Differences in Principals' Experience on their Instructional Leadership Behaviours in Colleges of Education in Ghana

Phyllis Agyeman-Nyarko

Abetifi Presbyterian College of Education, Kwahu-Abetifi, Ghana

Abstract

The study assessed the differences in Principals' instructional leadership behaviours based on experiences (number of years served as Principal) in Colleges of Education (CsOE) in Ghana using the descriptive survey design. The population of the study was all Principals from the forty-two (42) CsOE in Ghana. The study sampled thirty-six (36) Principals using the simple random sampling technique. The Principal Instructional Leadership Behaviours (PILB) scale was used to collect data. Means, standard deviations and the one-way ANOVA were used to analyse the research question and to test for the hypothesis respectively. The study revealed that Principals often promote collaboration among tutors, provide support for tutors' work, provide an induction for new tutors and promote in-service training for tutors in CsOE in Ghana. However, the findings from the study gleaned that supervision of instruction was sometimes exhibited by Principals in CsOE in Ghana. The study further found that Principals' instructional leadership behaviours differed when they were grouped according to their experience. It was concluded that though Principals provide instructional leadership for the benefit of tutors and the general teaching and learning climate of CsOE in Ghana, their instructional supervision should be improved. The study yielded a central recommendation that Principals of CsOE need to improve upon their supervision of instruction to promote the continuous professional development of tutors.

Keywords: instructional leadership behaviours, principals' experience, colleges of education

Introduction

The role of Principals has grown in complexity, transiting from transactional leadership to instructional leadership (Baldwin-Nye, 2007; Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2010; Murphy, Neumerski, Goldring, Grissom, & Porter, 2016). Previously, principals were mostly responsible for keeping students' safe, enforcing school policies, and fostering relationships with the world outside school. Practical daily tasks such as ordering supplies and creating bus schedules were common. Today, as instructional leaders, principals are asked to focus

on promoting best practices in teaching and learning so that students achieve academic success (Hallinger, 2011; Neumerski, 2012).

The concept of instructional leadership which emerged out of the growing body of research that supported the importance of the principal in school reform (Marzano, 2003) has been pressed to the forefront in the vocabulary of educational leadership and management. It came into prominence as a legacy of the effective schools' movement during the 1980s, focusing the attention of policymakers and scholars on the crucial role of the principal in school effectiveness. This paradigm for school leadership and management has received various definitions and explanations according to the literature, the aim of which is to provide an overall understanding of, and, the rationale for the role of the principal as an instructional leader.

Brazer and Bauer (2013) defined instructional leadership as "the effort to improve teaching and learning for students by managing effectively, addressing the challenges of diversity, guiding teacher learning, and fostering organizational learning" (p. 650). Van de Grift and Houtveen (2006) explain instructional leadership as the ability of a principal to initiate school improvement, to create a learning-oriented educational climate, and to stimulate and supervise teachers in such a way that the latter may exercise their tasks as effectively as possible. Murphy and Torre (2014) added that instructional leadership encompasses those actions that a principal takes to promote growth in student learning. These actions encompass defining the purpose of the college; setting system-wide goals; providing the resources needed for learning to occur; supervising and evaluating tutors; coordinating staff development programmes; and creating collegial relationships with and among tutors (Brewster & Klump, 2005; Covey, 2005).

> Different behaviours have been reported in studies that constitute principals' instructional leadership behaviours. For instance, Blasé and Blasé (2002) conceptualised instructional leadership behaviours of principals to include classroom visitation, observations, making suggestions, giving feedback, modelling effective instruction, ensuring uninterrupted instructional time, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing continuous professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching. Behaviours such as promoting attendance to conferences, seminars and workshops, professional associations and in-service educational

programmes were reported in Obi's (2002) study. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2014) concluded that building a culture and a climate of collaboration and learning, promoting coaching, collegial investigation, study teams, providing resources to support teachers in their work, providing resources and in-services that cultivate teacher innovation among others culminate into principal's instructional leadership behaviours. Principal instructional leadership behaviours from the foregoing, thus, encompasses role behaviours (or practices) of the College Principal including behaviours such as promoting in-service training of tutors, supervising instruction (tutors' work), providing support for tutors' work, providing orientation /induction for tutors and creating opportunities for collaboration/collegiality among tutors.

Yet, are principals demonstrating these instructional leadership behaviours in CsOE in Ghana as their roles have grown in complexity? This poser is not readily available in the literature. Therefore, finding empirically supported facts on how college principals promote in-service training, supervise instruction (tutors' work), provide support for tutors' work, provide an induction for tutors and create opportunities for collaboration /collegiality among tutors is worth assessing. Rebore (2007) has observed that the responsibility of educating the masses requires academic staff to be equipped in the skills and knowledge in their subject area, keep abreast of societal demands in education, and be acquainted with research on the instructional process and on new methods of teaching which will promote the attainment of the general educational goals. Hence, the need for facilitating in-service training for tutors. In-service training takes the form of workshops, conference sessions, seminars, refresher courses, lectures, post-graduate courses and other short-term training events.

One of the ways of promoting professional growth and development of teachers according to Musaazi (1984) is through well-organized in-service training programmes for teachers within the education system. Musaazi continues that such in-service programmes should include activities that among other things develop teachers' skills of teaching and in the use of modern visual aids; encourage teachers to adopt various modern methods of evaluating student performance and increase teachers' skills and knowledge in their teaching subjects. He adds that some of the processes of encouraging growth and development in these areas may take the form of workshops, seminars, refresher courses, exchange teaching, professional writing, visit other schools to

observe teaching methods in those schools, staff meetings, postgraduate work at university and participation in the evaluation of the school programmes which are organised by employing authorities, tertiary institutions, teachers' subject associations and other individuals and groups.

Such in-service training programmes according to literature falls under the formal or traditional model of professional development which has dominated professional development for decades, partially because it has been the most common and enduring, are mostly off-site and involves short-term, single sessions or series of sessions and take the form of workshops, conference sessions, seminars, refresher courses, lectures, post-graduate courses and other short-term training events (Boyle, Lampriano & Boyle, 2005; Smith & Gillespie, 2007).

Many educators and researchers have also advocated the methods of teacher growth and enhancement that are based on continuous collegial interaction (collaboration) and support (Jarzabkowski, 2003; Covey, 2005). According to Jarzabkowski (2003), teachers are increasingly being admonished to move away from the traditional norms of isolation and autonomy and to move towards greater collegiality and collaboration. Covey (2005) adds that the conceptions that educators perform better when working together professionally are supported by organizational theory models which emerged earlier in the corporate sector. Covey explains that such conceptions view authentic teamwork as an essential characteristic of a successful organization as its members interact regularly to share their ideas and expertise and develop a common understanding of organizational goals and the means to their attainment. Previous scholarship has reported numerous benefits from teacher collegiality as evidence of the need for building a more effective collegial culture in schools. The most significant benefits of collegiality among teaching staff are an improvement in teacher professional growth and development and teacher professionalism (Jarzabkowski, 2003; Dufour, 2004). Collegiality also provides more systemic assistance to beginning teachers, helping them to avoid the sink-or-swim, trial-and-error mode that novice teachers usually face during the initial stages of their career. Collegiality further brings experienced and beginning teachers closer together to reinforce the competence and confidence of the beginners (Nias, 2000).

In their study of educators in the United States on supporting the lifelong study of teaching and learning, Blasé and Blasé (2004) found that effective instructional

leadership was frequently based on the belief that such principals provided formal and informal opportunities for teacher collaboration which yielded vast positive results for teachers. Within teachers' enthusiastic comments about collaboration, the authors found strong impacts on teachers' motivation, self-esteem, confidence, and ownership of decisions. Blasé and Blasé (2004) found out that collaboration in colleges can happen in two ways. First, principals encouraged teachers to become models for each other. This served to improve teaching, to motivate teachers and to provide recognition of exemplary teachers. Specifically, principals actively encouraged teachers to visit the classrooms of exemplary teachers, asked exemplary teachers to serve as models to other teachers, and encouraged teachers to make presentations within their school and district and at professional conferences.

According to Duke (2004), principals influence classroom instruction by supplying teachers with the necessary resources. Providing resources in Duke's view includes not only monetary resources and materials but also providing resources such as scheduling, developing the school calendar, hiring and correctly placing teachers, adopting textbooks, and purchasing necessary materials to support instruction. Duke continues that, principals consequently influence student achievement by helping teachers acquire necessary resources to support instruction. The lack of resources he opines may thus be a barrier to the use of some instructional strategies by teachers. Nolan and Hoover (2008) have emphasised that instructional supervision is a crucial tool used in building effective teacher continuous professional development. It is also seen as an organizational function that seeks the growth of teachers and improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning (Tesfaw & Hofman, 2012). Zepeda (2007) intimates that instructional supervision is needed and that the various approaches of instructional supervision such as clinical supervision, peer coaching, cognitive coaching and mentoring enhance teachers' continuous professional development.

Principals also use classroom observations and informal visits to the classroom to see what teaching strategies are being used and assess their effectiveness. They can then use instructional conferences to talk with teachers about classroom objectives and instructional methods. Zepeda (2007) suggests that discussion sessions between supervisor and teachers are essential to provide feedback on the supervision outcomes. From these discussions, supervisors may enlighten the teachers about their weaknesses and strengths regarding techniques, methods, approaches and teaching aids used. Zepeda add that it helps in increasing the

46

teaching development of teachers while at the same time enable teachers to make improvements to their teaching practice to be more effective. Supervision of teachers' performance by principals can affect classroom instruction. Blasé and Blasé (2004) comment that instructional conferences with teachers affect teacher classroom instruction. Burant (2009) findings of researches on instructional supervision concluded that there is a significant relationship between instructional supervision and continuous professional development.

Induction is one of the very important stages in the staffing process of any institution or organization. Wong and Wong (2003) observe that induction is a comprehensive, structured, and sustained group process that fosters a true learning community by continuing to provide support and training to new teachers into their tenure. To Wong and Wong, induction is a lifelong experience and process that teaches the social and cultural practices that centre on learning. Rebore (2007) also identifies induction as a process designed to acquaint newly recruited individuals with the school system and the relationships, they should develop to be successful. To him, this is an administrative function that is often neglected or loosely organized in many schools. He contends that this is unlike industrial and business communities where a high premium is placed on induction because they have come to realise that, there are a cause-and-effect relationship of this process to employee retention and job performance.

Rebore (2007) maintains that the importance of the proper induction and induction of new appointees cannot be overestimated. He continues that, too many capable teachers, including many who have devoted years of preparing their careers, resign their positions and give up teaching because of an unnecessarily unpleasant and frustrating initial experience in a school that lacks an effective comprehensive induction programme. The consequence according to Rebore (2007) is unfortunate, not only for the young teacher but also for society, which loses the valuable services of a trained teacher. He believes that induction should be designed for both newly employed individuals as well as reassigned employees. Rebore (2007) recognises two main levels of an induction process – informational and personal adjustment programmes. Informational programmes are concerned with providing either initial material or updating information. Initial material according to Rebore, consists primarily of information about the school system, the community it serves, and the school where the employee will work. This he suggests should be for new employees. Updating informational programmes on the other hand is geared towards the employee who is reassigned. These programmes should also concentrate on the

particular school and community to which he/she has been reassigned (Rebore, 2007).

At the personal adjustment level, Rebore (2007) states that the new employee must know and be known to all categories of workers in the institution to enable him to interact effectively with them. Thus, at the informational level, he proposes that the newly employed worker must be given all information concerning the school and the community in which he is to work. Rebore continues that the teacher must be informed about school policies and procedures, administrative procedures, location of classrooms, laboratories, resource centres, workshops, class streaming and class size. Also, information about students' attitude to time, games, studies, class assignments and discipline among others must be known to the teacher. About the community, he recommends that the teacher should be informed about the economic, social, cultural, ethnic and religious make-up of the community.

There is the recognition that the first two or three years of teaching (induction period), is critical in developing teachers' capabilities and beginning teachers should not be left alone to sink or swim (Clement, 2011). Breaux (2011), therefore, suggests that the school should adopt internal support systems and strategies that (that is, the daily support activities and continual learning opportunities) are most important for the continuous professional development of new teachers. In the National Teacher Training College (NTTC) in Lesotho for example, Stuart, Kunje and Lefoka (2000) found that tutors had not been specifically prepared for their role as teacher educators. The NTTC had no formal induction or preparation for new tutors. Informal induction was sparse and differed by the department, with some offering more help than others. Peer observation was unknown. Tutors with only secondary training started teaching content and graduate later to methodology. Otherwise, tutors learn on the job, drawing on memories of their training, often from colleagues and using what books they could. It was clear that when they had first come to the college many had not known what to do, and did not always get the help they needed.

Furthermore, researchers have long recognized the potential relationship that personal characteristics such as age, gender, education and work experiences have on how principals execute their instructional leadership behaviours (Mehdinezhad & Sardarzahi, 2016; Johnson, 2004). Among these personal characteristics, work experience has been commonly used as criteria in selecting principles and vice-principals (Mehdinezhad & Sardarzahi, 2016; Johnson,

2004). The Ministry of Education (MoE, 1996) for instance, has set criteria for selecting principals that require at least five years of teaching experience or experience as a unit leader, department head, and head of the pedagogical centre or school supervisor. The relationship between principals' work experience and their instructional leadership behaviours was examined in some studies. Mehdinezhad and Sardarzahi (2016) established no significant relationship between any of the components of instructional leadership behaviours and the experience of principals. Johnson (2004) also found in his study of instructional leadership behaviours of principals and student achievement that there is no significant relationship between experience and leadership behaviours of principals. So, if the relationship between instructional leadership behaviours and work experience failed to reach statistical significance, then could there be any statistically significant difference between principals' work experience and their instructional leadership behaviours?

Edwards and Aboagye (2015) recommended that instructional supervision skills are needed to bridge the gap between theory and practice in Ghana's education system. Another related study was conducted by Donkor and Asante (2016). Their study looked at the instructional leadership styles of basic school headteachers in the Kwaebibirim district. The study found that instructional leadership exists in the basic schools in the district and some aspects of instructional leadership activities (supervision, evaluation, and direct personal support to teachers) seemed to be implemented more than others (curriculum planning, organization and delivery). However, the available literature failed to adequately assess the differences in principals' instructional leadership behaviours based on their work experience. This study, therefore, is worth the effort.

Research Question
What instructional leadership behaviours do principals of CsOE in Ghana commonly demonstrate?

Hypothesis

H_o: There is no statistically significant difference in instructional leadership behaviours (self-reported) when principals are grouped according to their experience.

H_1: There is a statistically significant difference in instructional leadership behaviours (self-reported) when principals are grouped according to their experience.

Method

Research Design: This study used a survey design to gather the data. This design gathers data at a particular point in time, through a questionnaire to answer the research question and to test the hypothesis. The essence of the study was to describe the nature of instructional leadership behaviours of principals and assess whether or not differences exist in such behaviours when these principals are classified according to work experience. Data collected through survey design also enable the generalisation of findings of the study from a sample to the entire population. Surveys are versatile and practical, especially to the administrator, in that they identify present conditions and point to present needs (Sarantakos, 2005).

Population: The population of the study comprised forty-two (42) principals from the 42 CsOE in Ghana.

Sampling: The sample size for the study was thirty-six (36) principals based on the recommendation of Krejcie and Morgan (1970). In selecting the sample, a simple random sampling technique was used. In the first place, a sample frame consisting of the names of all the principals was prepared. The fish-bowl draw (lottery) technique, a form of simple random sampling was used to pick the 36 principals to participate in the study. The names were written on a piece of paper, folded, put in a bowl and thoroughly shuffled. Afterwards, the bowl was raised and a friend was asked to pick one of the folded pieces of paper at random without looking into the bowl. The selected number was recorded, and removed from the bowl. This process of selection continued until the 36 principals were randomly selected who gave their informed consent to participate in the study.

Instrument: The instrument used for the collection of data for the study was a structured questionnaire and in paper form. The items on the questionnaire were guided by the literature on instructional leadership behaviours of principals. The items on the questionnaire were used to elicit information on five constructs that were conceptualised as principal instructional leadership behaviours (PILB). These were the promotion of in-service training (in-service) which had seven (7) items, supervision of tutors' work (supervision) with eleven (11) items, provision of support for tutors' work (support) contained eleven (11) items, promotion of collaboration among tutors (collaboration) had eleven (11) items and provision of induction for tutors (induction) also contained eleven (11) items bringing the total items to fifty-one (51). The researcher adopted a Four-point Likert Type scale for the study ranging from: Very Often - 4 points,

Often - 3 points, Sometimes - 2 points, and Never - 1 point. Content and face validity were established for the instrument. The overall Cronbach's alpha value of 0.810. Pallant, (2007) suggests that the ideal Cronbach's alpha coefficient of a scale should be above 0.70.

Data Analysis: Statistical means and standard deviations were used to analyse the research question. For the hypothesis, descriptive statistics in the form of means and standard deviations and inferential statistics (one-way ANOVA) were used to test the hypothesis.

Results

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The working experience (number of years spent as principal) among principals was first assessed. Three classifications were adopted in categorizing principals' working experience. The classification was based on the assumption that between 1-5 years, a principal could be regarded as a novice because he/she may still be learning on the job. Between 6-10 years, instructional leadership of the principal could moderately be demonstrated. Whereas between 11-15 years, the principal may blend maturity with profound instructional leadership behaviour. The result is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Distribution of Principals according to their Experience

Working Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1-5 years (Novice)	18	50.0
6-10 years (Intermediate)	12	33.3
Above 10 years (Advanced)	6	16.7
Total	36	100

Table 1 reveals that 18 (50%) of the principals had worked between 1 and 5 years, 12 (33.3%) had worked between 6-10 years and 6 (16.7%) of them had worked as principals for more than 10 years. From this, one can conclude that most principals of CsOE in Ghana who participated in the survey were relatively novice concerning the number of years spent on the job as principals. Similarly,

the number of principals with intermediate experience was quite encouraging but the number of principals with advanced experience was quite small. From the results, it can be concluded that most principals nearly retire before their tenth year as principals, eroding many CsOE of rich instructional leadership.

Research Question: What instructional leadership behaviours do the principals of CsOE in Ghana commonly demonstrate?

This research question examined instructional leadership behaviours commonly demonstrated by the principals of CsOE in Ghana. The responses to the 51 items were spread across the five (5) sub-scales and presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Instructional Leadership Behaviours Demonstrated by Principals

Instructional Behaviours	Mean	Std. Dev.	Decision
Promotion of in-service training	2.68	.27	Often
Supervision of instruction	2.40	.26	Sometimes
Provision of support for tutors' work	2.81	.35	Often
Promoting collaboration among tutors	2.93	.23	Often
	2.92	.10	Often
Provision of induction			
Mean of Means and SD	2.75	.24	Often

Note. $1.0 \leq M < 1.5$ (Never), $1.5 \leq M < 2.5$ (Sometimes), $2.5 \leq M < 3.5$ (Often), $3.5 \leq M \leq 4$ (Very Often)

The results in Table 2 indicate various perceptions held by principals regarding their instructional leadership behaviours in CsOE in Ghana. The mean of means and standard deviations of 2.75 and .24 respectively were computed for the five sub-constructs. The estimated mean of 2.75 suggested that these behaviours were often exhibited by principals. However, by comparing the calculated mean of means of 2.75 to the individual means in the instructional leadership behaviours,

"promoting collaboration among tutors" appeared to be commonly demonstrated by principals (self-reported) in CsOE in Ghana (M=2.93, SD=.23). Another instructional leadership behaviour commonly demonstrated by principals (self-reported) was the "provision of induction" (M=2.92, SD=.10), followed by "provision of support for tutors' work" (M = 2.81, SD = .35) and "promotion of in-service training" (M=2.68, SD=.27). However, the supervision of instruction was sometimes demonstrated by principals (M=2.40, SD=.26).

Hypothesis Testing

To assess whether or not differences in instructional leadership behaviours of principals exist based on their experience (number of years spent as a principal), the following hypotheses were tested at an alpha level of 0.05.

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in instructional leadership behaviours (self-reported) when principals are grouped according to their experience.

H_1: There is a statistically significant difference in instructional leadership behaviours (self-reported) when principals are grouped according to their experience.

Table 3

Instructional Leadership Behaviours of Principals in CsOE by Experience

Instructional Leadership Behaviours	Working Experience					
	1-5 years		6-10 years		Above 10 years	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Promotion of in-service training	2.60	.31	2.83	.20	2.65	.08
Supervision of instruction	2.42	.32	2.47	.23	2.26	.03
Provision of support for tutors' work	2.80	.42	2.98	.18	2.58	.20
Promoting collaboration among tutors	3.01	.17	2.74	.23	3.06	.23
Provision of induction	2.94	.11	2.86	.05	2.99	.09

Note. Mean (M), Standard Deviation (SD) $1.0 \leq M < 1.5$ (Never), $1.5 \leq M < 2.5$ (Sometimes), $2.5 \leq M < 3.5$ (Often), $3.5 \leq M \leq 4$ (Very Often)

From Table 3, it can be observed that principals with 6-10 years of experience appeared to promote in-service training often in their respective CsOE in Ghana (M=2.83, SD=.20) whereas principals with 1-5 years of experience least promote in-service training for tutors (M=2.60, SD=.31). Regarding supervision of instruction, it was reported that principals with more than 10 years of experience sometimes engage less in this behaviour (M=2.26, SD=.03) as compared to principals with 6-10 years of experience (M=2.47, SD=.23). Concerning the provision of support for tutors' work, it was reported that principals with 6-10 years of experience often exhibit this behaviour more (M=2.98, SD=.18) whereas principals with above 10 years of experience engage less in this behaviour (M=2.58, SD=.20). On promoting collaboration among tutors, it was realised that principals with above 10 years of experience often engage more in this behaviour (M=3.06, SD=.23) whereas those with 6-10 years of experience often engage less in this behaviour (M=2.74, SD=.23). Finally, it was established that principals with above 10 years of experience provide induction more often for tutors (M=2.99, SD=.09) as compared to principals with 6-10 years of experience (M=2.86, SD=.05).

To test whether these differences in the mean scores have reached statistical significance, a one-way ANOVA test was performed. The result is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

One-Way ANOVA test on Principals' Experience on their Instructional Leadership Behaviours

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Promotion of In-service training	Between Groups	.386	2	.193	3.003	.063
	Within Groups	2.119	33	.064		
	Total	2.505	35			
Supervision of instruction	Between Groups	.199	2	.100	1.481	.242
	Within Groups	2.221	33	.067		
	Total	2.421	35			

Provision of support for tutor's work	Between Groups	.697	2	.348	3.233	.052
	Within Groups	3.555	33	.108		
	Total	4.252	35			
Promoting collaboration among tutors	Between Groups	.609	2	.304	7.593	.002
	Within Groups	1.322	33	.040		
	Total	1.931	35			
Provision of induction	Between Groups	.084	2	.042	4.681	.016
	Within Groups	.296	33	.009		
	Total	.380	35			

Note. *p<.05 (2-tailed)

The results in Table 4 show a significant statistical mean difference at the .05 probability alpha level for the groups on promoting collaboration among tutors [$F(2,33)$=7.593, p =.002, Eta^2 =.315] and provision of induction [F(2,33)=4.681, p =.016, Eta^2 =.221]. However, differences in principals' supervision of instruction failed to reach statistical significance [$F(2,33)$ =1.481, p =.242, Eta^2 =.082], promotion of in-service training [$F(2,33)$=3.003, p =.063, Eta^2 =.154], and provision of support for tutor's work [$F(2,33)$=3.233, p =.052, Eta^2 =.164]. On the whole, it can be concluded that differences exist in the self-reported instructional leadership behaviours of principals in CsOE in Ghana. Consequently, the alternate hypothesis that "there is a statistically significant difference in instructional leadership behaviours (self-reported) when principals are grouped according to their experience" is accepted while the null hypothesis is rejected at an alpha level of 0.05.

To ascertain where these differences lie within the group, a Post Hoc analysis was conducted using the Tukey HSD test and the statistically significant results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Results of Post Hoc Test on the Comparative Difference of Experience on Instructional Leadership Behaviours of Principals in CsOE in Ghana

Dependent variable	Experience of Comparison	Mean diff.	Sig.
Provision of support for tutors	6-10 years vs. above 10 years	.401*	.042
Promoting collaboration among tutors	1-5 years vs. 6-10 years	.261*	.005
	Above 10 years vs. 6-10 years	.321*	.006
Provision of induction	Above 10 years vs. 6-10 years	.132*	.018

Note. *p< 0.05 (2-tailed significant results)

Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for principals with 6-10 years of experience (M=2.98, SD=.18) was significantly different from principals with more than 10 years of experience (M=2.58, SD=.20) on the provision of support for tutors. However, the mean score for principals with 1-5 years of experience did not differ significantly from either 6-10 years or above 10 years of experience group. Concerning the promotion of collaboration among tutors, it was found that the mean score for principals with 1-5 years of experience (M=3.01, SD=.17) was significantly different from the mean score principals with 6-10 years of experience (M=2.74, SD=.23). Similarly, the mean score for principals with above 10 years of experience (M=3.06, SD=.23) differed significantly from the mean score for principals with 6-10 years of experience. Finally, the mean score for principals with above 10 years of experience (M=2.99, SD=.09) was significantly different from the mean score for principals with 6-10 years of experience (M=2.86, SD=.05). The remaining comparisons between the groups failed to reach a significant level.

Discussions

From the analysis of the research question, it was found that principals in CsOE in Ghana often promote collaboration among tutors, provide an induction for newly appointed tutors, provide support for tutors' work in the college, and

promote in-service training in the college. However, supervision of instruction is sometimes exhibited by these principals in CsOE in Ghana. On the promotion of collaboration among tutors, Jarzabkowski, (2003) observed that tutors are increasingly being admonished to move away from the traditional norms of isolation and autonomy and to move towards greater collegiality and collaboration. In their study of educators in the United States on supporting the lifelong study of teaching and learning, Blasé and Blasé (2004) found that effective instructional leadership was frequently based on the belief that such principals provided formal and informal opportunities for teacher collaboration which yielded vast positive results for tutors. In the CsOE in Ghana, principals create opportunities for tutors to work collaboratively to discuss and share teaching approaches with other tutors, plan and share assessment practices with colleagues, engage in peer review, develop research and projects with colleagues, participate in collaborative enquiry and problem-solving and collect, interpret and apply feedback from students' work. This enhances teacher professional growth and development (Jarzabkowski, 2003), and teacher professionalism (Dufour, 2004). Collaboration also provides more systemic assistance to beginning tutors, helping them to avoid the sink-or-swim, trial-and-error mode that novice tutors usually face during the initial stages of their career and brings experienced and beginning teachers closer together to reinforce the competence and confidence of the beginners (Nias, 2000).

Another significant revelation that emerged from the principals' instructional leadership behaviours in CsOE in Ghana was the provision for induction for tutors. According to Rebore (2007), the importance of proper induction and induction of new appointees cannot be overestimated. He continues that, too many capable teachers, including many who have devoted years of preparing their careers, resign their positions and give up teaching because of an unnecessarily unpleasant and frustrating initial experience in a school that lacks an effective comprehensive induction programme. The findings contrast a study conducted by Stuart et al. (2000) in Lesotho and Malawi on *Career Perspectives of Tutors in Teacher Training Colleges*. The authors found that no formal induction is offered to new tutors. The study finding agreed with Clements' (2011) view that induction is critical in developing teachers' capabilities, and so beginning teachers should not be left alone to sink or swim. Schools should therefore adopt internal support systems and strategies that (that is, the daily support activities and continual learning opportunities) are most important for the continuous professional development of new teachers (Breaux, 2011).

However, the findings failed to support Stuart et al.'s (2000) study that tutors had not been specifically prepared for their role as teacher educators. In Ghana, principals often provide induction service for newly appointed senior members. This programme aims at briefing newly appointed tutors on their duties and responsibilities in the college. Also, during this programme, newly appointees are formally introduced to the college community and informed about the college policies, systems and administrative procedures. Often, the newly tutors are paired with experienced tutors who meet regularly to offer support and encouragement, as well as identify and discuss general concerns and challenges of the new tutors. The essence is to prepare new tutors psychologically for the task ahead. It is therefore not surprising that these new tutors easily adapt and adjust to the colleges' culture of effective teaching and research.

On the provision of support for tutors' work in the college, it can be deduced that principals in CsOE in Ghana are much concerned by the professional growth of their tutors in the college. This because their supports continue beyond the induction phase for the tutors. Blasé and Blasé (2004) report that effective instructional leaders helped to develop faculty by providing essential resources and that this greatly enhanced teacher growth, classroom teaching, and student learning. According to Duke (2004), principals influence classroom instruction by supplying teachers with the necessary resources. Providing resources in Duke's view includes not only monetary resources and materials but also providing resources such as scheduling, developing the school calendar, hiring and correctly placing teachers, adopting textbooks, and purchasing necessary materials to support instruction. In support of Duke's (2004) position, principals in CsOE in Ghana encourage tutors to use research-based teaching strategies, allow tutors to make decisions regarding instructions, support tutors to practise new skills/innovation and creativity in teaching, maintain a school climate that is conducive to teaching and learning, protect instructional time, take the initiative to discuss tutors' concerns with them, give specific ideas on how to improve instructions and provide professional and educational literature (journals, articles, research findings) for use by tutors.

Regarding the promotion of in-service training in the colleges, it was found that principals often promote in-service training to tutors. The finding affirms Obi's (2002) observation that principal instructional leadership behaviours include promoting attendance to conferences, seminars and workshops, professional associations and in-service educational programmes, and, building a culture and a climate of collaboration and learning, promoting coaching, collegial

investigation, study teams, providing resources to support teachers in their work, providing resources and in-services that cultivate teacher innovation, teacher reflection and teacher leadership and building a culture of lifelong learning through inquiry and collaboration (Glickman et al., 2014). It can be deduced that principals often plan and execute college-based in-service training programmes for tutors, alert tutors on in-service training programmes available for participation, encourage tutors to participate in in-service training programmes in CsOE in Ghana. They also ensure that tutors are informed early about in-service training programmes to be attended, provide sufficient funds and resources for tutors attending in-service training programmes, bring in experts in certain areas for in-service training and support individualised efforts of tutors to participate in in-service training programmes. This behaviour is often exhibited due to the reason that such training serves as a bridge between prospective and experienced educators to meet the new challenges of guiding students towards higher standards of learning and self-development to promote excellent and effective teaching and learning environment for student teachers in CsOE in Ghana.

The results show that supervision of tutors' work was found to be the least practised/demonstrated instructional leadership behaviour in the opinion of principals. This finding should be of concern to principals because Nolan and Hoover (2008) observed that instructional supervision is a crucial tool used in building effective teacher continuous professional development. Supervision is also seen as an organisational function that seeks the growth of teachers and improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning (Tesfaw & Hofman, 2012). Zepeda (2007) further intimates that a clear connection of instructional supervision to continuous professional development is needed to enhance teachers' continuous professional development. In-depth studies of teachers' perceptions of characteristics of school principals that influence teachers' classroom instruction have also concluded that the behaviours associated with instructional leadership positively influence classroom instruction (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). Specifically, Blasé and Blasé's (2004) findings indicated that when instructional leaders monitor and provide feedback on the teaching and learning process, there were increases in teacher reflection and reflectively informed instructional behaviours, a rise in implementation of new ideas, greater variety in teaching strategies, more response to student diversity, lessons were prepared and planned more carefully, teachers were more likely to take risks and had more focus on the instructional process, and teachers used professional discretion to make changes in classroom practice. Teachers also indicated positive effects

on motivation, satisfaction, confidence, and sense of security. Thus, if college principals are not performing this instructional leadership function regularly, then it is likely that this will affect the continuous professional development of college tutors. This development may in turn affect tutors' performance and consequently teacher trainees' achievement. Blasé and Blasé (2004) found that principals who did not engage in monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process hurt teachers and classroom practices.

The trainees in Ghana's CsOE are being prepared to teach pupils at the basic level (primary and junior high schools) of education in Ghana and are expected to help their pupils to develop as fully as possible all aspects of their potentials; which includes among other things their physical, intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual wellbeing. Ensuring that principals of CsOE in Ghana perform this instructional leadership role of supervising tutors' work can therefore not be underestimated. Because supervision and instructional leadership often go hand-in-hand and findings of researches on instructional supervision suggest that there is a significant relationship between instructional supervision and continuous professional development (Burant, 2009). The finding is particularly important because the result of all these instructional leadership behaviours when demonstrated by the principal is a collaborative learning environment where learning is not confined to the classroom and is the objective of all educators. These behaviours attract more commitment and satisfaction from teachers as well as establish a climate that encourages mutual trust, risk-taking, experimentation, reflective thinking and collaboration, all in a stimulating, supportive and professionally challenging environment. These influences in turn culminate into a classroom where students experience lessons designed around learning theory and diverse learning strategies (Blasé & Blasé, 2002).

The study found statistically significant differences in principals' instructional leadership behaviours when they are grouped according to their level of experience (number of years spent as principals). In the first place, it was revealed that principals with 6-10 years of experience, more often, provide support for tutors than principals with above 10 years of experience. However, the magnitude of the difference is small (Cohen, 1988). It can be reasoned that moving away from 'novicism', these group of principals appeared to understand the needed import for supporting tutors to discharge their responsibilities tactfully in the colleges. Having acquired the needed experience, they seemed to understand the specific needs of tutors and resources tutors need to be more effective and efficient on the job. Secondly, a moderate statistically significant difference was estimated for the promotion of collaboration between tutors with 1-5 years of

experience and 6-10 years of experience and between principals with above 10 years of experience and 6-10 years of experience. The results suggest that both novice principal (1-5 years of experience) and advanced principal (above 10 years of experience) may want to create opportunities for tutors to work collaboratively, plan and share assessment practices with colleagues, engage in peer review, develop research and projects with colleagues, participate in collaborative enquiry and problem-solving and collect, interpret and apply feedback from students' work. These behaviours may leave lasting impressions in the minds of tutors about the novice principal and advanced (nearly exiting) principal. Another small statistically significant difference was reported in the provision of induction when the principals were grouped according to their level of experience. Specifically, principals with above 10 years of experience often provide induction service for newly appointed tutors as compared to principals with 6-10 years of experience. One reason accounting for this difference is that these group of principals believed that knowledge of content, research and school culture need to be integrated and explained to new tutors to psychologically adjust to new challenges concerning college responsibilities. This study finding confirms Royster (2015) who found a moderate to weak relationship between principals' experience and their instructional leadership behaviours.

Furthermore, no statistically significant differences were reported for the promotion of in-service training and supervision of instruction when the principals were grouped according to their experiences. This suggests that principals in CsOE in Ghana often promote in-service training on equal terms and sometimes supervise instructions in their respective colleges. The finding is consistent with Mehdinezhad and Sardarzahi's (2016) findings in their study of leadership behaviours and its relation with principals' experience that from the perspective of teachers and principals, there is no significant relationship between any of the components of leadership behaviours and experience of principals. It is again in line with Johnson (2004) who found in his study of instructional leadership behaviours of principals and student achievement that there is no significant relationship between experience and leadership behaviours of principals.

Conclusions
Tutors are benefiting from principals' instructional leadership behaviours in the CsOE in Ghana. Instructional leaders provide focus and direction to curriculum and teaching, establish conditions that support teachers and help students succeed, provide the resources needed for learning to occur and, supervise and evaluate teachers. Instructional leaders also coordinate staff development

programmes, build collegial/collaborative and empowering relationships with and among teachers, and inspire them to reach ambitious goals. These leaders are accessible and interact with the faculty and staff about day-to-day happenings in the school continuously, creating a trusting atmosphere through developing a positive relationship with teachers, allowing teachers to take risks without penalty, building the capacity to develop teachers' abilities and personal awareness through reflection, providing opportunities for continuous professional development, giving leadership in staff development and working collaboratively.

It is further concluded that instructional leadership behaviours of principals in CsOE are affected by their year of experience as principals. Principals with an intermediate level of experience (6-10 years of experience) often provide support for tutors. Both novice principals (1-5 years of experience) and advanced principals (above 10 years of experience) often promote collaboration among tutors while advanced principals (above 10 years of experience) often provide an induction for newly appointed tutors.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from the study:

1. It is recommended that principals of CsOE need to improve upon their supervision of instruction since it was the least instructional leadership behaviour college principals were found in the study to exhibit. As indicated earlier, supervision of tutors' work is one of the instructional leadership behaviours of principals that help to promote the continuous professional development of tutors.

2. Again, the national executive committee and the sector zones of the National Conference of Principals of CsOE (PRINCOF) should collaborate to establish a forum for discussing and sharing information on best practices on their roles as principals in the area of functioning as instructional leaders.

3. Councils of CsOE and the National for Council Tertiary Education (NCTE) should make efforts to provide principals with the necessary education, and training they need to function effectively in their instructional leadership roles. Capacity building for principals by appointing authorities, NCTE and development partners, therefore, will be a step in the right direction. The principals should also be encouraged to read books, articles, research publications and other relevant materials to broaden their knowledge span regarding their roles as instructional leaders.

References

Baldwin-Nye, S. (2007). *Job demand and leadership role perception differences of incumbent and aspiring women high school principals.* Doctoral dissertation, University at Albany, State University of New York. Dissertation Abstracts, 13.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). The dark side of school leadership: Implications for administrator preparation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*(4), 245-273.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2002). Teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership and implications. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1*(3), 256-264.

Boyle, B., Lamprianou, I., & Boyle, T. (2005). A longitudinal of teacher change: What makes professional development effective? Report of the second year of the study. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16*(1), 1-27.

Brazer, S. D., & Bauer, S. C. (2013). Preparing instructional leaders: A model. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(4), 645-684.

Breaux, A. L. (2011). *101 answers for new teachers and their mentors: Effective teaching tips for daily classroom use*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Brewster, C., & Klump, J. (2005). *Leadership practices of successful principals.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Burant, S. E. (2009). *The relationship of instructional supervision and professional learning communities as catalysts for authentic professional growth: A study of one school division* (Master's Thesis, University of Saskatchewan). [Online] Retrieved from http://www.library2.usask.ca/theses/.../pdf

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Covey, S. (2005). *Principal-centred leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Donkor, A. K., & Asante, J. (2016). Instructional leadership of basic schools

in Ghana: The case study of schools in Kwaebibirem District. American International *Journal of Contemporary Research, 6*(4), 65-78.

Dufour, R. (2004). Leading-edge: Leadership is an affair of the heart. *Journal of Staff Development, 25*(1), 12-24.

Dufour, R., Eaker, R., & Dufour, R. (2005). *On common ground, the power of professional learning communities.* National Educational Service.

Duke, D. L. (2004). The turnaround principal: High-stakes leadership. *Principal, 84*(1), 12-23.

Edwards, A. K., & Aboagye, S. K. (2015). Assessing school leadership challenges in Ghana using leadership practices inventory. *International Journal of Education and Practice, 3*(4), 168-181.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). London: Pearson.

Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(2), 271-306.

Jarzabkowski, L. M. (2003). Teacher collegiality in a remote Australian school. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 18*(3), 139 144.

Johnson, R. L. (2004). *A study of instructional leadership behaviours of principals and student achievement.* Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607-610.

Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action.* Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mehdinezhad, V., & Sardarzahi, Z. (2016). Leadership behaviours and its relation with principals' management experience. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research, 5*(1), 11-16.

Murphy, J., Neumerski, C. M., Goldring, E., Grissom, J., & Porter, A. (2016). Bottling fog? The quest for instructional management. Cambridge *Journal of Education, 46*(4), 455-471.

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1984). *The theory and practice of educational administration.* Hong Kong: Macmillan Publishers.

Neumerski, C. M. (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.

Nias, J. (2000). Why teachers need their colleagues: A developmental perspective. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Change* (pp. 1257 1271). London: Prentice-Hall.

Nolan, J. F., & Hoover, L. A. (2008). *Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice* (2nd Ed.). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Obi, E. (2002). Motivation and organisational behaviour. In A. N. Ndu, L. O. Ocho and B. S. Okeke (Eds.), *Dynamics of educational administration and management: The Nigerian Perspective* (pp. 18-25). Onitsha: Meks Publishers Ltd.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual* (3rd Ed.) New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Rebore, R. W. (2007). *Human resource administration in education: A management approach* (8th Ed.). London: Prentice Hall Inc.

Smith, C., & Gillespie, M. (2007). *Professional development and teacher change: Implications for adult basic education* (NCSALL Rep. No. 7). Boston: National Centre for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.

Stuart, J., Kunje, D., & Lefoka, P. (2000). *Careers and perspective of tutors in teacher training colleges: Case studies of Lesotho and Malawi.* Sussex: Falmer Press.

Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(1), 31-56.

Tesfaw, T. A., & Hofman, R. H. (2012). *Instructional supervision and its relationship with professional development: Perception of private and government secondary school teachers in Addis Ababa.* Retrieved on 28th May 2016 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED534226.pdf.

Van de Grift, W., & Houtveen, A. A. M. (2006). Underperformance in primary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(3), 255-273.

Wong, H & Wong, R. (2003). *How to retain new teachers.* Source: http://www. teachers.net/gazette/FEB03/wong.htm/

Zepeda, S. J. (2007). Cognitive dissonance, supervision, and administrative team conflict. *International Journal of Educational Management, 20*(3), 224-232.