Comparison of Principals' Instructional Leadership Style for Quality Learning between Public and Private Schools

Muhammad Iqbal [*] | Farrukh Munir [†] | Fatima Nawaz [‡]

Abstract: *This research was designed to compare the instructional leadership style of public and private school heads for quality learning. The research was descriptive in nature, and the mixed methods approach was used to conduct this study. Data were collected through a survey questionnaire and an interview from a sample was 200 teachers and 20 school heads, respectively. It was concluded that the instructional leadership styles of both public and private school heads played a positive role in promoting a healthy learning culture among teachers and students. Some of the key responsibilities of school heads are to work as curriculum manager, effective planner, motivator and promoter of quality education. The findings of this may be helpful to the educational planners and school heads to have a clear understanding of the actions to be taken for improving the quality of education.*

Key Words: Instructional Leadership, Quality Education, School Heads, Motivator.

Introduction

The word instructional leadership derived in the 1980s when researchers started research ineffective school movement. The guiding style of a Leader who is connected to the central business of teaching-learning and understanding is known as an instructional leader. Instructional leadership is comprised of two words 'leadership' and 'instruction'. Leadership refers to the procedure of communication between heads and their staff (Horner, 1997; Pfeiffer & Dunlap, 1982; Reichwald, Siebert, & Moslein, 2004). Instructional leadership style in education settings involves planning and management of goals, allocating resources, monitoring the teachers' teaching plans and activities for the students' better learning and growth. Some of the main characteristics of instructional leadership are effective communication, collaborative, systemic thinking, and continuous learning, having good knowledge of pedagogical skills and content, assessment and analysis of data, and effective working with other team members. Some of the actions the principal take as an instructional leader to promote

students' growth through effective learning and teaching (Mestry, 2013). Previous researches indicate that those schools in which principals play a role in instructional leadership are successful schools (Dhlamini, 2008; Mabata, 2004). Sekhu (2011) says that some research scholars consider instructional leadership as exclusively the only principal's actions taken in schools, but some others indicate that instructional leadership are team actions taken within the school. I also agree with those researchers that assert that instructional leadership is known as a combined responsibly of principals, departmental heads, teachers and subject advisors. Some researchers add subject advisors in instructional leadership because they play a significant role in supporting and evolving teacher, especially with content and curriculum distribution because they play a significant role in assisting teachers specifically with content and course delivery. Robinson, Loyed, & Rowe (2008) argue that when principals as instructional leaders evaluate and visit regularly schools progress and

[*] Assistant Professor, Division of Education, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: drmiqbal@ue.edu.pk
[†] Lecturer, Institute of Education & Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
[‡] M.Phil Scholar, Division of Education, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

other activities; it is likely to have a large influence on school achievements. Bartlett (2008) has also indicated that the principal's instructional leadership has a large effect on students' achievement. All these previous research show that if principals' cannot understand clearly what instructional leadership is? Consequently, their school progress is very low and difficult for heads to manage their schools properly. This study amid to investigate the principals or heads, instructional leadership style by comparing the public and private school heads

Review of Literature

Instructional leadership is very important for creating a conducive teaching-learning environment. The scholars described the concept of instructional leadership. It determines the principals' instructional leadership role by highlighting the principals' instructional initiative and their jobs attributes and exercises as instructional leaders for the smooth function of their schools. Lashway (2003) proposed that there was a need for solid administration in the government-funded educational system during responsibility development. The extended activities for school-based responsibility, the situations of the principal were distinguished as the basic component in a school's prosperity (Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1996; Schriff, 2001). Studies found that the job of the head as a pioneer in the open and nonpublic associations: (a) was a basic factor in making schools equipped for improving the nature of understudy scholarly effecting and (b) crucially affected the working and execution of the school and the scholastic advancement of its occupants (Marsh & LeFever, 2004; Parker, 1984).

Instructional administration as an idea should be comprehended with regards to education management. Two keywords are 'leadership' and 'instruction'. Leadership is explained as a process that comprises an interaction between one whole announcement and those that are motivated (Horner, 1997; Pfeiffer & Dunlap, 1982). More explanation of this definition is the fact that a leader applies more of the inspirational techniques to motivate the intrigue and backing of the gathering or supporters towards the activity. Reichwald, Siebert, & Moslein (2004) said that administration is to do with making a domain in which

individuals are encouraged to produce and move in the direction of the leader. Mastrangelo, Eddy, & Lorenzet (2004) presented the idea of expert initiative, where they recommend that it includes 'giving guidance, procedure, and coordination to the individuals from an association to adjust the authoritative objectives. Weber (1996) and Hallinger (2005) described some models of principals as instructional leaders in which they describe some other actions of instructional leadership. Weber's (1996) described the key characteristics of the instructional leadership framework as follows:

(a) the school's mission: The instructional leader collaboratively improves a mutual vision and goals for the school with participants.

(b) Managing the instructional program: The instructional leader observers classroom training arrangement with the school's mission and also offers instructional resources.

(c) Promoting a positive school learning climate**:** The instructional leader encourages a positive learning environment by interactive goals, creating potentials and establishing and systematic environment positive school learning climate.

(d) Observing and improving instruction: The instructional leader observes and develops instruction through the use of classroom observation and professional enlargement activities.

(e) Assessing the instructional program**:** The instructional leader contributes to the planning, designing, administering and analysis of assessments to evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum

Objectives of the Research

The core objective of this research was to investigate and compare the principal role as instructional leadership for quality learning in government and private schools.

The secondary objectives of the study were:

❖ To discover the principal's instructional leadership style in government and non-government school in the Lahore district.

❖ To compare the difference between the principal's instructional leadership style in

a public and private school in the Lahore district

- ❖ To discover the quality of learning in public and private schools in the Lahore district
- ❖ To relate the difference between the quality of learning in government and non-government school in the Lahore district.

Research Questions

- ❖ What is the instructional leadership style of school heads in government and non-government schools in the Lahore district?
- ❖ What is the difference between the instructional leadership style of school heads in public and private schools in the Lahore district?
- ❖ What is the quality of learning in government and private schools in the Lahore district?
- ❖ What is the difference between the quality of learning in government and private schools in the Lahore district?

Methodology

This research was descriptive in nature and used a mixed-methods approach (qualitative and quantitative) to gathered data. The population of the study was comprised of all teachers and principals/headteachers public and private schools of Lahore, District. The study sample was 200 teachers, 20 principles/school heads selected from the public and private schools conveniently. Quantitative data was collected from teachers through a survey questionnaire, while for an in-depth understanding of the matter, qualitative data were collected from principals/school heads through open-ended interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed through SPSS in which means, standard deviation, were calculated and for comparison independent sample t-test was applied. For the understanding of qualitative data, thematic analysis was done.

Descriptive Analysis

The mean score and standard deviation of teachers' responses, collected by survey questionnaire on 5 points rating scale, were analyzed through descriptive analysis. Detail of descriptive analysis of quantitative data is given in table 1 to 6 below:

Table 1. Demographic Information

S. No	Statements	Sector	N	Mean	SD
1	Sector	Public	100	1.00	0.00
		Private	100	2.00	0.10
2	Gender	Public	100	1.51	0.50
		Private	100	1.36	0.48
3	Academic	Public	100	1.72	0.43
		Private	100	1.64	0.59
4	Professional	Public	100	1.71	0.71
		Private	100	2.03	0.83
5	Time duration in school	Public	100	2.86	1.09
		Private	100	2.49	1.09

Table 2. Defining the School Mission

S. No	Statements	Sector	N	Mean	SD
1	Discuss school goals, purposes, and mission with staff	Public	100	4.17	0.92
		Private	100	3.86	1.13
2	Visit the school building regularly	Public	100	3.91	1.04
		Private	100	4.05	0.86
3	Train a team to be creative in its work	Public	100	3.98	0.89
		Private	100	4.00	1.03
4	Converse school goals with students	Public	100	4.02	1.01
		Private	100	3.97	0.89

Table 3. Promoting a Positive Learning Environment

S. No	Statements	Sector	N	Mean	SD
1	Asks guardians to praise instructors for good work	Public	100	3.83	1.06
		Private	100	3.93	0.93
2	Nominate teachers for awards	Public	100	3.99	1.04
		Private	100	4.01	0.95
3	Encourage and bolster a staff part looking for extra preparing	Public	100	3.88	0.85
		Private	100	3.94	0.95
4	Praise staff individuals for their great work	Public	100	3.99	1.08
		Private	100	3.88	1.02
5	Join a casual conversation among staff individuals	Public	100	3.99	1.08
		Private	100	3.90	0.93
6	Seek guidance from staff separately before going to the final verdict	Public	100	3.93	0.91
		Private	100	4.01	0.88

Table 4. Promoting a Positive Learning Environment

S. No	Statements	Sector	N	Mean	SD
1	Provide data teachers need to design their work adequately	Public	100	3.75	1.07
		Private	100	3.86	1.04
2	Insist strategies and techniques be followed	Public	100	4.01	0.99
		Private	100	3.76	1.01
3	Find resources to assist staff with working superbly	Public	100	3.95	1.00
		Private	100	3.96	1.06
4	Make a point by point staff improvement plans	Public	100	3.97	1.02
		Private	100	3.85	1.00
5	Coordinate educational plan across grade levels	Public	100	4.04	0.96
		Private	100	3.86	1.05
6	Provide explicit help for educational program improvement	Public	100	3.76	1.13
		Private	100	3.94	0.86
7	Spend time working on teaching skills with a teacher	Public	100	3.89	1.01
		Private	100	4.07	1.03
8	Work with instructors to find new methodologies for managing learning issues	Public	100	4.03	1.04
		Private	100	4.08	0.89

Table 5. Observing and Improving Instruction

S. No	Statements	Sector	N	Mean	SD
1	Observe a class	Public	100	4.00	1.09
		Private	100	4.11	0.97
2	Encourages staff to attempt their best	Public	100	4.08	0.97
		Private	100	4.12	0.80
3	Communicate higher requirements to staff and students	Public	100	3.88	1.01
		Private	100	4.08	0.80
4	Showing models of effective teaching methods to staff	Public	100	4.08	0.90
		Private	100	3.91	0.98

S. No	Statements	Sector	N	Mean	SD
5	Demonstrate a creative instructing strategy to staff	Public	100	4.06	0.85
		Private	100	3.84	1.02
6	Assist the instructor in making a specific strategy to raise student accomplishment	Public	100	3.93	1.05
		Private	100	4.15	0.94

Table 6. Assessing the Instructional Program

S. No	Statements	Sector	N	Mean	SD
1	Review student's performance with teachers	Public	100	4.12	0.91
		Private	100	4.24	0.84
2	Stress the significance of accomplishing top test scores to educators	Public	100	4.13	0.91
		Private	100	4.07	0.94
3	Use student evaluation data to measure progress toward the school's objectives	Public	100	4.12	0.89
		Private	100	4.06	0.88
4	Discuss evaluation results with teachers to decide zones of strength and weakness	Public	100	4.12	0.96
		Private	100	4.15	0.78
5	Use the work and activities of students as a part of the instructional assessment	Public	100	3.93	0.99
		Private	100	4.21	0.89
6	Make normal contact with instructors to assess student progress	Public	100	4.16	0.79
		Private	100	4.12	0.88

T-test Interpretation

Comparison of principals as instructional leader in public and private schools

H₀: There is no significant mean score difference between the instructional leadership style of public and private school principals for quality of learning. The result of the T-test is described below in table 7.

Table 7. T-Test of Quantitative Data

L.Style	sector	N	Mean	SD	t-test for Equality of Means ($\alpha = 0.05$)		
					df	T	Sig.
Instructional	Public	100	139.1	9.85	198	-0.253	0.16
Leadership	private	100	139.4	7.89			

To explore significant mean score difference between public and private school principals as instructional leader, the "Independent sample t" test was applied. The result is t (198) = -.025, p>.05. As p = 0.16., so the null hypothesis, which states, "There is no significant mean score difference between instructional leadership style of public and private school principals for quality of learning", was not rejected. No significant mean score difference was discovered.

Thematic Analysis of the Qualitative Data

The qualitative views were analyzed by thematic analysis. Various themes were drawn based on the views of the principals/headteachers, as described below:

Management of Curriculum

❖ Murphy and Hallingers (1985) proposed in their model of instructional leadership that

such kind of leaders played their role in coordinating and management of curriculum likewise

- ❖ Participant 1&2 holds the view: "Instructional leadership is a managing the curriculum and instruction by the principal of school".
- ❖ Participant 3 holds a view: "Growing professionally and reflect, responsibilities of Instructional leadership includes clear objectives, overseeing the educational program, checking exercise plans, dispensing assets and assessing educators routinely to advance understudy learning and development".
- ❖ Participant 7& 8 holds a view: "It is the management of curriculum and instructions by the principal of school".
- ❖ Participant 10 says: "Consistently the board of educational program and guidance by a school head."
- ❖ Participant 13 holds: "The management of curriculum, planning, implementing and analyzing all curricular and co-curricular activities and monitoring all activities with vigilantly by a school leader".
- ❖ Participant 14 holds: "Maintain the discipline and curriculum approach".
- ❖ Participant 15 holds: "Everyday management of curriculum and instruction by a school principal".
- ❖ Participant 17: "Instructional leadership is the management of curriculum and instruction where there is a disciplined hierarchy of a team of leaders."
- ❖ Participant 18 holds: "Management of curriculum and school".
- ❖ Participant 19 holds: "It is the management of curriculum as a principal through instructions".
- ❖ Participant 20 holds: "It is the management of curriculum and instructions by the principal".

Effective Planner or Goal Setter

- ❖ Participant 4 holds: "Instructional leader advocates for effective teaching by providing clarity and support for teachers as well as obtaining the compulsory assets to expand instructing viability. Relational abilities. Compelling arranging, Trustworthiness".

- ❖ Participant 12 holds: "Our Mission is to give top-notch training and childcare in a protected, deferential and comprehensive climate that forms an establishment forever long learning."
- ❖ Participant 13 holds: "Our vision is for every kid to build up an oddity of learning, find their inclinations and fill in their adoration for learning".
- ❖ Participant 14 holds the view: "Our Vision is a community where all children feel cherished, regarded and urged to create to their fullest potential".
- ❖ Participant 15 holds the view: "Our main goal is to lead and support the early learning local area in building the best establishment for kids birth to five".

Discipline Maintainer

- ❖ Participant 3 holds the view: "Maintain discipline and time management. To work under rules and regulations, with positive energy to solve everyday problems of the staff".
- ❖ Participant 12 holds the view: "Encouragement, Professional development and discipline".
- ❖ Participant 13 holds the view: "Discipline, cooperation and supportive teamwork".
- ❖ Participant 16 says: "Division of labour among teachers for better task management".

Motivator

- ❖ Participant 4 says: My team has real soldiers; they are devoted and loyal people. Using a minimum budget and limited resources available, they thrive on designing the best possible lesson plans and activities to drive the maximum out of students.
- ❖ Participant 15 says: "Motivational coaching of staff to solve everyday problems".
- ❖ Participant 12 holds the view: "Set up elevated standards, urge students to have positive associations with one another. Give understudies a voice during class, Make the study hall a protected spot, Give input frequently. Try not to just praise grades, commend the achievements as well."

❖ Participant 17 says: Create instructors and create heads of students in cycles which utilize displaying, training, coaching and normal discourse in manners which are educated by understudy input and understudy results.

The Promoter of Quality Education

❖ Participant 1 says: "To teach children with the best quality so that children learn more and more."
❖ Participant 2 says: "Healthy learning environment for teachers and students. For example, Teachers use A.V aids to deliver a lecture".
❖ Participant 6 holds the view: "Major role is monitoring students' learning objectives".
❖ Participant 16 holds the view: "As the instructional leaders' principals must lead schools in a way that places student their learning in the middle. They should set elevated requirements and norms for the scholastic and social improvement, everything being equal, and the presentation of educators."

Cooperative

❖ Participant 1 holds the view: "to be cooperative and helpful for his staff and students".
❖ Participant 7 holds the view: "With mutual cooperation and friendly for staff and students".
❖ Participant 9 & 10 holds the view: To develop good and helpful cooperation to cabinet teachers and students

Progressive

❖ Participant 17 says: "Build up a steady learning society, Address Learners' Needs, Keep it Positive, Provide Feedback, Celebrate Success, Safety, Employ Interactive Games and Activities."

Democratic by Nature

❖ Participant 19 says: "By applying Democracy policy. Look after every mode of work in school."

Problem Solver

❖ Participant 14 says: "To work under rules

and regulations, with positive energy to solve everyday problems of the staff."

Findings

Findings of phase 1 in which questionnaire are filling from both public and private school teachers are:

Defining a School Mission

❖ According to public school teachers (45%) and private school teacher (34%) are strongly agree that their school principals are discussed school goals, purpose and mission with their staff.
❖ According to public school teachers (36%) and private school teacher (33%) strongly agrees that their school principals visit the school building regularly.
❖ According to public school teachers (30%) and private school teacher (36%) strongly agrees that their school principals are trained a team to be creative in their work.
❖ According to public school teachers (39%) and private school teacher (31%) are strongly agree that their school principals are converse school goals with students.

Promoting a Positive Learning Environment

❖ According to public school teachers (32%) and private school teacher (33%) are strongly agree that their school principals are asked guardians to praise instructors for good work
❖ According to public school teachers (41%) and private school teacher (35%) are strongly agree that their school principals are nominated teachers for awards
❖ According to public school teachers (23%) and private school teacher (33%) strongly agrees that their school principals are encouraged and bolster a staff part looking for extra preparing
❖ According to public school teachers (37%) and private school teacher (33%) are strongly agree that their school principals are praise staff individuals for their great work
❖ According to public school teachers (38%) and private school teacher (27%) are

strongly agree that their school principals are joined a casual conversation among staff individuals

❖ According to public school teachers (27%) and private school teacher (38%) strongly agrees that their school principals are seeking guidance from staff individuals in making a decision

Managing the Instruction Program

❖ According to public school teachers (27%) and private school teacher (30%) strongly agrees that their school principals are provided data teachers need to design their work adequately

❖ According to public school teachers (37%) and private school teacher (25%) are strongly agree that their school principals are insisted strategies and techniques be followed

❖ According to public school teachers (35%) and private school teacher (36%) are strongly agree that their school principals are found resources to assist staff with working superbly

❖ According to public school teachers (38%) and private school teacher (27%) are strongly agree that their school principals make a point staff improvement plans

❖ According to public school teachers (35%) and private school teacher (31%) are strongly agree that their school principals are coordinate educational plan across grade levels

❖ According to public school teachers (28%) and private school teacher (28%) strongly agrees that their school principals are provided explicit help for educational program improvement

❖ According to public school teachers (27%) and private school teacher (41%) strongly agrees that their school principals spend time working on teaching skills with a teacher

Observing and Improving Instruction

❖ According to public school teachers (40%) and private school teacher (41%) are strongly agree that their school principals are observed a class

❖ According to public school teachers (28%) and private school teacher (32%) strongly

agrees that their school principals are encouraged to staff to attempt their best

❖ According to public school teachers (32%) and private school teacher (32%) are strongly agree that their school principals are communicated higher requirements to staff and students

❖ According to public school teachers (37%) and private school teacher (28%) are strongly agree that their school principals are showing models of effective teaching methods to staff

❖ According to public school teachers (30%) and private school teacher (32%) strongly agrees that their school principals are demonstrated a creative instructing strategy to staff

❖ According to public school teachers (38%) and private school teacher (29%) are strongly agree that their school principals are helping a teacher develop a specific strategy to increase student achievement

❖ According to public school teachers (29%) and private school teacher (29%) strongly agrees that their school principals are Assist the instructor to make a specific strategy to raise student accomplishment

Assessing the Instructional Program

❖ According to public school teachers (34%) and private school teacher (36%) are strongly agree that their school principals are review student's performance with teachers

❖ According to public school teachers (40%) and private school teacher (44%) are strongly agree that their school principals stress the significance of accomplishing top test scores to educators

❖ According to public school teachers (38%) and private school teacher (38%) are strongly agree that their school principals are used student evaluation data to measure progress toward the school's objectives

❖ According to public school teachers (35%) and private school teacher (38%) are strongly agree that their school principals are discussed evaluation results with teachers to decide zones of strength and weakness

- ❖ According to public school teachers (38%) and private school teacher (45%) are strongly agree that their school principals are using the work and activities of students as a part of the instructional assessment
- ❖ According to public school teachers (43%) and private school teacher (36%) strongly agrees that their school principals make normal contact with instructors to assess student progress.

Phase 2 (interviews)

Findings of phase 2, in which interviews of 10 public and 10 private school principals were conducted, the following themes are developed through thematic analysis:
- ❖ Curriculum manager
- ❖ Effective planner and goal setter
- ❖ Discipline maintainer
- ❖ Motivator
- ❖ The promoter of quality education
- ❖ Cooperative
- ❖ Progressive
- ❖ Democratic
- ❖ Problem solver

Discussion

The present study aimed to explore the important factor of IL and quality learning in private and government schools both. These factors project how principle being an instructional leader effects quality learning and even improve the quality of teaching. (Bartlett, 2008) state that the principal's IL has a large effect on student performance. Robinson, Loyed, & Rowe (2008) argues because when the principal's as IL evaluate and regularly visit schools progress and other activities, that's why it is likely to have a large influence on school achievements. I completely agree with Elbot and Fulton, who says "goals in a school don't achieve involuntarily; however it is generally dependent on instructional help concentrated by its head" (Elbot & Fulton, 2008).

Recommendations

On the basis of collected data and search for this topic, some of the recommendations are:
- ❖ Principals have the leadership quality it is very important for principals
- ❖ Only those peoples promoted to the post of principals who had a clear vision and goal setter
- ❖ It's the responsibilities of principals to create a trustworthy environment for both students and teachers

References

Bartlett, J. C. (2008). Principal leadership practices: a correlation study of specific instructional leadership practices and student achievement on the Tennessee gateway tests. *Liberty University.*

Dhlamini, M. C. (2008).). The instructional leadership role of the school principal in the improvement of the quality of education: a case study (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa).

Elbot, C. F., & Fulton, D. (2008). *Building an intentional school culture: Excellence in academics and character*—Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin press.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (2013). Running on empty? Finding the time and capacity to lead learning. *NASSP Bulletin, 97(5),* 5-21.

Horner, M. (1997). 'Leadership Theory: Past, Present and Future. *Team Performance Management 3(4),* 87-270.

Lashway, L. (2003). The mandate to help low performing schools . *(Report No. EDOEA-03-06). Eugene, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED478248).*

Mabata, M. V. (2004).). The principal's instructional leadership role as a factor influencing academic performance: a case study (Doctoral dissertation).

Marsh, D. D., & LeFever, K. (2004). . School principals as standards-based educational leaders: Looking across policy contexts. . *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 32(4), ,* 387-404.

Mastrangelo, A., Eddy, E. R., & Lorenzet, S. J. (2004). The Importance of Personal and Professional Leadership . *The Leadership and Development Journal 25(5): ,* 51-435.

Mestry, R. (2013). The Innovative Role of the Principal as Instructional Leader: A. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research, ,* 60-119.

Parker, N. N. (1984). The work of public and private elementary school principals. *(Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46,* 572.

Pfeiffer, I. L., & Dunlap, J. B. (1982). Supervision of Teachers: A Guide to Improving Instruction. *Encanto: Oryx Press.*

Reichwald, R., Siebert, J., & Moslein, K. (2004).) 'Leadership Excellence: Learning form an Exploratory Study on Leadership Systems in Large Multinational . *Journal of European Industrial Training 29(3):,* 98-184.

Richardson, M. D., Lane, K. E., & Flanigan, J. L. (1996). Teachers' perceptions of principals' attributes. *Clearing House, 69(5), ,* 290-293.

Robinson, V. M., Loyed, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational administration quarterly, 44(5),,* 635-674.

Schriff, T. (2001). Priorities and barriers in high school leadership: A survey of principals. Reston, Virginia. *National Association of Secondary School Principals. .*

Sekhu, M. S. (2011). Practices of primary school principals as instructional leaders : implications for learner achievement. *M.Ed Dissertation. University of Pretoria, Pretoria.*

Weber, J. (1996). Leading the instructional program in Smith SC St Piele PK (eds) School leadership. *handbook for excellence. USA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Aianagement.*