Principal´s time management: agenda priorities and challenges for school leaders

Autoría: Romero, Claudia; Krichesky, Gabriela

Fecha de publicación: Abril 2024

¿Cómo citar este trabajo?

Biblioteca Di Tella

UNIVERSIDAD
TORCUATO DI TELLA
Escuela de Gobierno

Escuela de Gobierno

Documentos de Trabajo 2024/02

Principal´s time management

Agenda priorities and challenges for school leaders

Claudia Romero

Gabriela Krichesky

Mayo 2024

Principal´s time management: agenda priorities and challenges for school leaders

Claudia Romero

Gabriela Krichesky

Universidad Torcuato Di Tella

Abril 2024

Abstract: During the past years, the responsibilities, job intensification and workload of school principals have increased. Since school leadership is a key factor for improving learning, in this study we seek to understand which practices prioritize school principals in the City of Buenos Aires, Argentina. By employing a quantitative approach, TALIS 2018 questionnaire was administered to a representative sample composed by 296 principals from both primary and secondary schools from the City of Buenos Aires. These principals dedicate the largest amount of time in administrative tasks, whereas the second dimension with the greatest preponderance in their agendas is related to interpersonal interactions with non-teaching members of the community, leaving scarce time for pedagogical practices. Relevant outcomes were found in this research. Principals´ agendas do not seem to arise from planned decisions towards leadership for learning, but from a reactive trait related to bureaucratic urgency and obligations, which does not constitute a good perspective for school improvement.

Introduction

Over the last decade, studies on educational leadership have shown that job responsibilities and workload have increased for school principals, as their tasks have gained more complexity and volume (Pollock, Wang and Hauseman, 2015). Factors that increment this workload can be related to unplanned work (Oplatka, 2017), new education reforms (Miller, 2015), mandatory implementation of practices through legal tasks and guidelines (Klocko and Wells, 2015) and intensive use of information technologies for communication and management (Pollock and Hauseman, 2019).

The pandemic has reinforced this tendency (Harris, 2020; Stone-Johnson and Weiner, 2020) since school principals were at the forefront of organizational, pedagogical and community strategies, which made their role even more exposed to intense frictions in an unprecedented adaptive effort (Romero, Zullo and Covos, 2023). Although school principals are confronting more multiple, complex and varied functions, specialized training is not always guaranteed, particularly in Latin America, to meet these purposes (Weinstein, Muñoz and Hernandez, 2014). The complexity of the principal's role, coupled with reform demands, lack of necessary preparation, and frequent struggles to prioritize and delegate tasks, results in increased demands of time and the need for quicker decision-making (Wang, Pollock and Hauseman, 2022), which calls for a much needed understanding of how they cope with time management and professional agendas.

Therefore, in this research, we aim to comprehend which practices are prioritized by school principals in the City of Buenos Aires (CABA), Argentina, by analysing how they distribute their time, based on the results obtained from TALIS 2018 (Teaching and Learning International Survey), an international assessment conducted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and

Development (OECD), where teachers and principals provide information about their leadership practices and school climate (Veletic and Olsen, 2021).

Theoretical Framework

School leaders are crucial for ensuring educational quality (Leithwood, Harris and Hopkins, 2019) as they manage improvement efforts (Pont, 2020), contribute to effective teaching (Ting y Chuang, 2024), optimize learning outcomes (Robinson and Gray, 2019), and promote educational equity and justice (Ryan, 2016; Shaked, 2023). Principals can enhance teaching through pedagogical leadership (Bolívar, 2019) while developing organisational learning to empower students and teachers towards equity and effectiveness (Bolívar and Murillo, 2017).

Furthermore, school leadership can indirectly impact teaching improvement by influencing both school and classroom climates, two factors that highly affect student learning outcomes (Allen, Grigsby and Peters, 2015). According to the National School Climate Council (2007) schools with positive climates

> (…) include norms, values, and expectations that support people feeling socially, emotionally and physically safe. People are engaged and respected. Students, families and educators work together to develop, live, and contribute to a shared school vision. Educators model and nurture an attitude that emphasises the benefits of, and satisfaction from, learning. Each person contributes to the operations of the school as well as the care of the physical environment (p. 4)

Likewise, diverse school climate definitions comprise students', school staff, and families' perceptions and experiences of school life in terms of social, civic, pedagogical, emotional, ethical and academic aspects (Thapa, Cohen, Guffeya and Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). In this sense,

these authors signal that a positive school climate is also usually associated with collective and shared responsibility over students´ results, cooperative learning, group cohesion, respect and mutual trust among teachers and students. Thus, positive school climates can influence the perception and behaviour of all community members so as to produce a sense of belonging and well-being.

Several decades ago relevant studies on the subject have also supported the idea that a positive school climate can actually promote students' abilities to learn by offering and enduring safe environments (Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy, Hannum and Tschannen-Moran, 1998), where leadership practices are directed towards the development of a culture of trust, support and collegiality (Day, Sammons and Gorgen, 2020). Thus, school leaders are especially responsible for defining a set of values, objectives and expectations that shape a healthy environment for teaching and learning. As Huang and Benoliel (2023) note, after examining how Singapore principals distribute their time across 13 leadership activities, school principals can strategically use their time for improving student outcomes through developing a positive school climate towards teaching and learning.

To achieve these positive climates school leaders can, for instance, create healthy organisational conditions within a culture of high expectations for both teachers and students (Hallinger, 2014). Also, principals can provide supportive structures to enhance shared leadership for teachers in order to strengthen professional learning communities within schools (Carpenter, 2015). Principals can additionally help different school members to achieve various organisational goals by exercising influence on them (Smith, Escobedo and Kearney, 2020).

Particularly, research aimed at exploring how principals can effectively foster positive school climate has focused on interactions between teachers and principals (Price, 2012), due to the fact that this relationship influences teachers' professional satisfaction and commitment (Price,

2015). Indeed, these social interactions are essential for generating effective learning climates (Price and Moolenaar, 2015), by fostering cooperative, respectful, and supportive environments that encourage potent pedagogical interactions to strengthen teaching practice (Fullan, 2014). In other words, principals do not only need to spend time managing teachers and professional teams, but also have to prioritise the well-being of teacher staff (Gorrell and De Nobile, 2023) in order to improve school climates and teaching practices.

Since leadership is a crucial factor for improving learning outcomes through indirect actions, such as building healthy climates for students and teachers, investigating how school principals allocate their time becomes a critical issue for educational systems (Romero and Krichesky, 2018). According to Grissom, Loeb and Master (2013) the time principals spend in teacher coaching or supervision, as well as developing the school's educational program, can predict positive achievement results. However, the amount of time dedicated to informal classroom walkthroughs negatively predicts student growth, particularly in high schools. Apparently, this happens because principals do not necessarily use those walkthroughs as part of a broader school improvement strategy.

Moreover, research shows that principals with better time management skills allocate more time in classrooms and in managing instruction in their schools while they spend less time on interpersonal relationship-building (Grissom, Loeb and Mitani, 2015). Authors also find strong evidence in this research that associates time management skills with lower principal job stress. In relation to the time dedicated by principals with teachers and other school stakeholders, a mixed methods study that collected data from five principals during 28 consecutive days, found that principals interacted with educational stakeholders most often while teachers provided instruction to students. When working alone, however, principals frequently identified their activity as a managerial task, as well as when interacting with district members or students (Hochbein Mayger

and   Dever,   2020).

Similar results were displayed by Pollock and Wang (2021) using a sample of principals from Ontario School´s English Language public system. In this particular study, school leaders declared to spend almost half of their time in their offices or in the Vice Principals´ office, while management chores rounded up to almost a third of their time. Another interesting finding from this research notes how current modes of communication (meetings, email and phone) affect their daily agendas. They stress how reading, writing and sending emails has become a somehow new "time consuming form of communication" for principals that can extend and disturb their workdays and even weekends (Hochbein, 2020). Likewise, a study carried out in three private schools in Dubai found that administrative tasks and parent inquiries, among others, were the most time-consuming tasks expected of principals that ensured success of their educational institutions (Abdallah and Forawi   2017).

Lastly, some studies have explored how principals exercise their leadership by using data from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). Specifically, in the past years research has focused for example on the relationship between school leadership and school culture through principals' voices (Taajamo, Jäppinen and Nissinen, 2023), on the relationship between distributed leadership and principal instructional leadership (Xia and O´Shea, 2023), while others sought to understand how school principals allocate their time in relation to the learning climate of their schools (Romero and Krichesky, 2018). The increasing interest in school leadership is in fact recognized by the TALIS 2018 study, where richer measures for school environment can be found in both the school and teacher questionnaires (Ainley and Carstens, 2018), providing better coverage to reflect the recent trends and innovations in research on school leadership (Veletic and Olsen, 2021).

Method

This study aims to comprehend how school principals from the City of Buenos Aires (Argentina) prioritise leadership practices, by analysing how they allocate their time in relation to their context. We are interested in investigating the connection between the use of time in the principal's agenda and its impact on the school climate, while also establishing comparisons with countries in the OECD and Latin America (LA), by using the TALIS 2018 questionnaire for principals.

TALIS examines time distribution in principals' schedules across six types of activities: (1) administrative and leadership tasks and meetings, (2) curriculum and teaching-related tasks and meetings, (3) interactions with students, (4) activities involving parents and tutor interactions, (5) interactions with the local and regional community, businesses, and industries, and (6) other activities. In 2018, the City of Buenos Aires (CABA), participated in TALIS for the first time with a representative sample of both public and private primary and secondary schools. This questionnaire was administered to a representative sample of schools comprising 175 primary school principals and 121 secondary school principals.

As a stratified probabilistic sample, schools were randomly selected while controlling for variables such as management sector, size and socioeconomic level of each school's population. In this research we aim to identify, using a quantitative methodology, agenda priorities and time allocation patterns of participating school principals. We therefore focused on items related to leadership and school climate within the questionnaire.

Context

Argentina is a federal country in which all educational services depend on each subnational jurisdiction or province. Most students attend public schools (70%), which are free of charge and

where teachers are designated, whereas 30% of students attend private schools where families pay a monthly fee and where all personnel are hired privately. The City of Buenos Aires has the largest proportion of students attending private schools, approaching almost 50%.

The functions of school leaders in Argentina are defined in school regulations. In the City of Buenos Aires principals are considered teachers in the highest hierarchical scale who have the responsibility to represent and lead the school taking into account educational policy, valid regulations and the Institutional Project. Generally, a large number of functions are assigned to principals, up to 65 in some cases. Most of these regulations include pedagogical, administrative and social or community functions.

In Argentina 83% of principals are women; this number represents one of the highest percentages in the region. At high school level, women comprise 62% of principals. The average age is 47.5 years, which is higher than the average in Latin America (44 years). Principals spend approximately 17 years working as teachers before becoming principals. More than half of them (57.4%) hold their position and 84.1% possess a higher-level degree (Weinstein, Muñoz and Hernández, 2014).

Results

In this sample, the majority of managers are women (60.7%), while the TALIS average of female directors is 48.9%. Regarding the average age of CABA, an average age of 52.4 years is recorded, which is close to the average age in TALIS (51.4 years). As for the time that school leaders remain in their positions at the same institution, we found that in this sample principals remain in office for an average of 6 years, very similar to the TALIS average (6.5 years). However, there are considerable differences between public and private schools. Directors remain an average of 7.51

years in private organisations, while in public ones this number is reduced to an average of 2.93 years.

The average for OECD and other Latin American countries show that school principals state that they spend the greatest amount of time on administrative tasks (Table 1). Likewise, there is an increase in the amount of time dedicated to these tasks, when comparing the results from TALIS 2013, not only in CABA but also internationally. The OECD average went from 41% in 2013 to 46.75% in 2018, for example, it grew almost 6 points. On the other hand, in CABA this increase rounds up to 13%. In the latter case, this phenomenon occurs both in public and private schools.

Table 1
Use of Time

Time percentage dedicated to:	OECD	CABA	BRAZIL	CHILE	COLOMBIA	MEXICO
Administrative and leadership tasks and meetings	46,75	39,56	38,52	44,27	50,93	45,02
Curriculum and teaching-related tasks and meetings	17,39	19,04	17,03	19,87	16,21	17,78
Interactions with students	15,3	19,61	19,36	16,52	12,35	17,23
Activities involving parents and tutor interactions	10,58	14,67	13,56	11,88	10,44	12,83
Interactions with local and regional community, business and industry	5,78	5,11	7,78	5,05	7,51	5,43

| Other activities | 4,2 | 2,01 | 3,75 | 2,41 | 2,56 | 1,71 |

The second most prevalent dimensions in principals' agenda are interpersonal interactions. The time devoted by CABA principals in interacting with students surpasses the time spent on curriculum and teaching-related tasks, in contrast to the OECD average, which shows opposite priorities. In fact, school leaders in CABA have indicated dedicating nearly 40% of their time to interacting with non-teaching members of the school community (students, parents, local community, and others), whereas the OECD average for this is 31.6%. Compared to Latin American countries, CABA principals allocate more time in interacting with students and families than Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Brazil. The latter has similar but lower percentages.

In CABA, principals working in private institutions tend to prioritise pedagogical tasks related to the curriculum and meetings with teachers (20.7%) more than those in public schools (14.5%). On the other hand, 34.7% of CABA principals report observing classes frequently or very frequently, a figure well below the OECD average (60.48%) and that of Latin America (see Table 2).

Table 2
Classroom observation

Percentage of principals that responded:	OECD	CABA	BRASIL	MEXICO	CHILE	COLOMBIA	CABA Private schools	CABA Public schools
Never	4,94	7,96	7,04	2,06	2,09	10,09	3,72	17,95
Occasionally	34,56	57,35	38,12	41,68	35,3	42,27	60,87	49,81
Frequently	42,44	30,54	40,91	39,58	43,19	27,33	31,67	26,93

| Very frequently | 18,04 | 4,13 | 13,91 | 16,66 | 19,4 | 20,29 | 3,72 | 5,3 |

Lastly, an intriguing finding relates to the experience of stress. For principals, the three most frequently mentioned sources of stress are having excessive administrative work, assuming additional responsibilities due to teacher absenteeism, and addressing concerns from parents or guardians (OECD, 2020).

Discussion

As whereas socio-demographic characteristics of principals are concerned, CABA´s sample demonstrates a majority of women, exceeding the OECD proportion and aligned with the feminization of the sector in Argentina (Romero and Krichesky, 2019). Principals in CABA are older than the OECD average and remain in their positions relatively briefly, especially in public schools where the average tenure is below three years. In CABA, as well as in other provinces in Argentina, principals are forced to develop a very long career path to attain this hierarchic position, which is based on seniority within the teaching profession. Besides, there are very low incentives to pursue   the   role.

Regarding the use of time, several findings can be identified in this study. First, greater administrative workload has been observed both locally and internationally, which can be linked to educational system reforms that have taken place over the last decades, relying on school leaders as key figures for their management. In the case of CABA, where this increase doubles the international rise, the project "Escuelas del Futuro" (Future Schools) can account for this matter, a jurisdictional reform outlined by the Ministry of Education for secondary schools, which involves substantial   curricular   and   administrative   transformations.

Secondly, a significant amount of time (almost 40%) is dedicated to interactions with non-teaching members in this sample, which is consistent with the findings of a previous study that identified an "interactive leadership" approach in a non-representative sample of secondary school principals (Romero and Krichesky, 2018). This phenomenon might be related to circumstances concerning school climate, as these interactions could be attempts to address conviviality problems in turbulent school environments noted in TALIS and other assessments like PISA (Romero and Krichesky,   2018).

While the contents of these interactions are not specified, results from TALIS 2018 shows persistent perceptions of challenging classroom climates in CABA: 52% of primary school teachers and 37.4% of secondary school teachers indicate that they are forced to wait a long time before starting class until students settle down, and 49% of primary school teachers and 35% of secondary school teachers consider that they lose a significant amount of class time due to disruptions (OECD, 2020), for instance. According to PISA 2018 data, significant problems persist within classroom and school climates in CABA. Over half of secondary school students report some noise and disorder in classes, 39.6% additionally indicate that in some classes students cannot work well, and 36% state they were absent from school at least once in the two weeks preceding the test, with 68% of these students being absent once or twice (Arena, Cetrángolo, Curcio and Kit, 2019).

Clearly, principals are sensitive to organisational contexts and problems, and therefore leaders in schools with negative environments may be more demanded to address issues related to school climate such as discipline, conflicts among stakeholders or students' regard for each other, among others (Lee and Hallinger, 2012). This might be the reason why principals spend a significant part of their school agendas´ in these interactions, considering that school leadership usually involves social interaction and requires leaders to navigate the complex relationships between teachers,   parents,   students,   and   external   stakeholders.

However, the high demand for social interaction can lead to emotional exhaustion in principals without sufficient skills (Wang, Pollock and Hauseman, 2022), and it doesn't inherently guarantee the required academic climate for a more relevant and equitable educational programme. In fact, as a consequence of the last pandemic, principals are nowadays even more concerned with helping their staff to deal with their emotions so that teachers can be effective in the classroom with their students (Oplatka and Crawford, 2022).

While dedication to pedagogical tasks in CABA´s sample is close to the OECD and Latin America averages, there is a marked difference in terms of time spent on classroom observation, which is even scarcer in public schools. This calls for further research to identify the nature of these other pedagogical tasks. It is evident that the focus of principals' agendas is not on pedagogical aspects. What motivates this time allocation? What consequences and challenges does it pose for the development of tasks related to leadership for learning? Further research could be carried out on this matter.

The emphasis on administrative tasks and interactions with "non-teaching" members could be motivated by external pressures, whether from educational administration or policies, as well as from internal school contexts. These imposed demands can be aimed at settling down complicated circumstances or emotionally supporting students and families. Considering these results, principals´ use of time can be somehow described as administration-bound, spontaneous and fragmented (Huang, Hochbein and Simons, 2020), while trying to resolve critical school conditions. On the other hand, the pedagogical dimension is relegated in the principal's agenda, perhaps because there are no clear incentives to address it, and there are no rewards or penalties based on learning outcomes. While the effects of low learning quality are deferred over time, the consequences of not addressing administrative issues or contextual situations are immediate, profound and serious.

Though our sample is exclusively composed by principals from Buenos Aires, the country's

capital, most of the working conditions and regulations that affect their jobs do not vary substantially within different districts in Argentina (Romero and Krichesky, 2019). In this sense, the way school leaders distribute their time might show similar patterns all over the country. However, further research could be aimed at deepening our comprehension of subtle variations in school leadership practices by comparing varied regions or provinces.

Even though the results hereby obtained match findings from similar - and far more ambitious - studies, this research comprises other limitations. Firstly, further consideration of external and compulsory time demands should be addressed in research, in order to deeply understand how principals distribute their time (Hochbein and Meyers, 2021). Secondly, it would be also interesting to complement our knowledge on school principals´ use of time by adopting qualitative methodologies and techniques.

Given that Argentina lacks quality standards or frameworks for regulating "effective leadership," for instance, it appears that principals' agendas do not stem from planned decisions of learning-focused leadership, but rather from reactive leadership towards urgent conflicts or bureaucratic obligations. This does not foster solid school improvement initiatives. Even if principals´ preparation programmes started addressing skills related to time management as Grissom and others (2015) suggest, policy regulations and educational reforms should also contemplate the context in which principals develop their work. Particularly, since interpersonal communication and job satisfaction, for example, significantly influence principal's performance (Tampubolon and Hamonangan, 2023). In this sense, principals´professional development programmes should also focus on intra and interpersonal skills in order to help school leaders respond and interact with diverse stakeholders (Day and Taneva, 2023).

In this sense, Kouali (2017) states that school principals must learn and develop different leadership styles, such as transformational or transactional leadership, so that they are able to modify

their leadership behaviour according to the situation, and to the demands and needs received from their teachers and other stakeholders. This flexibilty will allow leaders to respond accordingly and also influence their internal and external contexts, thus conducting a context-responsive leadership practice (Brauckmann and Pashiardis, 2022). Principals´ development initiatives should be aimed at that, while school regulations offer new possibilities for leaders to increase the level of teachers' satisfaction so that they can become more effective in their teaching. Constructing pedagogical leadership focused on learning in turbulent scenarios still remains a significant challenge and should be urgently addressed in order to achieve sustainable school improvement.

References

Abdallah, L., & Forawi, S. (2017). Investigating leadership styles and their impact on the success of educational institutions. *The International Journal of Educational Organization and Leadership, 24*(2), 19–30. doi:10.18848/2329-1656/CGP/v24i02/19-30

Ainley, J., & Carstens, R. (2018). *Teaching and learning international survey (TALIS) 2018. Conceptual framework*. OECD Education Working Papers, 187. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/799337c2-en

Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. (2015). Does leadership matter? Examining the relationship among transformational leadership, school climate, and student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 10*(2), 1–22.

Arena, E., Cetrángolo, O., Curcio, J., & Kit, I. (2019). *Argentina en PISA 2018 Informe de resultados*. Ministerio de Educación, Cultura, Ciencia y Tecnología de la Nación.

Bolívar, A. (2019). *Una dirección escolar con capacidad de liderazgo pedagógico*. Madrid: La Muralla.

Bolívar, A., & Murillo, F. J. (2017). El efecto escuela: Un reto de liderazgo para el aprendizaje y la equidad. In J. Weinstein & G. Muñoz (Eds.), *Mejoramiento y Liderazgo en la Escuela. Once Miradas* (pp. 71–112). Centro de Desarrollo del Liderazgo Educativo (CEDLE).

Brauckmann-Sajkiewicz, S., & Pashiardis, P. (2022). Context-responsive leadership. In *Encyclopedia of teacher education* (pp. 1–5). Singapore: Springer.

Carpenter, D. (2015). School culture and leadership of professional learning communities. *International Journal of Educational Management, 29*(5), 682–694. doi: 0.1108/IJEM-04-2014-0046

Day, Ch. & Taneva, S. (2023). Leadership of School Trusts in England During the Pandemic, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, doi: 10.1080/15700763.2023.2282538

Day, C., Sammons, P., & Gorgen, K. (2020). *Successful School Leadership. Education Development Trust*, University of Nottingham.

Fullan, M. (2014). *The Principal. Three Keys to Maximizing Impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gorrell, A. and De Nobile, J. (2023). The well-being of Australian primary school principals: A study of the key concerns. *International Journal of Educational Management.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-01-2023-0039

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S. and Master, B. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. *Educational Researcher, 42*(8), 433–444. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X13510020

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S. and Mitani, H. (2015). Principal time management skills: Explaining patterns in principals' time use, job stress, and perceived effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Administration, 53*(6), 773–793. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2014-0117

Hallinger, P. (2014). Reviewing reviews of research in educational leadership: An empirical assessment. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 50*(4), 539–576. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13506594

Hauseman, C., Pollock, K., & Wang, F. (2017). Inconvenient, but essential: Impact and influence of school-community involvement on principals' work and workload. *School Community Journal, 27*(1), 83–105.

Harris, A. (2020). Covid-19 - School Leadership in Crisis*? Journal of Professional Capital and Community, 5*(3/4), 321–326. doi:10.1108/JPCC-06-2020-0045

Hochbein, C. (2020). You've got email. *Educational Leadership, 77*, 42–45.

Hochbein, C., Mayger, L., & Dever, B. (2020). Examining the time principal dedicated to interacting with teachers and other educational stakeholders. In *Exploring Principal Development and Teacher Outcomes* (pp. 71–85). Routledge, New York.

Hochbein, C., & Meyers, C. (2021). Incorporating time demands into studies of principal time use. *School Leadership & Management, 41*(3), 175–193. doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1851671

Hoy, W. K., Hannum, J., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). Organizational climate and student achievement: A parsimonious and longitudinal view. *Journal of School Leadership, 8*, 336–359.

Hoy, W., Tarter, J. C., & Kottkamp, R. (1991). *Open School/Healthy Schools: Measuring Organizational Climate*. London: Sage.

Huang, T., & Benoliel, P. (2023). Principal time use and student academic achievement in Singapore. *International Journal of Educational Management*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2023-0427

Huang, T., Hochbein, C., & Simons, J. (2020). The relationship among school contexts, principal time use, school climate, and student achievement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 48*(2), 305–323. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218802595

Klocko, B., & Wells, C. (2015). Workload pressures of principals: A focus on renewal, support, and mindfulness. *NASSP Bulletin, 99*(4), 332–355. doi:10.1177/0192636515619727

Kouali, G. (2017). The instructional practice of school principals and its effect on teachers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management, 31*(7), 958–972. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2016-0253

Lee, M., & Hallinger, P. (2012). National contexts influencing principals, time use and allocation: Economic development, societal culture, and educational system. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 23*(4), 461–482.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2019). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership and Management, 40*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.159607

Miller, P. (2015). Leading remotely: Exploring the experiences of principals in rural and remote school communities in Jamaica. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 11*(1), 35–53.

National School Climate Council. (2007). *The School Climate Challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy, practice guidelines and teacher education policy*. Retrieved from http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/advocacy.php

OECD. (2019). Talis 2018 Results (Volume 1): *Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/talis-2018-results-volume-i_1d0bc92a-en#page77

OECD. (2020). *Volume II: Teachers and School Leaders as Valued Professionals*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/education/talis-2018-results-volume-ii-19cf08df-en.htm

Oplatka, I. (2017). Principal workload: Components, determinants and coping strategies in an era of standardisation and accountability. *Journal of Educational Administration, 55*(5), 552–568.

Oplatka, I., & Crawford, M. (2022). Principal, let's talk about emotions: Some lessons COVID-19 taught us about emergency situations and leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 25*(1), 162–172. doi:10.1080/13603124.2021.2014981

Pollock, K., Hauseman, C., & Wang, F. (2015). Complexity and volume: An inquiry into factors that drive principals' work. *Societies, 5*(2), 537–565. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc5020537

Pollock, K., & Hauseman, C. (2019). The use of e-mail and principals' work: A double-edged sword. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 18*(3), 382–393. doi:10.1080/15700763.2017.1398338

Pollock, K., & Wang, F. (2021). How principals use their time in Ontario, Canada. In M. Lee, K. Pollock, & P. Tulowitzki (Eds.), *How School Principals Use Their Time: Implications for School Improvement, Administration and Leadership* (pp. 95–113). New York: Routledge.

Pont, B. (2020). A literature review of school leadership policy reforms. *European Journal of Education, 55*, 154–168. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12398

Price, H. (2015). Principals' social interactions with teachers: How principal-teacher social relations correlate with teachers' perceptions of student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration, 53*(1), 116–139. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2014-0023

Price, H. (2012). School principal-staff relationship effects on school climate. In Y. Wubbels, D. Brok, P. Tartwijk, J. V. and J. Levy (Eds.), *Interpersonal Relationships in Education* (pp. 103–118). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Price, H., & Moolenaar, N. (2015). Principal-teacher relationships: Foregrounding the international importance of principals' social relationships for school learning climates. *Journal of Educational Administration, 1*. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-11-2014-0134

Robinson, V. & Gray, E. (2019). What difference does school leadership make to student outcomes? *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, *49*(2), 171-187.

Romero, C., & Krichesky, G. (2019). El director escolar en Argentina: Un actor clave pero (aún) invisible. Un estudio sobre las normas, condiciones laborales y formación de los directores escolares de escuelas públicas. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*, 12–12. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3576

Romero, C., & Krichesky, G. (2018). Interactive leadership in turbulent school climates. An exploratory study of high school principals from the City of Buenos Aires. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46*(2), 339–354. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217720456

Romero, C., Zullo, F., & Covos, M. (2023). School Leadership in Argentina during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Emotions, Tensions and Policy Challenges for the Future. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2023.2192779

Ryan, J. (2016). Un liderazgo inclusivo para las escuelas. In J. Weinstein (Ed.), *Liderazgo educativo en la escuela. Nueve miradas (*pp. 177–204). Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Universidad Diego Portales.

Shaked, H. (2023). How Social Justice Leadership Complements Instructional Leadership, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, doi: 10.1080/15700763.2023.2282534

Smith, P., Escobedo, P., & Kearney, S. (2020). Principal influence: A catalyst for positive school climate. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership, 16*(5), 1–16.

Stone-Johnson, C., & Weiner, J. (2020). Principal professionalism in the time of Covid-19. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community, 5*(3–4), 367–374. https://doi:10.1108/JPCC-05-2020-0020

Taajamo, M., Jäppinen, A. K., & Nissinen, K. (2023). Understanding the essential elements of school culture in global contexts: Exploring the TALIS 2018 data on school principals. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–25.

Tampubolon, T. C., & Tambunan, H. (2023). Effects of Knowledge Management, Interpersonal Communication, Sensemaking, and Job Satisfaction on Elementary School Principals' Job Performance in Indonesia. *The International Journal of Educational Organization and Leadership, 30*(1), 59–75. doi:10.18848/2329-1656/CGP/v30i01/59-75.

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(3), 357–385.

Ting. Y. & Chuang, N. (2024) Exploring the Relationship Between Principal Positive Instructional Supervision and Teacher Teaching Effectiveness: A Cross-Sectional Study in Taiwan, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, doi: 10.1080/15700763.2024.2324036

Veletić, J., & Olsen, R. (2021). Exploring school leadership profiles across the world: A cluster analysis approach to TALIS 2018. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.1953612

Wang, F., Pollock, K., & Hauseman, C. (2022). Time demands and emotionally draining situations amid work intensification of school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 59*(1), 112–142. https://doi.org/0013161X221132837

Weinstein, J., Muñoz, G., & Hernandez, M. (2014). *El liderazgo escolar en América Latina y el Caribe. Un estado del arte con base en ocho sistemas escolares de la región*. Santiago de Chile: ORALC/UNESCO.

Xia, J., & O'Shea, C. (2023). To what extent does distributed leadership support principal instructional leadership? Evidence from TALIS 2013 data. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *22*(4), 965-991.

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

Word count: 5336