Research Article

Differences in College Lecturers' Ratings of Principals Instructional Leadership: A Jamaican Perspective

Cerease Nevins-Bennett *

Faculty of Business Administration, Turks and Caicos Islands Community College, TKCA 1ZZ, Turks and Caicos Islands

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative study is to determine how lecturers rated their principals as instructional leaders and to examine the differences in lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership based on the demographic characteristics of gender, age range, lecturing status, number of years current principals have been employed to the colleges*.* and the highest level of educational attainment of the current principals. A survey that adopted the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) was used to collect data from 170 participants purposively. Overall, lecturers had moderately high ratings of principals' instructional leadership within the colleges. There were no statistically significant differences in the ratings of lecturers based on age range and the number of years the current principal has been employed within the colleges. Male lecturers rated their principal higher than female lecturers on the dimension of creating a positive college climate. Adjunct lecturers gave their principals a higher rating than full-time lecturers on the dimension of managing instructional programs. Principals that had a master's degree as their highest educational attainment were rated higher by the lecturers on the dimension of defining the college mission. This study contributes to the body of knowledge by filling the gap at the college level.

Keywords: *Creating a positive college climate, Defining the college mission, Leadership, Management, Managing instructional programs, Principal Instructional Leadership*

Introduction

An institution without the proper direction and guidance by its instructional leaders is one that is doomed to fail. The principal, as an instructional leader plays a pivotal role in guiding their institution by helping to shape its culture, encouraging collaboration with faculty, shift the focus from teaching to learning, and by providing various instructional support (Lunenburg, 2010). Within the 21st century, the

role of principals as instructional leaders has become unclear, however, their discernable actions are trending into a more strategic direction leaving their once managerial tasks to be delegated to other instructional leaders.

Instructional leadership is seen as one of the driving forces affecting lecturers' commitment. A concept made popular by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), instructional leadership acts as a guidepost for institutional leaders as policy creators and practitioners and as a device for improving institutions (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). Instructional leadership defines the need for principals' competent support to facilitate the execution of change in schools. Through effective instructional leadership, the strong, directive, and discernable leaders of the institutions can address the various issues affecting students and lecturers and address pedagogical and instructional issues of the institutions (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). When the instructional leadership job functions are fully executed, lecturers can better contribute to students' success because they are more committed. Tatlah et al. (2019) revealed that lecturers were more committed to the job when supervised, developed professionally, and allowed to improve through effective curriculum facilitation. This is true once the instructional leader effectively communicates the organization's goals and mission and provides a positive work climate (Ahmad et al., 2015).

Problem of the Study

Principals have placed more emphasis on managerialism (Bashir & Gani, 2020) and less on instructional leadership. This is evident in lecturers' level of involvement within the colleges and their levels of absenteeism, which may be due to the intensity of principal instructional leadership job functions. The World Bank report (2018) cited that institutional leadership/management and working conditions are the important factors affecting lecturer commitment to the job in developing countries (as cited in Evans & Yuan, 2018). Nannyonio (2017) provided evidence of limited instructional leadership functions performed by the principals. The report indicated that the principal's instructional leadership in Jamaica is an issue as only:

30% of the principals observed instructions in the classroom, 20% liaised with lecturers providing feedback on instructional improvement, 24% recognized the need for lecturer professional development, and 22% collaborated with lecturers in developing short-term goals. (Nannyonjo, 2017, pp. 19-20)

It is argued that instructional leadership (IL) will only be effective if resources, support, supervision of lecturers, and direction are given to facilitate lecturers' commitment and students' achievement (Campbell et al., 2018). Elaine Foster Allen, the then Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, Jamaica, and former principal at the Shortwood Teachers College in Jamaica, in a 2012 interview in the Jamaica Observer, further confirmed the problem. She said:

you don't have sufficient accountability framework in schools, and in many schools, the structures aren't in place for the principals to provide leadership in the area of teaching and learning; the problem is compounded by poor leadership. (Hamilton, 2012, para. 15)

Shaked (2018) identified the issues as principals removing instructional leadership duties from their daily work-life. Shaked (2020) stated that between eight to thirteen percent of the principals' time is spent on instructional leadership activities (p. 521). Burke (2014) indicated that principals' IL is necessary for community colleges because of its heavy reliance on adjunct lecturers and the inability to recruit highly trained lecturers to meet the demands of the work environment; thus, guidance is needed. In addition, Shaked (2020) indicated that principal IL is necessary as other instructional leaders (Deans and Heads of Departments) may demonstrate little instructional leadership, thus creating organizational issues. It is clear that principals still maintain direct control over instructional leadership functions (Ersozlu & Saklan, 2016) despite distributing leadership roles to Deans, Heads of departments and collaborating with lecturers on educational matters.

The purpose of this study is to determine how lecturers rated their principals as instructional leaders and examine the differences in lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership based on certain demographic characteristics.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership as defined by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)?
2. Are there any significant differences in lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership based on their gender, age range, teaching status, the number of years current principals have been working at the college, and the highest level of educational attainment of the principal?

H_{03a}: There are no significant differences in lecturers' ratings of PIL based on their gender, age range, and status of lecturers, the number of years current principals have been working at the college, and the highest level of educational attainment of the principal.

H_{a3a}: There are statistically significant differences in lecturers' ratings of PIL based on their gender, age range, and status of lecturers, the number of years current principals have been working at the college, and the highest level of educational attainment of the principal.

Literature Review
Historical Perspective and Nature of Instructional Leadership

The multidimensional concept of instructional leadership emerged in the 1970s from the effective school movement (Jyh Lih & Bin Ismail, 2018). Instructional leadership has been classified into exclusive and inclusive approaches (Ghavifekr et al., 2019) and direct and indirect approaches (Blasé & Blase, 2004); narrow and broad view (Hao, 2016). The whole approach to instructional leadership requires that the leader take full responsibility for the institution's management, pedagogy, goal setting, supervision, and instructional development (Ghavifekr et al., 2019). The inclusive approach requires collaboration between the instructional leader and the lecturers on instructional matters such as setting goals and adjusting the curriculum (Ghavifekr et al., 2019). The narrow view conceptualizes the actions of the instructional leader that has a direct impact on pedagogy, while the broad view focuses on actions that impact students learning (Hao, 2016). The narrow, direct, and inclusive view of instructional leadership will lead to an increase in the lecturer's organizational commitment to the job (Hao, 2016). Principals can effectively execute their roles as instructional leaders if the stakeholders directly involved in the governance of the institution reduce the many barriers that prevent them from carrying out their functions (Hallinger & Wang, 2015).

Various models of instructional leadership have been introduced, which either formed the cornerstone of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) model proposed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) or were inspired by the PIMRS. The PIMRS is the most prominent model consisting of three dimensions of instructional leadership, namely "defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate" (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985, p.18). Qian et al. (2017) modified the PIMRS to suit the Chinese educational context by adding a fourth dimension which solicits internal and external instructional support because the model proposed by Hallinger and Murphy (1986) was more suited for western societies and the Caribbean. In addition, ten items were added to the adjusted PIMRS scale relating to institution uniqueness, employee empowerment, staff relationship, institutional policy, parental involvement, and community support (Qian et al., 2017). Other notable models were developed by Vilanova et al. (1981), Bossert et al. (1982), Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), Van de Grift (1989), Leithwood et al. (1990), and McEwan (2003), but were never as reliable and valid as the PIRMS (Hallinger, 2010).

Principals as Instructional Leaders in Higher Education

An instructional leader is a leader who is involved in the administration and leadership of an educational institution (Jenkins, 2009). Their primary roles include setting goals, allocating resources, streamlining the curriculum, monitoring instructional processes, and evaluating instructions to achieve institutional, students, and faculty success (Miller & Weber, 2018). There are many instructional leaders within the college system that is headed by the principal/president. These include the vice principals/presidents, program directors, campus directors, Deans, Chairs/Heads of Departments, and instructional coaches (Ersozlu & Saklan, 2016). Despite their involvement and importance in instructional leadership, the principal maintains direct control over instructional leadership functions (Ersozlu & Saklan, 2016).

Traditionally, principals, in general, were regarded as school managers or curriculum managers; however, during the turn of the twenty-first century, principals were viewed as leaders who are responsible for ensuring effectiveness within the colleges (Lahui-Ako, 2001), institutional learning, school improvement and academic achievement of students (Ghavifekr et al., 2019). Amidst the belief that principals spend less time on instructional leadership activities within colleges, Neumerski et al. (2018) believe several reasons may have been attributed to the issues surrounding principals' execution of instructional leadership. They stated:

(1) principals' rarely have enough time in their day to spend on teaching and learning. (2) few have been adequately trained to assess teaching and to coach teachers around instructional improvement, (3) principals have little 'appetite' for focusing their work on teaching and learning, and (4) principals intentionally avoid 'interfering' in classrooms. (Neumerski et al., 2018, p. 270)

One of the major problems of some principals as instructional leaders is that they have limited experience in what quality instructions entail; they use their own beliefs and judgment in making decisions and evaluating teaching performances (Neumerski et al., 2018). Doherty & Jacobs (2015) believed that a lack of consistency in rating teachers produces bad reviews for principals and leads to subjectivity.

The roles of the principals as instructional leaders are of importance to faculty and the institution at large (Neumerski et al., 2018). These roles include channelling the institution towards performance and success, creating an atmosphere for educational growth, instructional improvement, and provider of professional development (Khan & Khan, 2014). Neumerski et al., 2018) found that because of this role, principals are burnt out and frustrated and call for a restructuring of the functions of principals. Contrary to this, Shaked (2018) found that, on average, only eight per cent of the principal's time is spent doing instructional leadership functions. This leads to the question of the relevance and importance of instructional leadership to the institutions and stakeholders amidst the scholarly argument that instructional leadership is an outdated phenomenon (Valliamah et al., 2016). Valliamah et al. (2016) answered by arguing that it is still and will remain alive if the college's academic performance and students' outcome remains a priority of leaders. Blase and Blase (2004) recommended that successful principals should collaborate with lecturers on instructional matters and form partnerships to prevent burnout and charter the way for a successful institution (Oplatka, 2017).

The Principals' Instructional Leadership Dimensions and Job Functions

The Principals' Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) was developed by Hallinger & Murphy (1985) and is concentrated on the functions and behaviours of the principal. This sole focus highlights the "heroic view" of the important role principals play within the institution in setting organizational goals, oversight of pedagogy, and academic development (Hallinger, 2005). The PIMRS comprise the elements or functions that are important for instructional leadership to occur and assesses the dimensions of defining the college mission, managing the instructional program, and

creating a positive school climate (Robinson et al., 2008).

Dimension 1: Defining the College's Mission

Defining the school's mission is an integral part of instructional leadership behaviour and consists of two important job functions: framing and communicating school goals (Hallinger & Lee, 2013). Having a clearly defined mission means that the instructional leader must know the intended plan of action and direction the institution will take to succeed (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). Defining the mission means that the goals of the institution, as manifested through the instructional processes, will be framed, and communicated to the teachers (Hendawy Al-Mahdy & Al-kiyumi, 2015), the importance of which propels accountability and improvement of the instructional processes (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). While defining the mission is a collaborative effort between principals and teachers, the mission must be extensively communicated to promote teachers' and students' success (Mohammed & Henkebo, 2019). Robinson et al. (2008) indicated that the setting of goals has an indirect impact on students' outcomes and is related to the coordination and focus of lecturers' work.

Dimension 2: Managing the Instructional Program

This dimension consists of three job functions of the instructional leader relating to the supervision and evaluation of instructions, coordination of the curriculum and monitoring of student's progress (Tatlah et al., 2012). Managing the institution's instructional program involves the principal working collaboratively with teachers to evaluate, develop, implement, and coordinate the curriculum, in addition to monitoring students' success (Hallinger et al., 2018). Though it is argued that the principal solely carries out this responsibility, Hallinger and Wang (2015) purport that a collaborative effort between teachers is necessary, but the sole responsibility rests on the principal, who is accountable for students' outcomes. Mohammed and Hankebo (2019) believe that to achieve instructional leadership success, the leaders must "focus on learning, encourage collaboration, provide support, use data to improve learning, and align the curriculum, instruction and assessment" (p. 8510).

Dimension 3: Creating a Positive College Climate

This dimension requires that leaders develop a culture that allows for the continuous improvement of the institution and where students' and lecturers' rewards are supported by their purpose and best practices (Hallinger, 2010). The features of the principal leadership behaviour require the protection of instructional time, promoting lecturers, provision of professional development, maintaining high visibility within the college, providing incentives for lecturers, and providing learning incentives for students (Mohammed & Hankebo, 2019). To create a positive climate, Hallinger and Wang (2015) argued that the principal must maintain a presence on campus and create a climate that builds on faculty support and continuous improvement of andragogy. In doing so, the expectations of the college faculty and students are fully articulated, policies and standards are created, there is calculated use of time, and the implementation of staff development programs (Turkoglu & Cansoy, 2018). Notwithstanding, Wei et al. (2018) were quick to explain that the practice of instructional leadership should balance the building of the institution's climate instead of focusing primarily on task orientation. This dimension has overlapping features of the transformational leadership framework of curriculum alignment, professional learning, collaboration, and formulating and communicating a shared mission (Desravines et al., 2016). Organizational climate is strongly associated with organizational commitment as employees who are more familiar with and are comfortable with the organizational culture are more committed (Ahmad et al., 2015)

Ratings of Principals' Instructional leadership According to Demographic Variables

A quantitative study conducted in Vietnam by Hao (2017) found that overall, teachers gave high ratings for their principals' instructional leadership with mean scores between (M = 3.50) and (M = 4.41). Similarly, Hallinger and Murphy (1986) reported that teachers rated

their principals between M = 3.6 to M = 4.2 on a scale of 1-5, with 5 representing the highest ratings. The highest rating of M = 4.2 was given to the principals' function of supervising and evaluating instructions (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986). Though overall high ratings were found by Almahdy and Al-Kiyumi (2015), defining the school mission was rated the highest among the three dimensions and managing instructional program was rated the lowest.

Gender of Principals and Lecturers

Male and female lecturers have differences in the perception of principals' instructional leadership behaviour, with females having a higher perception than males (Ghavifekr et al., 2019). Hao (2016) also found that female teachers rated their principals higher on job functions relating to goal framing, goal communication, instructional evaluation and supervision, and curriculum coordination. A study conducted in Nigeria among secondary school teachers found significant differences in gender only for the dimension of managing instructional programs "(M = 3.72, SD = .70)" (Bada et al., 2020, p. 4465). Within the Caribbean context, Hutton (2017) studied high-performance principals and conducted an independent samples t-test to determine the differences in the ratings of male and female teachers of their principals. It was found that there were no significant differences in the ratings of the high-performance principals by gender.

Tenure of Lecturers

Hao (2016) indicated that the tenure of the lecturers had a significant impact on how they perceived and rated their principals in instructional leadership; the longer the tenure, the higher the ratings given to principals. Similarly, in a study conducted in Jamaica on instructional leadership among students' academic achievements, Heaven and Bourne (2016) found that instructional leadership had an impact on teachers' instructions among those with greater tenure.

Training and Teaching Experiences

A quantitative survey study on principal instructional leadership in Vietnam found no statistically significant differences between lecturing experiences of the lecturers and their perception of the principal's instructional leadership functions (Hao, 2016). This was emphasized by Qian et al. (2017), who purported that the culture of the institution and the social practice of its constituents shaped the instructional leaders and their practices. A study conducted in Nigeria among secondary school lecturers, Bada et al. (2020) found inconclusive results using MANOVA to support the claim that lecturers rated principals higher based on the number of years of teaching experience.

Methods

The quantitative research methodology was used for this study, utilizing survey design. Data was collected from 170 lecturers using purposive sampling. This technique allowed for the deliberate selection of participants based on pre-existing criteria set by the researcher. Purposive sampling was used as the sampling method.

The Participants

A Total of 170 lecturers from two community colleges were used in the study (College A: 72 lecturers, and College B: 162 lecturers) after approval was given. The participants consist of 52 males (30.6%) and 118 females (69.4%). One hundred and one participants were between the ages of 39 and below (59.4%) and sixty-nine (40.6%) were 40 and above. One hundred and fifty lecturers (88.2%) were fully tenured while only twenty (11.8) were part-time lecturers.

Instrument

The Principal Instructional Management Ratings Scale (PIMRS) consists of 50 items measuring three dimensions and ten job functions of instructional leadership of the principals. The PIMRS measured variables on a Likert scale of 1-5, with "1" being "Never" to "5" representing "Almost always"; therefore, the calculated means for the lecturers' rating of the PIL ranged between 1 and 5. In this study, mean scores between 1-1.9 were considered "low", 2-2.9 were "moderately low", 3-3.9 were "moderately high", and means of 4-5 were considered "high". Hallinger and Wang (2015) stated that

"a score of 4 and above were considered high engagement in PIL" (p. 54). Moderately low means the scores were not extremely low but within reasonable limits, while moderately high means the scores were not extremely high but within reasonable limits.

PIMRS Reliability and Validity

The overall reliability for the survey instrument was α = .84. Cronbach Alpha for the three dimensions the PIMRS were defining the college mission (α = .83), managing instructional programs (α = .79), and creating a positive college climate (α = .89). There was high content validity for the instrument. wo college principals and one secondary school principal were used to provide the content validity for the instrument. Using a content validity rating scale, the average agreement among raters were defining the college mission (CVRS = 100%), managing instructional programs (CVRS = 94%), and creating a positive college climate (CVRS = 97%).

Data Analysis Procedures

Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were used while inferential statistics of independent samples t-test was used. Descriptive data were presented using tables, graphs, and narratives. The mean and standard deviations were derived for the three dimensions of PIL, which are defining the college mission, managing instructional programs, and creating a positive college climate.

Result
Research Question 1: What are lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership as defined by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)?

The mean and standard deviations for lecturers' ratings of their principals' instructional leadership are displayed in Table 1. Overall, lecturers had moderately high ratings of principals' instructional leadership within the colleges (*M = 3.05, SD = 0.6*). Lecturers had moderately high ratings of the principal instructional leadership dimension of defining the college mission (*M* = 3.29, *SD* =0.66), moderately low ratings for managing instructional programs (*M* = 2.99, *SD* = 0.56), and creating a positive college climate (*M* = 2.84, *SD* = 0.58) respectively.

Table 1 also shows the 10 job functions of the principal as rated by the lecturers. The principals' job function of communicating the college goals were given moderately high ratings by the lecturers (*M* = 3.37, *SD* = 0.71). Lecturers gave moderately low rating for the principals' job function of maintaining high visibility (*M* = 2.28, *SD* = 0.62), monitoring students' progress (*M* = 2.79, *SD* = 0.71), providing incentives for lecturers (*M* = 2.68, *SD* = 0.79), and promoting professional development (*M* = 2.94, *SD* = 0.77).

Table 1 The Mean and Standard Deviation of the Lecturers' Ratings of the Principals' Instructional Leadership Dimensions

Instructional leadership dimensions and job functions	N	M	SD
Dimension 1: Defining the college mission	**170**	**3.29**	**0.66**
Framing the college goals	170	3.20	0.68
Communicating college goals	170	3.37	0.71
Dimension 2: Managing instructional program	**170**	**2.99**	**0.56**
Supervising and evaluating instructions	170	3.09	0.81
Coordinating curriculum	170	3.10	0.65
Monitoring student progress	170	2.79	0.71
Dimension 3: Creating a positive college climate	**170**	**2.84**	**0.58**
Protecting instructional time	170	3.09	0.79
Maintaining high visibility	170	2.28	0.62
Providing incentives for lecturers	170	2.68	0.79
Promoting professional development	170	2.94	0.77
Providing incentives for learning	170	3.21	0.78
Overall instructional leadership	**170**	**3.05**	**0.6**

N=170

Research Question 2: Are there any significant differences in lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership based on their gender, age range, teaching status, the number of years current principals have been working at the college, and the highest level of educational attainment of the principal?

Differences in Lecturers' Ratings of PIL Based on Gender

The mean and standard deviations for lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership are displayed in Table 2. When the Independent samples t-test was run, it was determined that there were statistically significant differences in the ratings of male and female lecturers on the PIL dimension of creating a positive college climate t (168) $=2.83, p = .006, d = .470$.

This suggested that male lecturers ($M =$ 3.02, $SD = .579$) rated their principal higher than female lecturers ($M = 2.75, SD = .569$) on the PIL dimension of creating a positive college climate. There were no significant differences in the ratings of male and female lecturers towards principals' instructional leadership dimensions of defining the college mission; t (168) = -.592, $p = .55$, and managing instructional programs; t (168) = -.382, $p = .70$.

Table 2 Means and Standard Deviation of Lecturers' Ratings of Instructional Leadership by Gender

Variables	Gender	n	*M*	*SD*
Defining the college mission	Male	52	3.25	.623
	Female	118	3.32	.675
Managing instructional program	Male	52	2.97	.519
	Female	118	3.01	.576
Creating a positive college climate	Male	52	3.02	.579
	Female	118	2.75	.569

N=170

Differences in Lecturers' Ratings of PIL Based on Age-Range

The mean and standard deviations for lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership are displayed in Table 3. When the Independent samples t-test was run, it was determined that there were no statistically significant differences in the ratings of lecturers based on age-range towards the PIL

Dimension of defining the college mission; t (168) = -.640, $p = .52$, managing instructional programs; t (168) = -.515, $p = .61$, and creating a positive college climate; t (168) =-.859, $p = .39$.

Lecturers aged 39 and below ($M = 3.02, SD = .579$) and lecturers aged 40 and above ($M = 2.75, SD = .569$) gave similar ratings in relation to their principals' instructional leadership.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviation of Lecturers' Ratings of Instructional Leadership by Age Range

Variables	Age-range	n	*M*	*SD*
Defining the college mission	39 and below	101	3.27	.640
	40 and above	69	3.34	.687
Managing instructional program	39 and below	101	2.98	.571
	40 and above	69	3.02	.541
Creating a positive college climate	39 and below	101	2.80	.581
	40 and above	69	2.88	.591

N=170

Differences in Lecturers' Ratings of PIL Based on their Lecturing Status

The mean and standard deviations for lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership are displayed in Table 4. When the Independent samples t-test was run, it was determined that there were statistically significant differences in the ratings of full-time and adjunct lecturers on the PIL dimension of managing instructional program $t(168) = -4.88$, $p = .000$, $d = .975$. Adjunct lecturers ($M = 3.40$, $SD = .366$) rated their principal higher than full-time lecturers ($M = 2.94$, $SD = .558$) on the PIL dimension of managing instructional program.

Differences in Lecturers Ratings of PIL based on the Number of Years Current Principal Have Been Employed to the College.

The mean and standard deviations for lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership are displayed in Table 5. When lecturers rated principals based on the number of years they have been employed to the college, the independent samples t-test revealed no statistically significant differences relating to the PIL dimensions of creating a positive college climate; $t(168) = 2.03$, $p = .84$; defining the college mission; $t(168) = -1.09$, $p = .28$, and managing instructional programs; $t(168) = -.168$, $p = .10$.

There were no statistically significant differences in the ratings of full-time and adjunct lecturers towards principals' instructional leadership function relating to defining the college mission; $t(168) = -1.77$, $p = .09$, and creating a positive college climate; $t(168) = -1.12$, $p = .27$.

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviation by Lecturer Status of Lecturers Ratings of Instructional Leadership

Variables	Lecturer status	n	M	SD
Defining the college mission	Full-time	150	3.27	.669
	Adjunct	20	3.51	.541
Managing instructional program	Full-time	150	2.94	.558
	Adjunct	20	3.40	.366
Creating a positive college climate	Full-time	150	2.82	.578
	Adjunct	20	2.95	.468

N=170

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviation of Lecturers Ratings of Instructional Leadership Based on Number of Years Current Principal has been Employed to the College.

Variables	Principals' tenure	n	M	SD
Defining the college mission	1-9 years	115	3.26	.641
	10-15	55	3.38	.692
Managing instructional program	1-9 years	115	3.04	.548
	10-15	55	2.90	.569
Creating a positive college climate	1-9 years	115	2.84	.571
	10-15	55	2.82	.615

N=170

Differences in Lecturers Ratings of PIL Based on the Highest Level of Educational Attainment of the Current Principal

The mean and standard deviations for lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership are displayed in Table 6. When the Independent samples t-test was run, it was determined that there were significant differences in lecturers' ratings of their principals based on the principals' highest level of educational attainment relating to how they performed their PIL function of defining the college mission; $t(168) = -4.33$, $p = .000$, ($M = 3.12$, $SD = .619$).

There were no statistically significant results relating to the PIL dimensions of creating a positive college climate; t (168) = -.153, p = .251, and managing instructional programs; t (168) = -.767, p = .44. d = .779. Principals that had Masters' degree as their highest educational attainment (M = 3.61, SD = .639) were rated higher by the lecturers on the dimension of defining the college mission than those who held a doctoral degree as their highest educational attainment.

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviation of Lecturers' Ratings of Instructional Leadership Based on Highest Level of Educational Attainment of the Current Principal

Variables	Educational attainment	n	*M*	*SD*
Defining the college mission	Masters	53	3.61	.639
	Doctorate	117	3.12	.619
Managing instructional program	Masters	53	3.04	.640
	Doctorate	117	2.97	.518
Creating a positive college climate	Masters	53	2.91	.601
	Doctorate	117	2.80	.576

N=170

Discussion

In this study, the findings revealed that lecturers had overall moderately high ratings of their principals' instructional leadership. Having moderately high ratings means that lecturers believe their principals use their professional knowledge and role as leaders to oversee the instructional teaching-learning process within the colleges to get successful results (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). This finding was confirmed by Almahdy & Al-Kiyumi (2015), who, in their study among 368 teachers in Omani, found that teachers' perception of their principals' instructional leadership was moderately high. The findings also suggested that at the community college level, principals not only focused on college administrative matters but also played a significant role in ensuring instructional leadership functions were carried out. Heaven and Bourne (2016) conducted research in Jamaica among secondary school teachers using mixed methods and found that teachers rated their principals' instructional leadership to be low. There is a clear need for principals to focus on the strategic objectives of their institutions at the level of the community college, however, included in their strategy and operational planning should be clear objectives to deal with instructional leadership. This should form a part of the mission and vision of their institution to bring forth success.

When the three dimensions of the principal instructional leadership were examined, the findings revealed that lecturers gave moderately high ratings for defining the college mission (M = 3.29, SD = 0.66), but moderately low ratings for managing instructional programs (M = 2.99, SD = .56), and creating a positive college climate (M = 2.84, SD = .58). This was supported by Valliamah et al. (2016), who found that defining the school mission played a more dominant role as perceived by teachers; however, their mean scores relating to the three dimensions were higher than that obtained in this study. A moderately high rating for the dimension of defining the college mission means that lecturers believe the principal as an instructional leader is cognizant of their intended plan of action and will direct the college towards success by achieving its set goals (Hallinger, 2015).

A moderately low rating for the dimension of managing the instructional program means that lecturers believed that their principals played a less than important role in coordinating the colleges' curriculum, controlling the instructional process, and monitoring the progress of students. The PIL duties may be underperformed or delegated to other instructional leaders without the principals' direct supervision. Hallinger and Wang (2015) were quick to point out that curriculum coordination and control is one of the key responsibilities of

the principals despite delegating duties to other instructional leaders; that is, the supervision of this process is vital to any college. The moderately low ratings obtained may also indicate that principals fail to effectively work collaboratively with lecturers to evaluate, develop, implement, and coordinate the curriculum, in addition to monitoring students' success (Hallinger et al., 2018). The theory of distributive leadership advocates for the principals as instructional leaders to distribute leadership throughout the college by empowering staff, creating teams to spread tasks and accountability (Shava & Tlou, 2018), and working collaboratively. According to Hulpia et al. (2010), principal-lecturer collaboration creates trust, enhances communication, provides direction to goal attainment, and positively impacts lecturers' commitment.

Lecturers giving a moderately low rating for the dimension of creating a positive college climate means that they believed the principals did a poor job in fostering a college environment that is conducive to learning, development of human capital through professional development, rewarding of faculty and students, and did a poor job in fostering an environment that promotes the overall improvement of the college. This also implied that lecturers believed the principals failed to effectively develop a culture that is conducive to college improvement and best practices (Hallinger, 2010).

Studies show conflicting results when examining the differences among lecturers' ratings of their principals on instructional leadership matters based on their demographics. This study revealed that there were statistically significant differences in the ratings of male and female lecturers on the PIL dimension of creating a positive college climate, where male lecturers gave higher ratings when compared to female lecturers. Hallinger and Lee (2013) believed that the difference in the ratings by gender is based on the various societal norms and lecturers' expectations of what comprises good instructional leadership. Though there were several researchers who either confirmed or refuted this study, Bada et al. (2020), in a study conducted in Nigeria among secondary school teachers, found that there were differences in

gender only for the dimension of managing instructional programs. Though this study revealed that lecturers' age did not impact how they viewed principals' instructional leadership, Kiral and Suçiçeği (2017) found significant differences in lecturers' perception of PIL at all three dimensions according to age range. They found that younger teachers had lower perceptions of their PIL. For example, they reported that teachers below 30 years old had lower perceptions than those between 41-50 and 51 and above.

Full-time and adjunct lecturers are paramount to any institution; however, they differ based on the number of hours spent working, lecturers' availability to partake in college-wide activities, and adjuncts gaining a full understanding of the functioning of the college. The study showed significant differences in the ratings of full-time and adjunct lecturers on the PIL function of managing the instructional program. In this study, adjunct lecturers gave their principals a higher rating than full-time lecturers on this PIL dimension. The dimension of managing instructional programs involves supervising and evaluating instructions, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring students' progress. Adjunct lecturers, because of a lack of knowledge of the college structure and environment and not having the required teacher training to effectively engage in teaching, may be offered additional support provided by the instructional leader (Burke, 2014). Higher education institutions are heavily reliant on adjunct lecturers (Shaked, 2020); thus, instructional support is paramount. This support may not have been received by the full-time staff, which may account for the difference in results for this PIL dimension. Adjunct and full-time lecturers gave similar ratings for the principals' roles in defining the college mission and creating a positive college climate.

When lecturers rated principals based on the number of years they have been employed at the college, the results revealed no statistically significant difference relating to the PIL function of creating a positive college climate, defining the college mission, and managing instructional programs. This means that lecturers did not view principals' tenure as making a difference in how they function within the

colleges. Similarly, this current study found statistically significant differences in lecturers' ratings of their principals based on the principals' highest level of educational attainment relating to defining the college mission. Principals who possessed a master's degree as their highest educational attainment was rated highest by the lecturers on the dimension of defining the college mission compared to those principals who held a doctoral degree as their highest educational attainment. Lecturers did not rate the principals differently for the PIL functions of creating a positive college climate and managing instructional programs.

Conclusion

Research question one looked at lecturers' ratings of their principals' instructional leadership. Lecturers rated principals' instructional leadership as important by giving overall moderately high ratings. Lecturers believed that the principals placed much emphasis on defining the mission of the college by framing and communicating the goals effectively for decision making and instructional planning. Lecturers believed that this dimension was moderately executed by the principal and given greater prominence than their roles in managing the colleges' instructional programs and creating an instructional environment and climate that is positive. Lecturers, however, rated principals as placing less emphasis on maintaining a presence within the college by interacting with students and staff, providing them with incentives for extrinsic motivation in executing their tasks, and giving them the opportunity to develop professionally through in-house and external developmental activities. This closes the gap in the literature regarding the importance placed on principal instructional leadership by the lecturers and fills the knowledge gap that existed relating to the lack of information in the higher education literature.

Research question two looked at the differences in lecturers' ratings of their PIL based on demographic factors, using independent samples t-test. These findings corroborated with or refuted the literature, in addition to giving new insights. The gender of lecturers had a significant role to play in rating PIL. The study found that males had an overall higher rating than females in how they rated the PIL of creating a positive college climate. This finding contrasts with other studies that are in support of females giving higher ratings of PIL. What is significant to the body of knowledge is that males believed that principals placed more emphasis on how they created and promoted a positive college climate. Contradictions also occurred for the rating by age range; however, this study proved that at the community college levels investigated, the age range does not play a significant role in the rating of PIL dimensions. Adding to the body of literature is that adjunct lecturers rated their principals higher than full-time lecturers. There was no literature found to support or refute this claim; however, this may imply that more instructional support may have been given by the principals to the adjunct lecturers because of their limited pedagogical skills, thus filling the knowledge gap. How lecturers rated PIL based on the principals' tenure made no significant difference, which meant that younger tenured and older tenured principals executed to a similar degree their IL functions. Noteworthy to the contribution to the literature is that principals whose highest educational attainment was a master's degree were rated higher than those with a doctoral degree. This may have implications for employment, promotion, and training.

Implications for Principals

The principals may use information from this study to guide instructional policies and activities. Principals may use the information to improve their instructional leadership practices or incorporate such practices once they see improvements in the results of both lecturers' commitment and students' performances. Principals may take the initiative to incorporate or continue to promote professional development training for lecturers, provide incentives for lectures, ensure that the curriculum is effectively developed, and maintain a presence within the college since these are weak areas as identified by the lecturers' ratings. The findings imply that principals must emphasize the execution of instructional leadership, whether directly or by delegating and supervising responsibilities. It also implies that further training

and sensitization are needed among community college level principals.

Implications for the College Board.

A gap exists between the functions of effective principals and the principals employed within the community colleges. Many times, principals are appointed to the community colleges without formal training in instructional leadership and teacher training backgrounds. Training is needed to prepare these leaders in instructional leadership to have a better understanding of the educational environment and needs of the lecturers and students relating to instructional matters. The College Board should create policies to ensure that principals are abreast and involved in instructional leadership directly or through distributed leadership but maintain great supervision to ensure that this form of leadership is executed. In addition, the findings imply that the Board must ensure that principals and aspiring principals for community colleges enrol in the National College for Educational Leadership (NCEL) or take professional courses in instructional leadership before being appointed as leaders within the community colleges. Refresher training must be done yearly. This is in line with the call for community colleges to stick to their mandate of providing continuing education for school leavers and drop-outs at the K-12 level, skills training, and technical vocational education, which will require greater principal involvement and instructional support to faculty.

Implications for the Ministry of Education

The Ministry of Education has a foothold over the community colleges, sets criteria for recruitment of principals, and provides training and workshops for principals at the community college levels. The Ministry could also bridge the gap between theory and practice by looking at the principal instructional leadership results and identifying the various dimensions and job functions of the principals that need strengthening. Noteworthy is the finding that principals who held a master's degree were given higher ratings for providing instructional leadership than those who held a doctoral degree. This will have implications for

the future employment of principals at the community college levels since instructional leadership is necessary for these institutions.

Future Research
Expanding the Study

Future research could include other instructional leaders within the community colleges, investigating the roles they play in the instructional leadership process and how it impacts lecturers' commitment. The job functions of other instructional leaders such as Program Directors, Chairs/Heads of departments, Deans of Academic Affairs and Deans of Faculty may have a more direct impact on the commitment of lecturers within the colleges because they are more involved in the instructional operations of the college. The research may also be extended to look at the lecturers themselves as instructional leaders and how their actions through college-wide collaboration and empowerment are associated with their levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment. This is a necessary area of research because the principals may delegate instructional leadership duties and responsibilities to other instructional leaders, and how they perform in the area of defining the college mission, managing instructional programs, and creating a positive college climate will be a reflection of the principal as they are accountable for the actions of their subordinates.

Incorporate the Principals' Self-Perception

Future research could incorporate the principal's perception and rating of their instructional leadership job functions. A comparison could then be made with the perceptions of lecturers. This is important as it creates a balance, adds to the validity of the findings and reduces bias associated with self-ratings.

Develop an Instrument Fitting the Caribbean Context

A data collection instrument or survey to capture principals' instructional leadership could be developed from the literature that speaks more to the Caribbean educational context in higher education. This could be used in lieu of the PIMRS, which was designed for the K-12 educational system. The current PIMRS

does not capture many behaviours of the instructional leader within the college setting in the Caribbean. The researcher could develop this instrument to include the collaboration and creation of partnerships with the private sector and the broader community on instructional matters such as students' work experiences, community outreach programs, and lecturer professional development through industry advancements and best practices.

Principal Self Assessed PIMRS

It is recommended that the Board of the College, Ministry of Education, and other affiliate bodies who are responsible for appointing, recruiting, and selecting principals mandate these principals to conduct a self-assessed instructional leadership survey. This will determine how they rate themselves as instructional leaders. Many principals employed in community colleges are recruited directly from other industries and do not necessarily have any educational training or background. Therefore, these principals should undergo continuous instructional leadership practices to boost their leadership qualities and job functions.

Recommendations for Future Practice
Principal Self Assessed PIMRS

It is recommended that the Board of the College, Ministry of Education, and other affiliate bodies who are responsible for appointing, recruiting, and selecting principals mandate these principals to conduct a self-assessed instructional leadership survey. This will determine how they rate themselves as instructional leaders. Many principals employed in community colleges are recruited directly from other industries and do not necessarily have any educational training or background. Therefore, these principals should undergo continuous instructional leadership practices to boost their leadership qualities and job functions.

References

Ahmad, A., Abdul Majid, A. H., & Mohd Zin, M. L. (2015, August 13-14). *Do compensation and organizational climate affect organizational commitment in higher educational institutions*. International Conference on Entrepreneurship, Business and Social Sciences. Indonesia.

Almahdy, Y. F., & Al-Kiyumi, A. R. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership in Omani schools. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(12), 1504-1510. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-3-12-4

Bada, H. A., Ariffin, T. F., & Nordin, H. (2020). Teachers' perception of principals' instructional leadership practices in Nigeria. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(10), 4460-4469. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081013

Bashir, B., & Gani, A. (2020). Correlates of organizational commitment among university teachers in India: An empirical investigation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management, Research, and Innovation*, *16*(1), 7-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/2319510X19872632

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

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional Management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *18*(3),34–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X82018003004

Burke, K. M. (2014). Evidence-based instructional leadership in community colleges: A conceptual approach. *Educational Action Research*, *22*(2), 221-234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2013.859091

Campbell, P., Chaseling, M., Boyd, W., & Shipway, B. (2018). Effective instructional leader. *Professional Development in Education*, *45*(2), 276-290. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1465448

Desravines, J. J., Aquino, J., & Fenton, B. (2016). *Transformational leadership framework*. New Leaders.

Ersozlu, A., & Saklan, E. (2016). Instructional leadership in higher education: how does

it work? *British Journal of Education*, *4*(5), 1-15.

Ghavifekr, S., Radwan, O., & Velarde, J. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership roles and practices. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia*, *44*(2), 72-83. https://dx.doi.org/10.17576/JPEN-2019-44.02-08

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(2), 221-239. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1570076050 0244793

Hallinger, P. (2010). Developing instructional leadership. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Developing successful leadership* (pp. 61-76). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9106-2_5

Hallinger, P., Adams, D., Harris, A. & Jones, M., S. (2018). Review of conceptual models and methodologies in research on principal instructional leadership in Malaysia: A case of knowledge construction in a developing society. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *56*(1), 104-126. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-03-2017-0025

Hallinger, P. & Lee, M. (2013). Mapping instructional leadership in Thailand: Has education reform impacted principal practice? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *42*(1), 6-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/174114321350 2196

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985) Assessing the instructional management behaviour of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, *86*, 217-247. https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/461445

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, F. (1986). *Instructional leadership in effective schools*. Reports – Research Information Analysis.

Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Springer Publications.

Hamilton, C. (2012, April 22). Failing principals = failing schools: Bad school performance. Jamaica management blamed for poor teacher/student performance. *Jamaica Observer*. https://www.jamaicaob-server.com/news/...#ixzz1snCUuPZg

Hao, N., T. (2016). Teachers' perceptions on principals' instructional leadership behaviors in Vietnam. *Asian Teacher Education Network Journal of Teacher Education*, *1*(1), 1-12. https://www.emer-ald.com/insight/publication/issn/0951-354X/vol/32/iss/3

Heaven, G., Bourne, P. A. (2016) Instructional leadership and its effect on students' academic performance. *Review Public Administration Management*, *4*(3), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.4172/2315-7844.1000197

Hendawy Al-Mahdy, Y., & Al-kiyumi, A. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership in Omani schools. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(12), 1504-1510. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-3-12-4.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2010). The influence of distributed leadership on teachers' organizational commitment: A multilevel approach. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *103*(1), 40-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/002206709032 31201

Hutton, D. (2017). School constituents' ratings of the performance dimensions of male and female high-performing principals. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, *6*(1), 69-88

Jenkins, B. (2009). What it takes to be an instructional leader. *Principal*, 34-27. http://www.naesp.org

Jyh Lih, J., & Bin Ismail, R. (2018). Binary logistic regression analysis of instructional leadership factors affecting English Language literacy in primary schools. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *25*(2), 22-37. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2502-02

Khan, N., & Khan, A. (2014). Academic role of a principal and continuous professional development. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *3*(2), 925-942.

Kiral, E., & Suçiçeği, A. (2017). The relationship between teachers' perception of school

principals' instructional leadership and organisational commitment level. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences*, *6*(1), 95-109.

Lahui-Ako, B. (2001). the instructional leadership behaviour of Papua New Guinea high school principals: A provincial case study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *39*(3), 233-265. https://doi.org/10.1108/095782301103 92875

Leithwood, K. A, & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, *52*(3), 309–339. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430520 03309

Lunenburg, F.C. (2010). Managing change: The role of the change agent. *International Journal of Management Business, and Administration*, *13*, 1-6.

Miller, C., & Weber, B. (2018). *Principals as instructional leaders: A review of the literature.* Research Unit, Research, and Innovation for Student Learning.

Mohammed, Z., & Hankebo, D. (2019). Instructional leadership practices in the primary schools of Siltie Zone, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Current Research*, *11*(11), 8509-8516. https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.36971.11. 2019

Nannyonjo, H. (2017). *Building capacity of school leaders' strategies that work - Jamaica's experience.* Education Global Practice, The World Bank.

Neumerski, C. (2012). Rethinking instructional leadership, a review: What do we know about principal, teacher, and coach instructional leadership and where should we go from here? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(2), 310-347. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X1245 6700

Neumerski, C., Grissom, J., Goldring, E., Drake, T., Robin, M., Cannata, M., & Scheurmann, P. (2018). Restructuring instructional leadership: How multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems are redefining the role of the school principal. *The Elementary School Journal*, *119*(2), 270-297.

Oplatka, I. (2017). I'm so tired and have no time for my family: The consequences of heavy workload in principalship. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, *45*(2), 21-41.

Qian, H., Walker, A., & Lee, X. (2017). The west wind vs the east wind: Instructional leadership model in China. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *55*(2), 186-206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2016-0083

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(5), 635-674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X0832 1509

Shaked, H. (2018). Why principals sidestep instructional leadership: The disregarded question of schools' primary objective. *Journal of School Leadership*, *28*(1), 516-538. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461802 800404

Shaked, H. (2020). Instructional leadership in higher education: The case of Israel *Higher Education Quarterly*, *75*(2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12274

Shava, G., & Tlou, F. (20180. Distributed leadership in education, contemporary issues in educational leadership. *African Educational Research Journal*, *6*(4), 279-287. https://doi.org/10.30918/AERJ.64.18.09 7

Tatlah, I. A., Akhtar, S. N., & Hashmi, M. A. (2019). Effect of instructional leadership on teachers' performance and job commitment: A comparison of public and private Universities of Lahore. *Journal of Educational Research, 22*(1), 133-144.

Turkoglu, M., & Cansoy, R. (2018). Instructional leadership behaviors according to perceptions of school principals in Turkey*. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(5), 36-53. https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2018.05. 003

Valliamah, S., Kadijah, D., Subramanian, S. (2016). Reality on instructional leadership and commitment of teachers: A

preliminary study. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 3*, 123-127.

Van de Grift, W. (1989). Self-perceptions of educational leadership and mean Pupil achievements. In D., Reynolds, B.P.M., Creemers, T., Peters (Eds.), *School effectiveness and improvement* (pp. 227–242)*.* Cardiff/Groningen: School of Education

Villanova, R., Gauthier, W., Proctor, P., & Shoemaker, J. (1981). *The Connecticut school effectiveness questionnaire*, Hartford, CT: Bureau of School Improvement, Connecticut State Department of Education.

Wei, G., Lu, J., & Qian, H. (2018). Principal instructional leadership: Chinese PIMRS development and validation. *Chinese Education & Society*, *51*(1), 337–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2018.1510688