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***Abstract:*** *The purpose of this study was to examine the the relationship between teacher leadership on the learning quality of the Public Junior High Schools in Bandar Lampung City, Lampung province, Indonesia This research was a quantitative study with an asosiative method. Data collection was conducted using a questionnaire with 204 teacher samples at 100% response rate. The hypotheses were tested using simple linear regression analysis through the t test to determine the relationship of the independent variable on the dependent variable at a confidence level of 95% (α = 0.05). The result showed that there was a significant influence of teacher leadershipon the learning quality.*
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1. **Introduction**

Learning quality is a special concept of learning and education in general and thus, the principles of learning and education in general has to be well applied (Stracke, 2017). Learning quality is highly required due the increasing speed of globalization and changes worldwide (Stracke, 2013).Quality is the core concept of school education (Lee, 2010). Learning quality is important for learning processes and school success (Stracke, 2012).The quality of learning reflects the success of schools in achieving learning goals (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Quality development is crucial and needs a long process to be established and integrated(Stracke, 2010). Learning qualityis essential and despite it’s importance, many people find quality as an interesting concept (Sallis, 2014).The enhancement of Learning qualitydepends on the quality classroom mangement (Norton, 2016). A better quality of learning makes a result in greater academic achievement (Solberg, Howard, Gresham, and Carter, 2012). The quality of learning is influenced by several factors, such as teacher leadership (Deming, 2018).

In the past decades, there have been many studies that link high-quality leadership such as instructional leadership with positive school outcomes (Horng, 2010).Teacher leadership improves education quality and student learning (Masino and Niño-Zarazúa, 2016). The improvement of teacher leadership is in line with the quality of learning (Moller and Pankake, 2013). Teacher leadership is not a new concept and many research has been done on teacher leadership (Galland, 2008). Researchers have obtained results that teacher leadership is a very important factor in improving the quality of learning (Harris, 2013). Leadership is an important aspect to the school success (Hariri, 2011). Instructional leadership greatly influences the quality of school achievements(Hallinger, 2003). Instructional leadership is indispensable for teachers to achieve goals in the learning process (Gonzales and Lambert, 2014). The correlational

between leadership and quality learning enhanced student learning

This study is in three parts. First, it describes the methods, sample, instruments, data collection procedure. Second it presents the results and findings. Third it explains the conclusion and implication. The aim of this research is to answer the research question, “What is the relationship between the quality of learning and teacher leadership?”.

1. **Material And Method**

This quantitative study was held in eight public junior high schools in Bandar Lampung city, Lampung province, Indonesia. The total of 204 teachers were randomly selected among the eight representative public junior high schools.

**Study Design:** Quantitative study

**Study Location:** Eight public junior high schools in Bandar Lampung city, Lampung province, Indonesia.

**Study Duration:** December 2018 to February 2019

**Sample size:** 204 teachers.

**Sample size calculation:** The population of teachers of public junior high school teachers in the public schools in Bandar Lampung city, Lampung province were 1811. We used the confidence level of 95%.The sampling technique in this study used a random sampling technique that was taken from the population in a random and proportional way that were spread out. The sampling had two steps which were based on the location and the schools.The fisrt step was based on the location. There was a total of sixteen sub districts in Bandar Lampung city and randomly were taken eight sub districts, which were Rajabasa, Labuhan Ratu, Kemiling, Enggal, Tanjung Karang Pusat, Tanjung Karang Barat, Teluk Betung Selatan and Teluk Betung Utara. The second step was based on the schools in Bandar Lampung city. There were 37 public junior secondary schools in Bandar Lampung city. There was a school that was taken as a representative in every sub districts chosen, Finally,a sample of 204 teachers, out of 416 teachers, were chosen from the selected schools.

**Instruments**

 The instrument in this study used a questionnaire. The questionnaires consisted of twenty statements about the quality of learning and twenty statements about teacher leadership. The quality of learning includedfive factors, which weresuitability, attractiveness, effectiveness, efficiency and productivity of learning. Teacher leadership included six factors, which werecurriculum coordination, student progress monitor, instructional time maintenance, attendance maintenance, assessment provision to students and teacher professionalism development.The questionnaire was valued with the Likert scale that ranged from 1 to 5. The was a variety meaning of every range, 1 = strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3 = doubtful, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. The questionnairealso hadhigh results in validity and reliability. The results of validities for the quality of learning and teacher leadership ranged from 0.44 to 0.82. The reliability for the quality of learning was 0, 867 and teacher leadership was 0,925.

***Data collection procedure***

 The questionnaires were given to the principals during a monthly event for all principles of the public junior high school in Bandar Lampung city.The principals were advised to deliver it directly to their teachers. The teachers were advocated to answer the questionairre according to their own opinion and real condition in their school so the results could be consentaneous. The questionnaires were completed by 204 teachers (100% response rate) in eight schools in eight sub-districts of Bandar Lampung city, Lampung Province, Indonesia.Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 was used to analyze the data.

1. **Result and Discussion**

**Description of variables**

Table 1 reported the lowest score, the highest score, mean, median, modus, standard deviation and varians.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics for variables.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | **The quality of learning** | **Teacher leadership** |
| N | 204 | 204 |
| Lowest score | 41 | 40 |
| Highest score | 100 | 100 |
| Mean | 74,36 | 70,28 |
| Median | 75 | 70 |
| Modus | 70 | 70 |
| Standard deviation | 12,94 | 13,95 |
| Varians | 167,552 | 194,606 |

The lowest scores were 41 for the quality of learning and 40 for teacher leadership. The highest scores for both quality of learning and teacher leadership were 100. The mean for the quality of learning was 74,36 and 70,28 for teacher leadership. The median for the quality of learning was 75 and 70 for teacher leadership. The modus for both quality of learning and teacher leadership was 70. The standard deviation for the quality of learning was 12,94 and 13,9570 for teacher leadership. The varians for the quality of learning was 167,552 and 194,606 for teacher leadership.

These findings suggest: first, according to teachers’ perceptions, the quality of learning in public junior secondary schools in Lampung Province were higher than the teacher leadership. Second, the teachers’ perceptions of teacher leadership in public junior secondary schools in Lampung Province were also quite high. Finally, the teachers, in general, agrees that there was a significant relationship between the quality of learning andd teacher leadership in public junior secondary schools in Bandar Lampung city.

Analysis pre requisite tests can be divided into several types, namely normality test, heteroscedasticity test, multicollinearity test and linearity test (Sugiyono, 2010).

Table 2 reported the normality of the data using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.

**Table 2**.Normal Distribution Result

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | The quality of learning | Teacher Leadership |
| N | 204 | 204 |
| Normal Parametersa,b | Mean | 74.36 | 70.28 |
| Std. Deviation | 12.944 | 13.950 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .061 | .059 |
| Positive | .031 | .059 |
| Negative | -.061 | -.054 |
| Test Statistic | .061 | .059 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .065c | .084c |

Table 2 showed that the data were normally distributed because the values of the quality of learning and teacher leacher leadership were higher than 0,05.

 Heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether in the regression model inequalities occur from residuals, one observation to another observation (Sugiyono, 2010). One way to detect the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity is to look at the scatterplot graph below.



The result showed through the Scatterplot graph replied that it did not form a pattern, which means that the data was homogeneous.

To test multicollinearity, it can be done by looking at the VIF value of each independent variable. If the VIF value is <10, it can be concluded that data is free from multicollinearity. Table 3 showed the results of the multicollinearity test.

**Table 3.** Multicollinearity test

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Model | Collinearity Statistics |
| Tolerance | VIF |
|  | Teacher Leadership | ,975 | 1,025 |
|  |  |  |

The multicollinearity result of teacher leadership was 1,025 which is less than ten, menaning that the data is free from multicollinearity.

In the Linearity test, the hypothesis formulation was: Ho: regression model is non linear, Hi: linear regression model, with test criteria: reject Ho if the value of α from deviation from linearity in anova table is <0.05, in other cases Ho is accepted. Table 4 showed the result of the linearity test.

**Table 4.**Linearity test

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|  | Between Groups | (Combined) | 12055.353 | 56 | 215.274 | 1.441 | .043 |
| Linearity | 1498.608 | 1 | 1498.608 | 10.033 | .002 |
| Deviation from Linearity | 10556.745 | 55 | 191.941 | 1.285 | **.120** |
| Within Groups | 21957.804 | 147 | 149.373 |  |  |
| Total | 34013.157 | 203 |  |  |  |

 Significance values ​​in Table 4 showed deviation from linearity 0.120> 0.05 which meaned that Ho was rejected or that the regression model was linear.

 In the Signifancy test, the formulation of the hypothesis was Ho: the regression equation is not significant, Hi: the regression equation is significant, with the test criteria at a significant level of 0.05 is rejecting Ho if the value of tcount> 2, in other cases Ho is accepted. Table 5 showed the result of the significancy test.

**Table 5**. Significancy test

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | **60.675** | 4.573 |  | 13.268 | .000 |
| Teacher Leadership | .195 | .064 | .210 | **3.051** | .003 |

Teacher leadership obtained a value of tcount of 3.051> t table (3.202) of 1.972 and the value of α = 0.003 <0.05, thus Ho is rejected or concluded that the regression equation is significant.

The tendency of the relationshipof the quality of learning and teacher leadership can be reflected in the determinant coefficient values. Table 6 showed the determinant coefficient values.

**Table 6.** Determinant coefficient values

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .210a | .044 | .039 | 12.687 |
|  |

From Table 6, it is known that the value of R2 = 0.044. This means that the relationship between the quality of learning.and teacher leadership was significant.

1. **Conclusion**

 This paper examined the relationship between the quality of learning and teacher leadership, using survey data from a sample of 204 teachers in eight Bandar Lampung school sub-districts. This research was a quantitative study with an asosiative method. Data collection was conducted using a questionnaire with 204 teacher samples at 100% response rate. The hypotheses were tested using simple linear regression analysis through the t test to determine the relationship of the independent variable on the dependent variable at a confidence level of 95% (α = 0.05). The results showed that there was a significant relationship between the teacher leadership and the quality of learning, which implied that the higher of the teacher's leadership, the better quality of learning would be resulted. The lower the teacher's leadership, the worse quality of learning would be. These variables really had a positive and significant relationship.

**References**

1. Darling-Hammond, L. 2010. Performance Counts: Assessment Systems That Support High-Quality Learning. *Council of Chief State School Officers*.
2. Deming, W. E. 2018. *The new economics for industry, government, education*: MIT press.
3. Galland, C. 2008. *Effective teacher leadership: A quantitative study of the relationship between school structures and effective teacher leaders.* University of Missouri--Columbia.
4. Gonzales, S., and Lambert, L. 2014. Teacher leadership in professional development schools: Emerging conceptions, identities, and practices. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*(1), 6-24.
5. Hallinger, P. 2003. Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of education, 33*(3), 329-352.
6. Hariri, H. 2011. *Leadership styles, decision-making styles, and teacher job satisfaction: an Indonesian school context.* James Cook University.
7. Harris, A. 2013. Teacher leadership and school improvement *Effective leadership for school improvement* (pp. 82-93): Routledge.
8. Masino, S., and Niño-Zarazúa, M. 2016. What works to improve the quality of student learning in developing countries? *International Journal of Educational Development, 48*, 53-65.
9. Moller, G., and Pankake, A. 2013. *Lead with me: A principal's guide to teacher leadership*: Routledge.
10. Sallis, E. 2014. *Total quality management in education*: Routledge.
11. Solberg, V. S., Howard, K., Gresham, S., and Carter, E. 2012. Quality learning experiences, self-determination, and academic success: A path analytic study among youth with disabilities. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, 35*(2), 85-96.
12. Sugiyono, P. D. 2010. *Educational Research Method. Quantitative Approach.*

Titiek Wulandari. “The Relationship between Teacher Leadership and Learning Quality in Indonesia." IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME) , vol. 9, no. 3, 2019, pp. 01-05.