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Baseline Study on Leadership and Organizational Change

• Generate baseline data across the field of school leadership and across the entire school system of Singapore that will lead to practical benefits for school improvement and student learning;

• Team members from Policy and Leadership Study Academic Group – led by PI Clive Dimmock and subsequently led by Jonathan Goh as PI.

• Theme 4: Instructional Leadership practices
Research Design and Instrumentation

- Eight leadership themes (IL, DL, Work Culture, Work Values, etc.)
- FGD and Quantitative Survey
- Categorical data (time usage, self-efficacy, etc.)
- Rating scales for measurement data (IL, DL, Work Culture, Work Values)
Data Analysis Strategies

Analyses according to Leadership Themes

1. Analyses according to Leadership Themes
2. Analyses according to Demographic Categories
3. Exploring relationships between themes & Demographic categories
4. Exploring relationships between themes
5. Exploring relationships between all variables across levels (i.e., Individual and School):
   - Teachers nested in schools (Principals)
   - Teachers nested in schools (Vice-Principals-Agg.)
   - Teachers nested in schools (Key Personnel – Agg.)
   - Key Personnel nested in schools (Principals)
   - Key Personnel nested in schools (Vice Principals-Agg.)
Data Collection

- 224 Principals
- 322 Vice-Principals
- 686 Key Personnel
- 3513 Teachers
- School type: Gov, Gov-aided, Autonomous, Independent
Data Analysis

• Rasch Analysis
  – Equating measures on the same scale for comparison
  – Data cleaning (i.e., removing misfitting persons and items for further analyses)

• Independent T-tests

• One-way ANOVAs with Post Hoc Tests (Tukey HSD Tests or Tamhane Tests)

• Hierarchical Linear Modeling
IL Dimensions

- Aligning teaching practices to school vision
- Leading teaching and learning
- Developing conducive environment for teaching and learning
- Promoting professional development
Respondents

- Principals’ own perceptions
- Teachers’ perceptions of P
Instructional Leadership

Key Findings (ANOVA)
Are there significant differences in Ps’ self-reported IL perceptions and teachers’ perceptions of their Ps’ overall IL and individual IL components?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>% (No.) of components that are significant</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Components with significant differences</th>
<th>T-test/ ANOVA Post-hoc Result Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ Position</td>
<td>100% (4 of 4)</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>All (Overall measure of IL)</td>
<td>Tamhane: P &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aligning teaching practices to school vision</td>
<td>Tamhane: P &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leading teaching and learning</td>
<td>Tamhane: P &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing conducive environments for teaching and learning</td>
<td>Tamhane: P &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting professional development</td>
<td>Tamhane: P &gt; T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ps have higher levels of perceptions than teachers, VPs have higher levels of perceptions than KP, VPs have higher levels of perceptions than teachers, and KP have higher levels of perceptions than teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F2 Teaching and Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.38977</td>
<td>0.24794</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>-1.0445</td>
<td>0.2650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34671</td>
<td>0.20663</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-0.1994</td>
<td>0.8929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68942*</td>
<td>0.17894</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>1.2150</td>
<td>2.1639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38977</td>
<td>0.24794</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>-2.650</td>
<td>1.0445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73648*</td>
<td>0.21222</td>
<td><strong>0.003</strong></td>
<td>1.762</td>
<td>1.2967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07919*</td>
<td>0.18537</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>1.5889</td>
<td>2.5695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.34671</td>
<td>0.20663</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-0.8929</td>
<td>0.1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.73648*</td>
<td>0.21222</td>
<td><strong>0.003</strong></td>
<td>-1.2967</td>
<td>-0.1762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34271*</td>
<td>0.12485</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>1.0135</td>
<td>1.6719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.68942*</td>
<td>0.17894</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>-2.1639</td>
<td>-1.2150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.07919*</td>
<td>0.18537</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>-2.5695</td>
<td>-1.5889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.34271*</td>
<td>0.12485</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>-1.6719</td>
<td>-1.0135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA test shows that there are significant differences in perceptions across Ps, VPs, KP, and teachers at the 0.05 level.
Teachers’ Perceptions of Ps’ Leading in T&L Component of IL

- Hardest item to agree to:
  - Q14: Ps point out specific strength in teachers’ instructional practices during classroom observations.
  - Q09: Ps assess teachers’ classroom teaching on a regular basis.
  - Q15: Ps point out specific areas for improvement in teachers’ instructional practices during classroom observations.
  - Q11: Ps advise teachers on how to improve their teaching practices.
  - Q16: Ps encourage teachers to use research evidence to improve their teaching practices.
  - Q12: Ps ensure that all teachers agree on the meaning of excellence in teaching.
  - Q10: Ps ensures that teachers systematically engage in reflection in order to improve their teaching practices.

- Easiest item to agree to:
  - Q13: Ps ensures that teachers evaluate their teaching practices in terms of student learning outcomes.
Because the KP is their job. Because they know the subject matter, maybe they can know that whether they are align with SOP. But as a principal when we go there is to see the principal as authority that the one to make the final decision. So the fear and the insecurity is still there.

You know, these are things (initiatives, programmes…) need to be enforced. And some of these things there’s no room to be creative, because they are required.

So it's all… not clearly seen but it's all there (all the guidelines to help you, take the correct actions). You will never fail in Singapore as a principal because you just follow all the guideline, you will never fail.
• ...there will be times where, especially now you talk about incorporating ICT and all that, so they’ll spell out, you must have how many ICT lessons (laughter), you must make use of...there must be outdoor, some kind of outdoor lesson, even when I’m teaching the topic and I find that there’s no need for outdoor lesson, but because I have to make the number, that’s when I feel that I’m not empowered. It’s like I have to meet certain requirements even though I feel that it doesn’t quite meet the objective of my lesson.
• So...you teach the best that you can. you deliver the 21st century skills, and then you become uncomfortable because they ask about the results – ‘Why’ if the result go down

• you know, now when exams are coming up, like the ‘A’ Levels, then there’s, obviously, the kick into high-gear in terms of, like, pushing the students academically, very intensive curriculum, but they do things like, there’s, like, protected time for teachers...
Classroom Observation Form

Curriculum 2015

‘Teach Less Learn More’

21st Century Competencies

Holistic Assessment

ICT Master Plan 3

Citizenship and Character Education

Strategies for English Learning and Reading

Classroom Observation Form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Briefs</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLLM: Teach Less Learn More</strong></td>
<td>Shift from teacher-centric to student centric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SAIL: Strategies for active and independent learning. SEED: Strategies for Effective Engagement and Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2015: Curriculum 2015</strong></td>
<td>Strong fundamentals, Future Learnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Maintain standards and benchmarking; Develop assessment framework – assess skills and mindsets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21st Century Competencies</strong></td>
<td>Nurturing our young for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(New framework: Desired Outcomes of Students; Strengthening PE, ART, Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holistic Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Assessment for Learning and Assessment of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Assessment framework; Assessment practices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Leadership

Key Findings (HLM)
Teachers in Principals

• LEVEL 1 Predictors: Teachers’ gender; Teachers’ perceptions of school culture, distributed leadership

• LEVEL 2 Predictors: Principals based on gender; Principals’ perceptions of work value; School type, School level
# Teachers in Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Findings with significant difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS’ PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL’S IL VISION?</td>
<td>LEVEL 1 Predictors: Teacher/Individual</td>
<td>• <strong>Distributed leadership:</strong> empowerment; interactive relationships; developmental positively predict teachers’ perception of P’s IL Vision (0.048407 p 0.016; 0.419587 p 0.000; 0.171012 p 0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS’ PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL’S IL ENVIRONMENT?</td>
<td>LEVEL 1 Predictors: Teacher/Individual</td>
<td>• <strong>Distributed leadership:</strong> empowerment; interactive relationships; and developmental positively predict teachers’ perception of P’s IL Environment (0.397651 p 0.000; 0.230057 p 0.000; 0.167958 p 0.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Teachers in Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Findings with significant difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS’ PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL’S IL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT?</td>
<td>LEVEL 1 Predictors: Teacher/Individual</td>
<td>● Distributed leadership: empowerment; interactive relationships; and developmental positively predict teachers’ perception of P’s IL Professional development (0.391307 p 0.000; 0.255281 p 0.000; 0.171280 p 0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS’ PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL’S IL TEACHING AND LEARNING?</td>
<td>LEVEL 1 Predictors: Teacher/Individual</td>
<td>● Distributed leadership: empowerment; interactive relationships; and developmental positively predict teachers’ perception of P’s IL Teaching and Learning (0.078641 p 0.000; 0.317246 p 0.000; 0.359798 p 0.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers’ Perceptions of Principals’ DL: Empowerment

Q5: My principal goes out of the way to demonstrate the benefits of shared decision-making

Q1: My principal relinquishes control of some key operational decisions to the staff

Q6: My principal assures staff that as their leader, he or she accepts ultimate accountability for the outcome of any shared decisions they make

Q7: My principal encourages staff engagement in all key school-wide decisions

Q9: My principal makes the best use of staff talent by involving them in shared school decision-making

Q2: My principal gives the staff opportunities to assume informal leadership responsibilities

Q3: My principal creates opportunities for staff to take initiatives to improve school processes and outcomes

Q4: My principal encourages staff to make decisions within their work scope

Q8: My principal provides platforms for teachers to work in teams to improve school processes
HLM: Key Findings of Teachers in Principals

- Teachers’ perception of Principals’ Distributed Leadership is a positive predictor of their perceptions of Principals’ Instructional Leadership
- Cautious explanation of DL – Empowerment suggests a Singaporean way of distributed leadership – a threshold of empowerment
Paradoxes of Leadership in Singapore Schools

- Centralized/explicit curriculum versus curriculum innovation
- Bureaucratic procedures versus innovative leadership practices and knowledge
- The ‘art of leadership’ and ‘creative insubordination’ (Hughes, L.)
Thank you