

Instructional leadership in enhancing pedagogic teachers' competence at three universities guided schools in Malang City

Abdul Tedy

Candidate of Doctor, Education Management, Post Graduate School,
State University of Malang, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Ahmad Sonhadji K.H.

Professor, Education Management, Post Graduate School,
State University of Malang, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Imron Arifin

Associate Professor, Education Management, Post Graduate School,
State University of Malang, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Ali Imron

Professor, Education Management, Post Graduate School,
State University of Malang, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Abstract:

This research was aimed at finding out the following focuses as universities guided models at three high schools: (1) instructional leadership, (2) Teachers' pedagogic competences, (3) instructional leadership behavior in the teachers' pedagogic enhancement, (4) roles of the guiding universities in enhancing the instructional leadership and teachers' pedagogic competences. Data were collected by using three techniques including (1) indepth interview, (2) participative observation, and (3) documentation. Data were analyzed in two steps of individual case analysis and cross case analysis. The individual case analysis was done by (1) data reduction, (2) data display, and (3) conclusion, and the cross case analysis was done through constant comparative analysis. The validity and reliability was measured by examining the credibility, transferability, and confirmability. This research revealed that (1) the instructional leadership covered vision, mission, learning or instructional services, motivation, community relation, governmental relation, and the guiding universities relation, (2) the teachers' competences covered ability to understand learners, instructional planning and implementation, instructional evaluation, and students' potential development, (3) the instructional leadership behaviors covered management engineer, communicator, clinical practitioner, role model, and high priest, (4) the roles of guiding universities covered guiding and developing: teachers, educational staffs, learners, parents, and schools' committees

Keywords:

Instructional leadership, Principal, Teachers' pedagogic competence

Citation:

Tedy, Abdul; Sonhadji, Ahmad K.H.; Arifin, Imron; Imron, Ali (2017); Instructional leadership in enhancing pedagogic teachers' competence at three universities guided schools in Malang City; Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS), Vol.6, No.2, pp:319-326.

Introduction

Education plays primary roles in developing educated and characterized Indonesian human resources. Qualified human resources can only be resulted from quality education with professional educators. The Law no 20, 2003 of the Indonesia Republic stated that educators are professional work forces having the key main duties to plan and execute learning processes, evaluate learning outcomes, guide and train learners, research, and work for community services. Teachers with pedagogic, professional, personal, and social competences have been expected to be the primary driving force of instructional and learning processes and to be open for changes. Educators must not only be smart, but also adaptive to changes.

University guided schools are those immersing in the format of partnership education conducted by schools, universities, and government. Such partnership program is aimed at enhancing the education quality and school effectiveness as expected by the community. Several prominent universities in Indonesia have involved in such program. In Malang City, East Java, there have been three high schools experiencing this program, which are Brawijaya *Smart School* Senior High School, State University of Malang Laboratory Senior High School, and Widyagama Senior High School.

This research was aimed at (1) analyzing and describing the instructional leadership at those three schools, (2) analyzing and describing the teachers' pedagogic competences at those three schools, (3) finding out and describing effective instructional leadership towards the teachers' competences enhancement at those three schools. (4) finding and describing the roles of guiding universities in enhancing instructional leadership and teachers' pedagogic competences at those three schools as university guided school models.

Method

This research used descriptive qualitative multicase studies. Multicase studies designed was chosen due to the nature of this research to comprehend two or more subjects and data storage places. Such design made effort in examining several identified subjects and comparing those similarities and differences. This research had the characteristics of (1) progressing in the scientific background, (2) having the researcher as the main instrument, and (3) employing inductive data analysis analysis (Moleong, 2007). Locations of this research were: (1) Brawijaya *Smart School* Senior High School, Malang; (2) State University of Malang Laboratory Senior High School, Malang, and (3) Widyagama Senior High School, Malang.

Data analysis of this research comprised (1) individual case analysis, and (2) cross cases analysis. The individual case analysis was analysis within the individual schools of each location. The analysis was done constantly at the same time using data collecting technique as advised by Bogdan dan Biklen (1982) and practiced by Mantja (1989) covering the following procedures: (1) limiting the scope of analysis, (2) deciding the type of assessments, (3) developing analysis questions, (4) planning data collection steps by considering the previous observation; (5) writing comments of the observants on the appearing ideas, (6) writing self managed memo on the issues being assessed, and (7) exploring relevant resources while having the research.

Instructional leadership in enhancing pedagogic teachers' competence....

The cross case analysis procedures was done by following Yin (1984:107) with explanation building technique. This was guided towards explaining meaningful causal phenomena which was presented narratively. The procedures of this cross case analysis were: (1) Comparing conceptual findings of each individual case by using conceptual inductive approach, (2) Results of these analysis were used to develop propositions of the overall cases which were in line with the empirical data, (3) mengevaluasi kesesuaian proposisi dengan fakta yang diacu; (4) Reconstructing the relevant propositions based on the empirical data found in each individual case, and (5) repeating the process as far as these were needed.

Holistically and integratively with the consideration of relevant data focusing on the research objectives, the data collection techniques were conducted by doing: (1) indepth interview; (2) participant observation; and (3) study of documents. Data were analyzed qualitatively within individual case and cross cases. The validity and reliability was measured in terms of: (1) the credibility by consistently comparing facts among resources and methods, (2) tranferability, meliputi; (1) kredibilitas, yaitu pengecekan kredibilitas atau derajat kepercayaan by making detail explanation on the research focus, (3) dependabilitas, by auditing, checking mistakes and inconsistencies, and (4) confirmability by auditing done at the same time with the dependability.

Results and discussion

Research on the cross individual case for the first focus, which was the instructional leadership at the three Senior High Schools were: (1) charismatic leaders influencing the followers based on the followers perception on the supernatural ability, but not on the formal authority, (2) collaboration, which were the ability to determine vision, providing energies, having sense of togetherness, optimizing potentials, and making the followers aware of becoming one team, and productive performance, (3) innovative, which resulted new paradigm and products as well as new practical ideas, (4) creative having ideas, opinions, and innovation for the improvement of the schools, (5) visioner having future perspective which enabled people to productively contribute efforts for the success of the schools, (6) inspirative giving opportunities to the followers to actively participate in works and thinking as well as to innovate and produce new ideas for reference of the school development, and (7) collaboration which was the ability to determine vision, providing energy, fostering sense of collaboration and togetherness, optimizing potentials, and making every followers aware of making contribution in the good performance.

At the second focus, the teachers' competences turned out to cover: (1) pedagogic competence, which indicated the ability to manage instructional learning including understanding learners, planning and executing instruction, developing learners, and evaluating the instruction (2) personal competence, which indicated the characteristics of teachers as being firm, stable, mature, wise, commanding, faithful, and exemplary, (3) professional competence, which was teachers mastery in knowledge of teaching, knowledge of subject studies, and skills of leading students to learn, and (4) social competence which indicated the ability to communicate and interact among educational entities.

At the third focus, it was found out that the instructional behavior in three schools could be summarized as having: (1) technical behavior; (2) human behavior; (3) educational behavior; (4) symbolic behavior, dan; (5) cultural behavior.

At the fourth focus, it was found out that the roles of guiding universities had relationship with stakeholders which empowered the universities in guiding schools for the instructional leadership of principals and enhancing teachers' pedagogic competence. It was found out that principals in those three schools conducted formal relationship among teachers, educational staffs, and school communities by having formal meeting and informal meeting in social activities. Towards the students potential development, it was found out the principals provided facilities needed by the students both for learning and for healthy activities, provided developmental programs in terms of the academic and non-academic activities, and provided guidance and counselling. Principals ensured the parents' involvement and provided regulation involving parents. Principals turned out to involve alumni to improve school facilities. Such involvement evidenced to improve the schools. Principals turned out to involve school supervisors for monitoring, supervision, evaluation, reports, and continuous professional development. There evidenced the productive relationship among government, schools, and the guiding universities characterized by intensive communication and community involvement. This geared to the fact that the community also provided positive contribution in the forms of fund and non materials contribution. There was also found out that the guided universities model also proved of having the involvement of other educational organization for operational educational improvement.

From the findings, there have been obvious that the instructional leadership involved the (1) community expectation values, (2) unique instructional leadership characteristics, (3) unique guided school model; and (4) school organization structures. These have been important factors in the instructional leadership. These can be productive parts of fostering leadership responsibility in enhancing the teachers' professionalism and instructional processes at schools (Gorton & Schneider, 1991; Hallinger & Leithwood, 2002). Such instructional leadership practices conforms the notion of instructional leadership mentioned by Heck & Rossow (1990), which is, all principals' actions influence the students' learning outcomes improvement directly and indirectly. Furthermore, Gorton & Schneider (1991) said that Instructional leadership is basically operational actions to attain better working environment, satisfactory performance of teachers, and good outcomes of learning. The instructional leadership actions, of course, also deal with learners. Newman, King & Young (2000) says that the instructional leadership involve principals to form professional learning community to develop productive environment, teachers' satisfaction, and students' enhancement in their learning outcomes (Eggen & Kauchak 2004). Such situation also touches classroom situation. Sergiovani (2009) says that: *"to extent to which principal focus directly on teaching and learning, the importance of increasing student achievement, curriculum and assessment, and the development of improved instructional program"*.

The instructional leadership of the three schools turned out to significantly contribute to the improvement of the students' achievements. Such results showed that the instructional leadership complied the 5 aspects of leadership which are instructional and learning, collaboration, students' achievement analysis, teachers development, and curriculum renewal, instruction, and evaluation (Lunenburg & Irby, 2006). These are conducted to attain the vision, mission, and goals of the schools and to develop the so-called learning schools (Kemendiknas, 2010).

Instructional leadership in enhancing pedagogic teachers' competence....

The instructional leadership practiced at the three university guided schools also conforms the instructional leadership elements stated by the *Learning Centered Leadership Policy* (2008), which include curriculum, learning process, assessment, teachers appraisals, and customer success provision. The universities guided schools had excellences in being effective schools. The universities targeted to guide the schools in 7 national schools standard including content standard, competence standard, process standard, teachers and educational staff standard, educational facilities standard, and funding standard. In complying these standards, the three schools employed good instructional leadership covering (1) understanding the principle duties of the principals as leaders; (2) developing teachers' potential to effectively work for instructional activities, (3) developing the learners' potential, (4) being fully responsible for at school activities, and (5) collaborating with *stakeholders* to implement education. In working for these, apparently the principals were in line with the notion of principals as instructional leaders as stated by Kemendiknas (2010) covering (1) understanding the roles of principals, (2) actuating the principals responsibility accountably, (3) doing work professionally, (4) managing sustainable quality of work and performance, (5) improving teachers' pedagogic competence, and (6) improving learning process and outcomes.

It has also evidenced that teachers' pedagogic competence improved. The pedagogic competence is the main competence element which has to be paid attention. This supports the attainment of learning outcomes (Hasanuddin & Nurmaliah, 2012). Among others, this is the most important providing as the driving force of other competencies, which include pedagogic competence, personal competence, social competence, and professional competence (Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 74 Tahun 2008).

Results of the third focus concerning instructional aspects showed that the three Senior High Schools implemented effective and efficient instructional management. The principals used technical behavior, human behavior, educational behavior, symbolic behavior, and cultural behavior. The technical behaviors were evidenced with the implementation of the education management principles to manage the effective and efficient instructional and learning processes. Such behaviors were shown with the discipline monitoring and supervision in all aspects of teachers functions including preparation, instruction, evaluation, feedback, and follow up. The principals could successfully provide easy access and assistance to the teachers and made teachers aware of how to use the school time effectively.

The educational behaviors appeared to be having the principals provided clinical supervision and assistance which can be called as *clinical practitioner* (Ubben & Hughes, 1992, Sergiovanni, 1991). The principals had the capability of diagnosing learning problems and developing learning program fostering students to learn productively with better outcomes. These schools were guided by the different universities with different members of faculties and background, education based and non-education based.

The human relation behaviors of the three Senior High Schools Principals turned out to be evidenced in their democratic ways of leading the school community to solve problems. They often walked through the teachers' rooms and classrooms and communicate collegiately. They also discussed ideas on the spot. It was obvious that most of the Brawijaya *Smart School* Senior High School had principals developed from their teachers. Such practices conforms the notion of participatory management (Ubben,

Huges, and Sergiovanni, 1992). All principals of these three schools employed *human enginner* leadership approach. Being effective leaders with positive behaviors can foster individual motivation and team work collaboration to achieve the school goals (Muliati, 2010).

Principals who are able to create conducive atmosphere for learners and teachers to develop their personal potential and professionalism can fulfill the community expectation (Dubin, 1991). Such practices can produce *successful-school*. Such principals, according to Bernard, in McPherson (1986), are characterized by having no ulterior motives, eager to cooperate in team work, eager to communicate, having been authorized, having been smart in taking decision, having balancing dynamics, and being responsible.

The evidence of the guiding universities' roles in succeeding to mentor and develop all school community members can be proved as having successful indicators in making principals form effective school community and develop successful network with stakeholders (Gurr, et al, 2005).

Conclusion

This research concluded that (1) community expectation values and instructional leadership were the principals' actions to create productive and satisfactory work environment and to create learning effectiveness for students to have high achievements. One of the factors, the community chose one of the three schools was the fact that the schools delivered educational services as they expected, that the schools were good schools, and the schools made their graduates become accepted in higher institutions; (2) they have different unique characteristics that enabled them to succeed their schools as leaders.

The three schools were guided by different universities with different main majors, education based and non-education based. However, they had similar outputs of the teachers' competence improvement and effective instructional leadership practices. As they were guided by different universities, such as the Brawijaya Smart School Senior High School guided by the University of Brawijaya, the State University of Malang Laboratory Senior High School was guided by State University of Malang, and Widayagama Senior High School was guided by the University of Widayagaman. They had differences in their organizational structures.

The similarities turned out to focus on the instructional leadership practices, teachers' competencies enhancement, leadership behavior, and roles of the guiding universities. The leadership behavior turned out to be technical behavior, human relation, educational behavior, symbolic behavior, and cultural behavior. There were stakeholders empowered the universities and the schools including teachers and educational staffs, learners, parents, alumni, supervisors, government, public community, and other educational organizations.

It is suggested that the principals were to maintain the quality of the schools with sustainable strategies, to make effective supervision, to enlarge teachers' knowledge and to enhance teachers' competence, to conduct benchmarking program for teachers, and to empower alumni. For the universities, it is suggested to consider the schools' excellences, teachers' commitment, students' potential, and success factors of the schools in managing the partnership programs. To the government, it is suggested to pay attention to the

educational administration, educational management, and specifically the recruitment and man power development. To researchers it is suggested that this research can be a reference to conduct further or other researchers.

References

- Arifin, I.** 2008. *Evaluasi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Arifin, I. 2010. *Kepemimpinan Kepala PAUD dalam Inovasi Pembelajaran: Studi TK Anak Saleh*. Yogyakarta: Aditya Media.
- Cotton, K.** 2003. *Principals and Student Achievement*. Virginia USA: ASCD.
- Depdiknas. 2004. *Pedoman Sekolah Standar Nasional*. Jakarta: Direktorat PLP, Ditjen Dikdasmen, Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas.** 2008. *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* Jakarta: Dikmenum. Depdiknas.
- Direktorat Jenderal Peningkatan Mutu Pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan** 2010. *Pedoman Pelaksanaan Penilaian Kinerja Guru (PK Guru)*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional.
- Eggen, P & Kauchak, D.** 2004. *Educational Psychology Windows on Classroom, Sixth Edition*. New Jersey. Pearson Prentice-Hall, inc.
- Fattah, N.** 2004. *Konsep Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah (MBS) dan Dewan Sekolah*. Bandung: Pustaka Bani Quraisy.
- Ghufron, A.** 2008. *Kompetensi Guru Sekolah Dasar*. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan UNY.
- Glickman, C. D.** 2002. *Leadership for Learning*. Virginia USA. ASCD.
- Gomes, S. 2013. *Quality Management Philosophies*. (Online),(<http://xisspm.mfiles.wordpress.com/2011/07/chap2-quality-management-philosophy.pdf>), retrieved on 29 Agustus 2013.
- Gurr, C.D., Gordon P.S., & Gordan, R.** 2010. *Supervision and Instructional Leadership*. Boston USA: Pearson.
- Hasanuddin & Nurmaliah, C.** 2013. *Kompetensi Pedagogik Guru Biologi yang Telah Lulus Sertifikasi di SMA Negeri Kota Banda Aceh*. Darussalam Banda Aceh: Program Studi Pendidikan Biologi FKIP, Universitas Syiah Kuala.
- Kumars, D.** 2010. *Sistem Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah dan Pendidikan Tinggi Suatu Perbandingan di Beberapa Negara*. Jakarta: Depdikbud, Dikti, P2LPTK
- Lie A.** 2012. *Cooperative Learning: Mempraktekkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Lipham, J.M.et al.** 2008. *The Principalship: Concepts, Competences, and Cases*. New York: Logman, Inc
- Lunenburg, F.C., & Irby, B.J.** 2006. *The Principalship: Vision to Action*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Mantja, W.** 2003. *Etnografi: Desain Penelitian Kualitatif dan Manajemen Pendidikan*. Malang: Wineka Media.
- Mantja, W.** 2005. *Kerangka Acuan Penulisan Modul Strategi Pengelolaan Pendidikan Universitas Terbuka*. Jakarta: PAU-UT.
- Mantja, W.** 2008. *Profesionalisasi Tenaga Kependidikan: Manajemen dan Supervisi Pendidikan. Kumpulan Karya Tulis Terpublikasi*. Malang: Elan Mas.
- Moleong, L.J.** 1989. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Mulyasa, E.** 2007. *Standar Kompetensi dan Sertifikasi Guru*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

- Nawawi, H.** 2008. *Administrasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., McCarthy, M. M., & Fowler, F. C.** 2009. *Educational Governance and Administration*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sonhadji, A.** 2003. *Alternatif Penyempurnaan Pembaharuan Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan di Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan Makalah*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Sulistiyorini.** 2009. *Peranan kepala Sekolah Sebagai Pemimpin Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Taa'lum.
- Suriansyah, A. & Aslamiah.** 2007. *Strategi Pembelajaran Anak Usia Dini*. Banjarmasin: Comdes.
- Uji Kompetensi Guru (UKG) Tahun 2012.** Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (Online), (sergur.kemendiknas.go.id), diakses 11 Oktober 2013.
- Wahyudi.** 2010. *Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah dalam Organisasi Pembelajar (Learning Organization)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Yin, R.K.** 2002. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Washington DC: Crounus Corporations.