

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the quantitative data integrated from questionnaire distributed among the school principals and teachers of Bhutan. The questionnaire comprised of two parts as: Principal's Instructional Leadership and School Effectiveness.

Part 1A The dimensions of Principal's Instructional Leadership.

In this part of the questionnaire, the respondents rated 30 measures on the Principal's Instructional Leadership in the school.

Table 1 The overall level of the Principal's Instructional Leadership dimensions (N=53)

Dimensions of Principal's Instructional Leadership (X)	Mean	SD	Level of agreement
Principal's General Roles and Responsibilities (X ₁)	4.57	.31	Very high
Principal's role on Curriculum (X ₂)	4.40	.35	High
Principal's role on Assessment (X ₃)	4.51	.34	Very High
Principal's role on Professional Development (X ₄)	4.39	.39	High
Average of Principal's Instructional Leadership (X _T)	4.47	.31	High

The findings revealed the overall mean for the level of principals instructional leadership was at high level ($\bar{x} = 4.47$). The first and the third dimensions were perceived at very high level. While the second and the fourth dimensions were at high level.

Table 2 The level of the General Roles and Responsibilities dimension of Principal's Instructional Leadership (N=53)

Measures of Principal's Instructional Leadership on General Roles and Responsibilities	Mean	SD	Level of agreement
Framing the vision and mission for planning school goals	4.66	.44	Very High
Involving all teachers for planning and for every activity.	4.58	.43	Very High
Developing a well set achievable goal for school excellence.	4.56	.43	Very High
Facilitating the implementation of shared goals and plans.	4.50	.45	Very High
Maintaining a positive and strong relationship among the school staff and the community.	4.68	.46	Very High
Allocating appropriate time for instruction and for all the activities.	4.47	.49	High
Stating and informing clearly the roles and responsibilities of each individual in the school.	4.57	.46	Very High
Average of General Roles and Responsibilities	4.57	.31	Very High

The overall mean for the general roles and responsibilities of the principal was at the very high level ($\bar{x} = 4.57$). Allocating appropriate time for instruction and for all the activities was the only measure in the high level ($\bar{x} = 4.47$). The rest of the measures were all at the very high level.

Table 3 The level of the Curriculum dimension of Principal's Instructional Leadership (N=53)

Measures of Principal's Instructional Leadership on Curriculum	Mean	SD	Level of agreement
Leading and demonstrating the understanding of curriculum and pedagogy.	4.36	.53	High
Model effective curriculum implementation for teachers in the school.	4.38	.56	High
Decentralize school level monitoring and support system to enhance teaching/learning processes effectively.	4.54	.43	Very high
Nominate for various workshops, trainings and awards fairly.	4.43	.68	High
Ensuring the use of relevant multi-modal pedagogical techniques, as well as a range of instructional tools, technologies, and supplemental materials, to meet the needs of all learners.	4.34	.47	High
Emphasizing on the use of ICT in teaching learning processes.	4.37	.56	High
Spending time with the teachers to discuss on curriculum.	4.33	.58	High
Providing enough resources for curriculum implementation.	4.42	.48	High
Average of Curriculum	4.40	.35	High

The average mean for this dimension was at high level ($\bar{x}=4.40$). Decentralize school level monitoring and support system to enhance teaching/learning processes effectively had the highest mean at very high level ($\bar{x}=4.54$). The other measures were all at the high level.

Table 4 The level of the Assessment dimension of Principal's Instructional Leadership (N=53)

Measures of Principal's Instructional Leadership on Assessment	Mean	SD	Level of agreement
Developing a clear written policy of summative and formative assessment with teachers for learners.	4.62	.43	Very high
Making teachers' preparation on test construction based on Blooms taxonomy.	4.69	.33	Very high
Ensuring fair assessment based on coverage of syllabus, language, time allocation and levels of thinking.	4.60	.47	Very high
Developing indicators for every subject for improvement with subject teachers for the learners.	4.39	.53	High
Ensuring proper documentation and data records of assessment for analyzing.	4.49	.51	High
Provide positive feedback to students and teachers for improvement.	4.45	.45	High
Different programs are available for improving the students based on their performance.	4.35	.52	High
Average of Assessment	4.51	.34	Very high

This table illustrates the overall mean at very high level ($\bar{x}=4.51$). The first three measures were at the very high level. The rest of the measures fell in the high level.

Table 5 The level of the Professional Development dimension of Principal's Instructional Leadership (N=53)

Measures of Principal's Instructional Leadership on Professional Development	Mean	SD	Level of agreement
Identifying of the PD programs based on the needs.	4.56	.50	Very high
Encouraging PD programs in the school.	4.61	.40	Very high
Establishing Professional development programs as a part of school activities to enhance teachers in teaching learning processes.	4.58	.42	Very high
Ensuring positive professional rapport among staff.	4.47	.51	High
Encouraging and supporting participation in various PD programs.	4.54	.49	Very high
Updating and sharing on new teaching methodologies and subject content from various sources	4.34	.55	High
Encouraging the teachers to do action research.	4.08	.64	High
Supporting and encouraging teachers to write academic articles for publication.	3.97	.65	High
Average of Professional Development	4.39	.38	High

The average mean score for this dimension was at high level (\bar{x} = 4.39). The first, second, third and the fifth measures were perceived at very high level. The others measures were perceived at high level.

Part 1 B School Effectiveness

In this part of the questionnaire, the existing data of the school from the national evaluation were used. The data for the academic year 2013 were collected from the school principals'. The ratings given to the schools were recorded and analyzed.

Table 6 The overall level of School Effectiveness (Y) (N=53)

Dimensions of School Effectiveness	Mean	SD	Level of agreement
Leadership and Management Practices (Y ₁)	3.77	.42	High
Green School (Y ₂)	3.58	.43	High
Curriculum: Teaching and Classroom Management Practices (Y ₃)	3.77	.42	High
Continuous and Holistic Students' assessment (Formative and Summative) (Y ₄)	3.67	.47	High
Co-curricular Dimensions: For Wholesome Development (Y ₅)	3.60	.49	High
School-Community Relationship (Y ₆)	3.56	.57	High
Average of School Effectiveness (Y _T)	3.65	.28	High

The overall average mean for the school effectiveness assessment was at high level (\bar{x} = 3.65). All the dimensions of the school effectiveness were also at the high level.

Part 2: The relationship between Principals Instructional Leadership and School Effectiveness in the Urban Schools of Bhutan.

Table 7 The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Principal's Instructional Leadership and School Effectiveness of the Urban Schools of Bhutan (N=53)

	Principal's Instructional Leadership (X)	General Roles and Responsibilities (X ₁)	Curriculum (X ₂)	Assessment (X ₃)	Professional Development (X ₄)
School Effectiveness (Y)	.189	-.067	.294*	.099	.304*
Leadership and Management Practices (Y ₁)	.114	.043	.180	-.038	.201
Green school (Y ₂)	.137	-.079	.245	.128	.169
Curriculum: Teaching and Classroom Management Practices (Y ₃)	.067	-.030	.132	-.010	.128
Continuous and Holistic Students' Assessment (Formative and Summative) (Y ₄)	.003	-.041	.098	-.041	-.010
Co-curricular Dimensions: For Wholesome development (Y ₅)	.239	.088	.251	.147	.337*
School-Community Relationship (Y ₆)	.108	-.189	.151	.137	.241

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed).

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients produced by the data analysis revealed that there was no significant correlation relationship between the overall principal's instructional leadership and overall school effectiveness in the urban schools of Bhutan ($r = .189, p < .05$).

There was significant relationship found between professional development and curriculum dimensions of principal's instructional leadership and overall school effectiveness ($r = .304, p < .05$, and $r = .294, p < .05$, respectively). The correlation was however low positive correlation for the former and little correlation for the latter.

Also, there was little significant correlation coefficient was found between the professional development dimension (X_4) of principal's instructional leadership and co-curricular: for wholesome development dimension of school effectiveness (Y_5), with $r = .337, p < .05$ (low positive correlation). No significant relationship was found among the other principal's instructional leadership dimensions and school effectiveness dimensions.