managerial duties. Hallinger (2005) acknowledged that the principal has many duties, but he believed that the effective principal finds a balance among the many roles. For the instructional leadership model to work in Belize, principals would need intensive training and support, and concepts of time management and delegation would need to be included in the training.

Like most Caribbean countries, Belize has made huge investments in education over the last decade, averaging about 5% of the GDP and considerable progress has been made to make primary education more accessible. The Government of Belize has made education one of its top priorities and has constantly made changes to improve the quality of education at all levels. Efforts have been made to improve the quality of instruction at the primary level, increasing students' achievement through a new system of primary school teachers' training. All the reforms that have taken place have not included principals' training.

Murphy and Hallinger (1992) stated that principals need to be instructional leaders for improvement to become a reality. If research is indicating that instructional leadership is model associated with effective schools, then the MOE&Y needs to ensure that principals are trained

for at least one year in instructional leadership before they take up leadership positions. In addition to the training, the ministry must ensure that there are systems in place to coach, mentor, monitor and support principals. All stakeholders in education would need to recognize that the role of the principal as an instructional leader is essential and every effort must be made to make sure that principals are able to spend more time in the classrooms and less time in the office.

The MOE&Y could support the principals by ensuring they have materials and support staff that would enable them to carry out their roles as instructional leaders. In addition, the Ministry would need to ensure that professional development in leadership is ongoing and monitoring and support is provided by the District Education Center. Incentives should also be provided for principals that lead effective schools. It is also very common that many workshops are held annually especially in the month of August, where other stakeholders request that principals and teachers participate in training. There is the need to put an end to the one- shot workshops and link the goals of the workshops to the goals and objectives of the MOE&Y.

Concluding Remarks

This study was the first to examine the impact of a training program for instructional leadership on the instructional leadership behaviors of Belizean primary school principals, specifically monitoring the curriculum and instruction, monitoring student program and supervision and support of teachers. The results of the study supported the null hypothesis which stated that the training program would have no effect on principals' instructional leadership behavior as perceived by teachers. These results contradicted the researcher's hypothesis that the training program would have an effect on principals' instructional behavior as perceived by teachers.

The nation of Belize has placed its hopes for the future in improved education for its children and has invested a large percentage of the national budget to support schools. Yet Belizean schools are still under resourced and under staffed, and the burden of this shortage falls on the principal to remedy. In light of these realities, the MOE&Y must consider the level of additional investment that would be necessary to move its schools to the next level of quality in instruction. At a minimum, the Ministry could select a long-term focus of instructional leadership for all of its professional development offerings for principals, coordinating training programs with extensive follow-up coaching for a few principals each year. This would be a more effective use of professional development resources than a series of disconnected, one-shot workshops such as are presently offered each year. At the next level of intervention, the Ministry could evaluate the cost of providing clerical support for at least some additional schools, in order to free up principals' time for instructional leadership activities. In the future, the Ministry could consider requiring pre-service training in leadership and educational administration for principals, or paying trained principals at a higher level, to provide an incentive for principals to acquire this training. Certainly there are limits in Belize, as in all nations, to the amount of funding that can be made available to support schools. Nevertheless, with carefully prioritized, stepwise adjustments, the Ministry of Education and Youth could move the schools steadily toward an Instructional Leadership model that would improve educational outcomes for the nation's children.

REFERENCES

Auerbach, C., & Silverstein, L. (2003). *Qualitative data an introduction to coding and analysis.* New York, NY: University Press.

Barrow, D. (2001). *Throwing good money at bad schools. Why repetition rates are so high in our schools.* The Amandala, (p. 10, 27).

Bass, B. M. (1990). *From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision.* Organizational Dynamics, (Winter): 19-31.

Bellamy, T., Fulmer, C., & Muth, R. (2007). Five ideas for reframing the principalship. *Educational Leadership and Administration*, *19*, 57-74.

Bils, M. & Klenow, P. (2000). Does schooling cause growth? *American Economic Review 90(5),* 328–335.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38(2),* 130-41.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership (2nd ed.). How successful principals promote teaching and learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Brewer, H. (2001). Ten steps to success. *Journal of Staff Development, 22(1),* 30-31.

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement.* E.Lansing, MI. ED 181 005.

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. (1982). *Creating effective schools*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publication.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2005). Leadership development for early headship: The new visions experience. *School Leadership and Management, 25(3),* 217-239.

Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (2001). *Learning policy: When state education reform works.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cohen, D. & Soto, M. (2001). *Growth and human capital: Good data, good results. Technical Papers #179.* Paris: OECD Development Center.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. F., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., et al. (1966) *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington: Office of Education.

Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Davies, B. (2005). *The essentials of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication Inc.

DuFour, R. (1999). Help wanted: Principals who can lead learning communities. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*(604), 12-17.

DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 12. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

DuFour, R., & Marzano, R. (2009). High-leverage strategies for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership, 66(5), 62-68.*

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*, 15-27. *Educational Research, 52*(3), 368-420.

Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership.* Washington, DC: The Albert

Findley, D., & Findley, B. (1992). Effective schools: The role of the principal. *Contemporary Education, 63(2)*, 102-04.

Fink, E., & Resnick, L. (2001). Developing principals as instructional leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82(8),* 598-606.

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

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College

Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change: What the best leaders do to help their organizations survive and thrive*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38(4)* 915-45.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. W. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Greenfield, W, (1999). *Moral leadership in schools: Fact or fancy?* Annual Meeting of the

Greenfield, W. (1987). *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies*. Retrieved from EBSCO *host*.

Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: Form managerial to instructional to transformational leader. *Journal of Educational Administration, 30 (3),* 35-48.

Hallinger, P. (2005*). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away.* Bangkok, Thailand: College of Management, Mahidol University.

Hallinger, P. (2007). *Research on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership: Retrospect and prospect.* Bangkok, Thailand: College of Management, Mahidol University.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(1),* 5-44.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership, 45(1),* 54.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp 179-201). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hallinger, P., & Richardson, D. (1988). Models of shared leadership: Evolving structures and relationships. *The Urban Review, 20(4),* 229-245. doi:10.1007/BF01120135.

Hanushek, E. & Kimko, D. (2000*).* Schooling, labor-force, quality and the growth of the nations. *The American Economic Review, 90(5), 1184-1208.*

Harris, A., & Lambert, L. (2003). *Building leadership capacity for school improvement.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Hargreaves A., & Fullan, M. (1998). *What's worth fighting for out there*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of professional development: A new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp.127-150). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hill, P.W., & Crevola, C.A. (1999). *The role of standards in educational reform for the 21st century. [Electronic version]. In D. Marsh (Ed.), Preparing our schools for the 21st century, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1999 Yearbook.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hoerr, T. (1996). Collegiality: a new way to define instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77(5),* 380-382.

Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (2009). *Instructional leadership: A research-based guide to learning in schools (3rd ed.).* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2000). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Johnson, K. E. (1996). The role of the teacher in l2 teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 30(4),* 765-771.

Krueger, A. & Lindahl, M. (2000*). Education for Growth: Why and for Whom? Working Paper #7591*. Washington, DC: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Krug, S. (1992). Instructional leadership: A constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *28*(3), 430-443.

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD

Lambert, L., Collay, M., Dietz, M.E., Kent, K., & Richert, A. E. (1997). *Who will save our schools? Teachers as constructivist leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lambert, L. (2000). What's worth fighting for in your school?/What's worth fighting for in the principalship?/What's worth fighting for out there? (Book Review). *Educational Leadership, 57(4),* 92.

Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership, 59(8),* 37-40.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D., Cooper, J., Lambert, M., Gardner, M., & Ford-Slack, P. J. (1995). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lashway, L. (2001). Leadership for accountability. *Research Roundup.* 17(3). 1-4.

Lashway, L. (2002). Developing instructional leaders. *ERIC Digest 160 (July),* Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Leithwood, K. (2007). What we know about educational leadership. In J. Burger, C. F. Webber, & P. Klinck (Eds.). *Intelligent leadership.* (pp. 41-66). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Aitken, R. (2006). *Making schools smarter* (*3rd ed*.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Leithwood, K. A., Riehl, C., & National College for School Leadership (Great Britain). (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Lezotte, L. (1992). Principal insights from effective schools. *Education Digest, 58(3),* 14-17.

Lezotte, L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement.* Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

Lussier, R .N., & Achua, C. F. (2004). *Leadership: theory, application, skill development*. *(2nd ed.)*. Eagan, MN: Thomson-West.

MacBeath, J., & McGlynn, *A.* (2003). *Self evaluation: What's in it for schools?* London: Routledge.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., McNulty, B. A., & Association for Supervision and Curriculum, D. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mason, K. & Longsworth, N. (2005). *Hemispheric project for the preparation of policies and strategies for the prevention of school failure: Belize report*. Belize City, BZ.

McEwan, E. (2003). *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

McMillan, J.H. (2000). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer (4th ed.)* White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ministry of Education (1999-2000). Ministry of Education abstracts of statistics. Belize: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education (2010*). Ministry of Education Abstract of Educational Statistics (2008/2009)*. Belize: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education (2008-2009). *Education Statistic at a glance*. Ministry of Education, Belize.

Ministry of Finance (2007). *Population census*. Belize: Central Statistical Office.

Ministry of Finance (2008). *Population census*. Belize: Central Statistical Office.

Murphy, J. (1988). *The reform of school administration: Pressures and calls for change. Final copy*. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1992). The principalship in an era of transformation. *Journal of Educational Administration, 30(3),* 77-78.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (2002). *Principals should know and be able to do*. Alexandria, VA.

National Staff Development Council (2001). *Standards for staff development (Revised)*. Oxford, OH: NSDC.

Neuman, M., & Simmons, W. (2001). Leadership for student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82(1)*, 9-12.

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice (3rd ed.)*. London: Sage Publication.

Northouse, G. (2007) *Leadership theory and practice (4th ed.)* Thousand Oak, London: Sage Publication.

Ogawa, R., & Bossert, S. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *31*(2), 224-243.

Olson, L. (2000). New demands, new pressures alter administrators' roles. *Education Week*, *19(19)*, 14.

Pantelides , J. R. (1991). *An exploration of the relationship between specific instructional leadership behaviors of elementary principals and student achievement.* Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.*

Patton, M. (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry: A personal, experiential perspective. *Qualitative Social Work: Research and Practice*, *1(3)*, 261-283. doi:10.1177/1473325002001003636.

Patton, M.G. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, *44(4)*, 921-958.

Poplin, M. (1994). *The restructuring movement and voices from the inside: Compatibilities and incompatibilities*. Seminar conducted at the national meeting of the Association of California School Administrators. Palm Springs, CA.

Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal, 83*(4), 427-452.

Rutter, M. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours*: *Secondary schools and their effect on children*. London: Open Books.

Russo, A. (2004). School-based coaching. A revolution in professional development-or just the latest fad? *Harvard Education Letter 20* (4).

Saxe, G., Gearhart, M., & Nasir, N. S. (2001). Enhancing students' understanding of mathematics: A study of three contrasting approaches to professional support. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 4, 55–79.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Expanding conceptions of inquiry and practice in supervision and evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *6(4),* 355-365. doi:10.2307/1163975.

Sergiovanni, T. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (2nd ed.).* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, T. (1999). *Rethinking leadership.* Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). *Leadership as stewardship. In the Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (4th ed.)*. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Sheppard, B. (1996) Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 42*(4), 325-344.

Smith, W., & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R., and Diamond, J.B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies 36*(1), 3-34.

Stogill, R. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.

Stronge, J. H. (1988). The elementary school principalship: A position in transition?. *Principal, 67(5),* 32-33.

Supovitz, Mayer, Kahle (2000). Promoting inquiry based instructional practice: The longitudinal impact of professional development in the context of systematic reform. *Educational Policy, 14 (3),* 331-356.

Taylor, C., (2009). A good school for every child. How to improve our schools. New York, NY: Routledge.

Taylor, D. (2002) *The naked leader*. London: Bantam Books.

Terry, P. (1996). *The principal and instructional leadership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors in Education. Corpus Christi, TX.

Thompson, C (1991). *Pre-school and primary education in Belize: The state of affairs and matters ensuing. In K. Shoman (Ed.) Education in Belize: Towards the year 2000* (pp29 - 54). Benque Viejo, Belize: SPEAR/Cubola productions.

Weber, G. (1971). *Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools*. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

Weber, J. R., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, E. R. (1989). *Leading the instructional program*. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Wellish, J.B., Macqueen, A.H., Carriere, R.A., & Duck, G.A. (1978). School management and organization in successful schools. *Sociology of Education, 51,* 211-26.

Whitaker, B. (1997). Instructional leadership and principal visibility. *Clearing House, 70(3),* 155 Instructional leadership and principal visibility. *Clearing House, 70(3),* 155.

Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in Organizations (3rd Ed.)* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

APPPENDICES

Appendix A

General Manager's Letter of Informed Consent

APPPENDICES

Appendix A

Letter to General Managers

Dear General Manager,

I am writing to request your assistance with an important research study. This research may improve learning for students not only in your schools but also throughout Belize. This study is designed to test the effectiveness of a training program to teach school principals the instructional leadership model of principalship, a model that has been associated with improved student achievement. One school in your management has been chosen as one of twenty-five schools in Belize City to participate in this study. Principals in this study will participate in a four-day training workshop early in the spring term. They will also receive monthly follow-up visits to assist them in putting the instructional leadership model into practice in their schools.

To test the effectiveness of this program, teachers in the schools will complete a survey at the beginning of spring term, before the training workshop, and again at the end of the spring term. This survey simply asks teachers to describe principals' school behaviors. This research is being conducted in a completely confidential manner. Information received from the survey and from the school visits will be used only to evaluate the training program, and no school or person will be individually identified in the research report.

I hope I can count on your school to participate in this important and exciting research. I will contact you by telephone in the next few days to determine your response and to discuss next steps. I look forward to working with you on this project and to sharing the results with you when the study is complete.

Sincerely,

Carol I. Babb
Researcher

Appendix B

Principal's Letter of Informed Consent

Appendix B

Letters to Principals

Dear Principal,

I am writing to request your assistance with an important research study. This research may improve learning for students not only in your school but also throughout Belize. This study is designed to test the effectiveness of a training program to teach school principals the instructional leadership model of principalship, a model that has been associated with improved student achievement. Your school has been chosen as one of twenty-five schools in Belize City to participate in this study, and your general manager has agreed that you may participate.

Principals in this study will participate in a four-day training workshop early in the spring term. They will also receive monthly follow-up visits to assist them in putting the instructional leadership model into practice in their schools.

To test the effectiveness of this program, teachers in the schools will complete a survey at the beginning of spring term, before the training workshop, and again at the end of the spring term. This survey simply asks teachers to describe principals' school behaviors. This research is being conducted in a completely confidential manner. Information received from the survey and from the school visits will be used only to evaluate the training program, and no school or person will be individually identified in the research report.

I hope I can count on your school to participate in this important and exciting research. I will contact you by telephone in the next few days to determine your response and to discuss next steps. I look forward to working with you on this project and to sharing the results with you when the study is complete.

Sincerely,

Carol I. Babb
Researcher

Appendix C

Teacher's Letter of Informed Consent

Appendix C

Letters to Teachers

Dear Teacher,

I am writing to request your assistance with an important research study. This research may improve learning for students, not only in your school but also throughout Belize. Your school has been chosen as one of twenty-five schools in Belize City to participate in this study, and your general manager and principal have agreed that you may participate.

Your role in this study is simply to complete a survey at the beginning and end of the spring term. The examinations unit of the Ministry of Education will assist with the administration of the survey. You will not be asked to identify yourself in this survey, so your responses will be anonymous. In the report of this research, no school or individual will be identified.

I hope I can count on your participation in this important and exciting research. I will be happy to share the results with you and other teachers when the study is complete.

Sincerely,

Carol I. Babb
Researcher

Appendix D

Instructional Leadership Behavioral Checklist

Monitoring curriculum & Instruction	Comments
1. Involve teachers in developing and implementing school instructional goals and objectives.	
2. Incorporates the designated state and / or system curricula in the development of instructional programs.	
3. Ensures that school and classroom activities are consistent with school instructional goals and objectives.	
4. Evaluates progress toward instructional goals and objectives.	
5. Works with teachers in improve the instructional program in their classrooms consistent with student needs.	
6. Bases instructional program development on sound research and practice.	
7. Applies appropriate formative procedures in evaluating the instructional programs.	
Monitoring student progress	**Comments**
1. Establishing inclusive classrooms that send the message that all students learn.	
2. Providing extending learning opportunities for students who need them.	
3. Observing and reinforcing positive teacher behaviors in the classroom that ensures an academically demanding climate and orderly, well- managed classroom.	
4. Sending messages to students in a variety of ways that they can succeed.	
5. The establishment of policies on students progress relative homework, grading, monitoring progress, remediation, reporting progress and retention / promotion.	
6. Establishing high expectations for student achievement that are directly communicated to students, teacher, and parents.	
7. Establishes clear rules and expectations for the use of time allocated to instruction and monitors the effective use of classroom time.	

8. Establishes, implements, and evaluates with teachers and students (as appropriate) procedures and codes for handling and correcting discipline problems.	
9. Provides for systematic two – way communication with staff regarding the ongoing objectives and goals of the school.	
10. Establishes, supports, and implements activities that communicate to students the value and meaning of learning.	
11. Develops and utilizes communication channels wish parents for the purpose of setting for school objectives.	
Supervision and Supporting Teachers	**Comments**
1. Assists teachers in setting and reaching personal and professional goals related to the improvement of school instruction and monitors the successful completion of these goals.	
2. Makes regular classroom observations in all classrooms, both informal and formal.	
3. Engages in preplanning of classroom observations.	
4. Engages in post observation conferences that focus on the improvement of instruction.	
5. Provides thorough, defensible, and insightful evaluations, making recommendations for personal and professional growth goals according to individual needs.	
6. Engages in direct teaching in the classroom of his or her school.	
7. Schedules, plans, or facilitates regular meetings of all types (planning, problem solving, decision making, or in0- service training) among teachers to address instructional issues.	
8. Provides opportunities for and training inn collaboration, shared decision making, coaching, mentoring, curriculum development, and making presentations.	
9. Provides motivation and resources for faculty members to engage in professional growth activities.	
Promoting Instructional Climate	**Comments**

1. Serves as an advocate of students and communicates with them regarding aspects of their school life.	
2. Encourages open communication among staff members and maintain respect for differences of opinion.	
3. Demonstrates concern and openness in the consideration of students, teacher and / or parent problems and participates in the resolution of such problems where appropriate.	
4. Models appropriate human relations skills.	
5. Develops and maintains high morale.	
6. Acknowledges appropriately the earned achievements of others.	

Appendix E

Measure of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behavior

(Judy Pantellide's Survey Instruments)

MEASURE OF PRINCIPALS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

The 60 behaviors below represent instructional leadership behaviors of primary principals. Indicate those behaviors you have personally observed your current principal demonstrating.

1= *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, 4 = *Agree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*

	Please respond to each statement by putting a tick under your response.	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Observed a lesson in each teacher's classroom during the first term.					
2.	Provided diagnostic information on student achievement to teachers.					
3.	Enforced rules that discourage classroom interruptions.					
4.	Assessed effectiveness of remedial programs.					
5.	Encouraged teachers to use the most recent research for teaching reading.					
6.	Explained the school's test results at a Parents' meeting.					
7.	Periodically reviewed daily lesson plans with teachers.					
8.	Commended a teacher for positive, time-on-task classroom atmosphere.					
9.	Provided group test scores for teachers.					
10.	Preplanned school activities that would prevent interruptions.					
11.	Been visible in all parts of the building.					
12.	Surveyed teacher needs in identifying resources necessary to reach instructional objectives.					
13.	Provided an in-service for the staff explaining how the test data are to be used to improve student performance.					
14.	Developed partnerships with outside organizations to improve school conditions.					
15.	Used the school's test results to modify an instructional program.					

16.	Evaluated the plan for improvement of instruction.					
17.	Provided opportunities for peer coaching.					
18.	Explained the school's test results at a staff meeting.					
19.	Acknowledged students' academic accomplishments in informal settings.					
20.	Analyzed test results at each grade level.					
21.	Praised students who are trying but not being outstanding academically.					
22.	Develop a counseling program for a troubled student.					
23.	Participated in eligibility and Individualized Educational Program meetings.					
24.	Involved parents and community in development of plan for improvement of instruction.					
25.	Explained classroom interruptions policy at staff meeting.					
26.	Reinforced the excellent quality of a teacher's lesson presentation with a handwritten note.					
27.	Visited each teacher's class at least once each school year.					
28.	Assisted a teacher in developing a plan for improvement.					
29.	Made teachers aware of additional available resources.					
30.	Involved teachers in developments of a plan for the improvement of instruction.					
31.	Requested financial support for teachers' requests to attend instructional conferences, workshops, and seminars.					
32.	Attempted to meet each teacher's needs for instructional supplies.					
33.	Spoken to the teachers about the goals of the school.					
34.	Talked with students in assembly.					
35.	Assisted teachers in the identification and referral of special education pupils.					
36.	Assigned an effective teacher to another teacher who needs help.					

37.	Distributed a summary of the school's test results to all staff members.					
38.	Discussed with the staff the school's current achievement results and the school's achievement goals.					
39.	Worked with teachers to develop a list of goals for the school.					
40.	Involved teachers in budgeting for instructional materials.					
41.	Provided needed instructional support services (i.e., child study, psychological services, home visitation of students, remedial services) for at-risk students.					
42.	Worked with a teacher to improve instructional objectives.					
43.	Encouraged varied means of student evaluation.					
44.	Reviewed the components of an effective instructional lesson at a staff meeting.					
45.	Followed through on teacher suggestions and reported back to them.					
46.	Conducted an annual survey to get feedback on instruction from parents.					
47.	Monitored implementation of the plan for improvement of instruction.					
48.	Checked to assess the quality of lesson plans.					
49.	Created the staff development plan.					
50.	Scheduled a definite time to talk with parents of students having problems.					
51.	Commended a teacher in writing for correlating instructional activities.					
52.	Worked with teachers to prepare a list by the end of the first term of students who are not meeting their objectives.					
53.	Scheduled specific times for parents to visit teachers.					
54.	Given each teacher written feedback on each class observed					
55.	Provided time for teachers to visit the principal to discuss instructional problems.					

56.	Established, together with staff, achievement goals for the schools for students' mastery of basic skills.					
57.	Established, with each teacher, specific goals for increasing achievement scores in basic skills.					
58.	Personally reviewed annual instructional plans with teachers.					
59.	Provided an in-service for the staff describing the testing instruments.					
60.	Asked staff to list students who are improving in basic skills.					

Appendix F

Institutional Review Board Approval

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date:	Friday, February 11, 2011
IRB Application No	ED1120
Proposal Title:	Instructional Leadership in Belizean Elementary School
Reviewed and Processed as:	Exempt

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 2/10/2012

Principal Investigator(s):

Carol Iris Babb
1092 Apple Star Ave
Belize City, Belize,

Bernita Krumm
310 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

☒ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Shelia M. Kennison

Shelia Kennison, Chair
Institutional Review Board

Appendix G

Letter of Permission to Use Survey Instrument from Judy Pantelides

Dr. Judy Raiford Pantelides
Christopher Newport University
1 University Place
Newport News, VA 23606
757.851.6231

November 20, 2010

Carol Babb, M.Ed
Deputy Chief Education Officer
Ministry of Education
117 North Front Street
Belize City, Belize

Dear Ms. Babb,

I am hereby granting you permission for use of the research instrument I used in my 1991 doctoral dissertation entitled "Instructional Leadership of Elementary Principals". If you have any further questions or needs, please don't hesitate to ask.

I wish you the very best in your doctoral research and dissertation completion.

Sincerely,

Judy

Judy Raiford Pantelides

VITA

Carol Iris Babb

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN BELIZEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical: Born on October 31, 1958 to Colin and Geraldine Lewis. I am the second eldest of 6 children. I am married and have two children; Candice and Cristian Babb. Aiden Palma is my grandson.

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy/Education in Higher Education at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2012.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Secondary Education at University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida in 2002.

Completed the requirements for Licentiate Degree at College of Preceptors, London, England in 1985.

Experience:

Deputy Chief Education Officer - Ministry of Education- 2008 Present
General Manager of Anglican Schools- Anglican Diocese -2000-2008
Principal Queen Square Anglican Primary School- Anglican Diocese- 1990-2000
Elementary School Teacher- Queen Square Anglican School- 1975-1989

Professional Memberships:

Association of Justices of the Peace, Belize National Teachers Union

.

Name: Carol Iris Babb Date of Degree: December, 2011

Institution: Oklahoma State University Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN BELIZEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Pages in Study: 112 Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major Field: Higher Education

Scope and Method of Study:

This study used a mixed methods design. The quantitative method used was a repeated measures design. The qualitative methods used were observations and participants reflections. The purpose of the study was to determine the impact of a training program for instructional leadership on the instructional leadership behaviors of Belizean primary school principals, specifically monitoring the curriculum and instruction, monitoring student progress, and supervision and support of teachers.

Findings and Conclusions:

The results of the study supported the null hypothesizes which stated that the training program would have no effect on principals' instructional leadership behavior as perceived by teachers. The results showed that there were no statistically significant difference in the pre- and posttest means. However, the results showed that in individual schools there were some differences. In school 17, the results showed that the training program had an effect on the principal's instructional behavior as perceived by the teachers, with posttest results exceeding pretest.

For School 18 there was statistical significance in the manner teachers perceived their principal after the training in the overall assessment and in each of the four subscales, but in this school, the pretest score was significantly higher than the posttest score, a negative result. For schools one and five the planning subscale showed that principals in these schools appeared to have improved in planning but not in other areas. All of the principals complained that time was a factor that kept them back from implementing the strategies and skills shared.

Recommendations:

For the instructional leadership model to work in Belize, principals would need intensive training and support, and concepts of time management and delegation would need to be included in the training.

All stakeholders in education would need to recognize that the role of the principal as an instructional leader is essential and every effort must be made to make sure that principals are able to spend more time in the classrooms and less time in the office.

There is the need to put an end to the one- shot training workshops and link the goals of the workshops to the goals and objectives of the MOE&Y.

Name: Carol Iris Babb Date of Degree: December, 2011

Institution: Oklahoma State University Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma