

Effect of Instructional Leadership Practices on Teachers' Performance at the University Level

Muhammad Tanveer¹ Khadija Sittar² Sumaira Munawar³



Abstract: *The study's goal was to investigate how university-level teachers' performance was impacted by instructional leadership practices. The nature of the investigation was quantitative. The study's population comprised all 83 academic members in the humanities and social sciences. Lahore Leads University. Census sampling aims to collect information from every individual or element within the population, as the total number of faculty members was only 77. The researcher developed the questionnaire. After the demographic information, the questionnaire consisted of two parts; the first part of the questionnaire related to instructional leadership, and the second part related to Teachers' performance. The data was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Sciences). Inferential statistics were used to calculate the data. The independent samples t-test was utilized to ascertain whether there was a significant difference between the demographic variables, and one-way ANOVA was utilized to investigate the differences between them in inferential statistics.*

Key Words: Instructional Leadership, Teachers Performance, University Level, Education, Lahore Leads University

Introduction

The technical heart of educational institutions, teaching, and learning, is the only emphasis of instructional leadership (IL), a component of educational leadership. By concentrating on teachers' work, instructional leaders are accomplishing this. According to Lyonga (2018), IL is when a leader uses a variety of management tools to help students accomplish the targeted outcome. In addition to communicating expectations and goals, instructional leaders also keep their organizations' learning environments favorable in order to increase instructor dedication and output (Robinson & Gray, 2019). They accomplish this by firing ineffective teachers and solely employing, promoting, and keeping excellent ones (Limon & Nartgun, 2020) by taking part in their training and growth and exhibiting their own dedication to the field. In addition to supervising all policies and the teaching and learning process, an instructional leader also expertly manages resources, provides enlightening feedback, and develops programs to help teachers grow in their careers, adopt and operate innovative programs and technologies, and sustain a positive and productive work environment.

Blase and Blase (2000) recognized specific IL behaviors, such as offering a roadmap, monitoring policies, supplying tools, giving feedback, creating opportunities, promoting professional growth, and valuing the teaching and learning process. Thus, the literature illustrates how IL influences the teaching and learning process through teacher collaboration and development. Employment performance explains a person's effectiveness in a certain task and employment. It is linked to the amount of energy a worker uses to do the task at hand, which defines his behavior. Encourage employees to expend more energy in

¹ PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

✉ tanveerpdana@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

✉ drkhadijasittar@leads.edu.pk

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

✉ drsumaira.edu@leads.edu.pk

• **Corresponding Author:** Khadija Sittar (✉ drkhadijasittar@leads.edu.pk)

• **To Cite:** Tanveer, M., Sittar, K., Munawar, S. (2025). Effect of Instructional Leadership Practices on Teachers Performance at University Level. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 282–289. <https://doi.org/10.55737/qjss.vi-i.25315>

order to mold their behavior in a way that will determine their overall job performance (Mitchell, Ortiz, & Mitchell, 1987). One of the key determinants of the overall development of an educational institution is the performance of its teachers. Teachers are the foundation of any organization, and their work is essential to reaching its objectives (Akande, 2014).

The effectiveness of an educational institution's professors is one of the main factors that determines its overall progress. Any organization's cornerstone is its teachers, and achieving its goals depends on their efforts (Akande 2014).

In their research, Demitras and Karaca (2020) found that position ambiguity has a detrimental impact on job performance and that employees' performance rises to high levels when they support the organization's mission. Demitras and Karaca (2020) examined the impact of IL on the productivity of secondary school instructors. They discovered that teachers' effectiveness was impacted by the behaviors of instructional leaders. Similarly, Sungu et al. (2014) discovered that the work satisfaction and enactment of school teachers were significantly impacted by instructional supervisory actions. According to his research, role ambiguity has a detrimental effect on job performance, and when employees support the organization's mission, their performance soars.

Demitras and Karaca (2020) looked at how IL affected secondary school teachers' productivity. They found that instructional leaders' actions had an impact on instructors' performance. Similarly, instructional supervisory behaviors had a substantial impact on school instructors' job satisfaction and enactment. Additionally, it was found that school principals organize and implement programs for the development of pedagogical abilities and subject knowledge in addition to being aware of the professional development needs of their teachers (Saleem et al., 2020). The Latin term "commitment," which comes from the word "committee," refers to a combination of an individual's beliefs and activities that he has committed to, such as the existence of a group of people who are resolved to complete a goal. According to Meyer (2001), commitment is an individual's action toward specific tasks and institutionally determined goals.

The study confirmed the previous conclusions and found a strong and positive relationship between teachers' commitment and IL behaviors, namely the identification and internalization dimensions. Similar findings were reached by Mannan (2017); they discovered a significant positive relationship between the IL behaviors of female principals and the commitment of instructors. The necessity of the current study was brought up in light of the effects that IL behaviors have on teachers' dedication and output. A conceptual framework was created in order to test these theories. Conceptual Structure of the Research Methods Using a convenient sampling technique, a sample of twelve universities in Lahore, six private and six public, was chosen, and information was gathered from 60 faculty members, including 30 instructors from private universities (25 men and 5 women) and 30 instructors from public universities (23 men and 7 women). The 35-item research instrument, which uses a 4-point Likert scale, was modified to meet the needs of the study. It includes measures to gauge teachers' commitment, instructional leadership (IL), and performance.

According to Kennedy (2016) and Whitworth & Chiu (2015), educators have a significant impact on how our society develops in the future. Their duties include teaching, developing critical thinking abilities, and encouraging a passion for learning in their pupils. Teachers must, however, engage in ongoing professional development in order to fulfill their duties (Khan, 2012). Professional development programs assist educators in improving their teaching methods, staying current with the most recent developments in education, and achieving successful student results (Khan, 2012). Principals have a crucial role as instructional leaders and facilitators in this ever-changing educational environment, helping teachers advance their careers and promoting constructive school reform (Wardhana, 2016). A variety of programs and activities are included in professional development for teachers with the goal of improving their abilities, expertise, and teaching methods. Teachers can become acquainted with the changing demands of their students and the shifting educational scene through this continuous process (Wardhana, 2016). Teachers can collaborate, reflect, and participate in meaningful learning experiences through effective professional development programs.



Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions Of Instructional Leadership Practice

According to Kennedy (2016) and Whitworth & Chiu (2015), in favor of this opinion, there is no single documented case of a school successfully turning around its pupil achievement trajectory in the absence of talented leadership. In order to prevent teachers from feeling alone and abandoned, they believe that principals ought to be present in both the school and the classroom. Teachers' performance and morale are improved when they believe they are collaborating with the principal. The administrator who sets an example for what should be done in the classroom is always welcomed by the teachers, but the one who gives them instructions is not always appreciated. Principals' and teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership practice were shown to be inconsistent by Wardhana (2016). Although instructors would feel at ease with the principal's obvious presence in the classroom, principals must possess certain abilities in order to carry out this responsibility. It has been demonstrated by the effective school's study domain that principals are not always equipped with these abilities. Additionally, some principals continue to hold onto their traditional management positions, while others view themselves as school managers rather than instructional leaders.

Historical Context AND Models of Instructional Leadership

The concept's origins in the field of education and its influence on the shift of the principal's responsibilities from manager and school administrator to instructional leader—which eventually encompasses all of the instructors in a school—are part of the historical backdrop of instructional leadership. The idea of instructional leadership first surfaced as a way to boost school performance in the 1970s, when an issue was starting to show (Maclean, 2018). In the 1980s, instructional leadership emerged as the dominant paradigm for school leaders when researchers found that successful schools tended to have principals who prioritized curriculum and instruction. The following table displays the first thoughts on instructional leadership since its inception in the 1970s. These viewpoints offer a theoretical foundation that has directed this investigation into the elements of instructional leadership and their impact on student achievement. The emergence of school-based management and facilitative leadership in the early 1990s altered the notion of instructional leadership from the 1970s. Instructional leadership has returned to the top of the leadership agenda as a result of the expansion of standards-based accountability systems in South Africa and other global education systems (Kwan, 2019).

The concept of instructional leadership, as used by school leaders, is relatively new, having emerged in the 1980s when it was argued that the emphasis should be moved from principals as managers or administrators to instructional or academic leaders (Kwan, 2019). The influence of instructional leadership on students' performance on the matriculation exam has been emphasized by numerous scholars and researchers in the field of school leadership. Understanding the histories, goals, and roles of instructional leaders, as well as their actions and character traits, is another aspect of the principal's difficult job.

Teachers face a unique set of challenges, particularly principals. Even while many of the lessons learned from corporate leadership can be applied in our educational institutions, we still require our own leadership model that considers the unique aspects of teaching and learning. Teachers face a unique set of challenges, particularly principals. Even while many of the lessons learned from corporate leadership can be applied in our educational institutions, we still require our own leadership model that considers the unique aspects of teaching and learning. McEwan (2002) supports the aforementioned perspective by arguing that in order for modern principals to become instructional leaders, they must undergo training. This goes against the typical management responsibilities of a principal, which include organizing, planning, leading, and monitoring/controlling. The educational force component of the principal's job description covers curriculum implementation, teaching, and learning.

Research Method and Procedure

The study was quantitative in nature, and a survey method was used for data collection. The population for this study consisted of all teachers (83) of the faculty of humanities and social sciences at Lahore Leads University. Sampling involves selecting a subset of the population for data collection, as it is often impractical to study the entire population. In this study, census sampling was used because it is a method used in research to gather data from an entire population rather than just a sample. Unlike traditional

sampling techniques, where only a subset of the population is studied, census sampling aims to collect information from every individual or element within the population, as the total number of faculty members was only 77.

Instrumentation

Researcher developed the questionnaire. After the demographic information, the questionnaire consisted of two parts; first part of the questionnaire related to instructional leadership and the second part related to Teachers' performance.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed through SPSS (Statistical Packages for social Sciences). Inferential statistics were used to calculate the data. In inferential statistics, independent samples t-test was used to find out the significance difference among demographic variables and One Way ANOVA was applied to check the difference among demographic variables.

Results

Table 1

Independent Sample t Test Identifies the Difference Between Male and Female University Teachers Regarding Instructional Leadership

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	Sign.
Male	32	84.6563	11.02668	75	.274	.25
Female	45	84.0222	9.14402			

According to the table, the independent sample t-test determines how male and female university instructors differ in terms of instructional leadership. No discernible difference existed between males and (M=84.6563, SD=11.02668) and female (M=84.0222, SD=84.0222), $t=.274$, $p=.25$, regarding instructional leadership.

Table 2

Independent Sample t-Test Identifies the Difference between Male and Female University Teachers Regarding Teachers' Performance.

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	Sign.
Male	32	125.5938	18.11408	75	.353	.32
Female	45	126.9556	15.57089			

The table demonstrates how the independent sample t-test determines the performance differences between male and female university instructors. No discernible difference existed between males (M=125.5938, SD=18.11408) and female (M=126.9556, SD=15.57089), $t=.353$, $p=.32$, regarding instructional leadership.

Table 3

Independent Sample t-test Identifies the Difference of University Teachers' Instructional Leadership Regarding Qualification

Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	Sign.
MPhil	38	86.9211	9.91418	75	2.374	.02
PhD	39	81.7179	9.31594			

The table demonstrates how the independent sample t-test determines the variations in university instructors' qualifications with respect to instructional leadership. There were notable distinctions between MPhil. (M=86.9211, SD=9.91418) and PhD (M=81.7179, SD=9.31594), $t=2.374$, $p=.02$, regarding instructional leadership.

**Table 4**

Independent Sample t-test Identifies the Difference of University Teachers' Performance Regarding Qualification.

Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	t-value	Sign.
MPhil	38	130.1579	17.32757	75	2.008	.04
PhD	39	122.7179	15.13092			

The table demonstrates how the independent sample t-test determines the variations in university instructors' qualifications with respect to instructional leadership. There were notable distinctions between MPhil ($M=130.1579$, $SD=17.32757$) and PhD ($M=122.7179$, $SD=15.13092$), $t=2.008$, $p=.04$, about the performance of teachers.

Table 5

One-way ANOVA Identifies the Difference between University Teacher Instructional Leadership Regarding Experience

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27.952	23	1.215	2.063	.015
Within Groups	31.217	53	.589		
Total	59.169	76			

As the table demonstrates, the One-Way ANOVA determines how university instructors' instructional leadership differs in terms of experience. There was significant difference $df(76)$ 2.063, $p=.015$ of university teachers' instructional leadership regarding Experience

Table 6

One-Way ANOVA Identifies the Difference of University Teachers' Performance Regarding Experience

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	34.502	35	.986	1.639	.065
Within Groups	24.667	41	.602		
Total	59.169	76			

The table demonstrates how the One-Way ANOVA determines the variation in university instructors' performance with respect to experience. There was a significant difference $df(76)$ 1.639, $p=.065$ of university teachers' instructional leadership regarding performance.

Discussion

The current study, which examined how instructional leadership affected university-level teachers' performance and job commitment, is a novel attempt from a Pakistani standpoint. Researchers point out that the results of this study would be helpful for current research and play a significant role in previous studies in this field. The most well-known term in any educational institution, according to Khan (2012), is "instructional leadership." An instructional leader is in charge of providing sufficient resources in any institution and offers teachers a variety of tools to enhance the teaching and learning process.

curriculum implementation as well as curriculum execution. Similarly, in the context of Pakistan, teachers' performance and job commitment serve as the major indicators of the impact of instructional leadership. Earlier researchers such as Leithwood et al. (1999), Quinn (2002), Celikten (2001), and Hallinger et al. (1985) are slightly supported by the findings of this study, which was carried out in the developing nation of Pakistan. Furthermore, other studies studying instructional leadership, such as Khan (2012) and Masuku (2011), have recognized and endorsed these findings.

In their study, Blase and Blase (1999) discovered that instructional leadership is at the heart of several duties that are carried out in any educational setting, including effectively managing the classroom environment, developing instructors, and creating an efficient curriculum and development. Similar findings were discovered by Tice (1992–41), who concluded that instructional leadership entails improving teachers' competencies and appropriate feedback.

According to the study, judgment and evaluation are the primary methods used to evaluate performance (Akande, [2014](#)). This indicates that a teacher's performance is the culmination of all of the skills and knowledge that he uses to improve his instruction. According to Herscovitch Meyer ([2001](#)), commitment is an individual's effort toward a certain work and the intended goals of any organization. Employee commitment refers to their duties and attitudes toward a company. The three main components of commitment are explained by the researchers in this study: first, they provide a clear definition of affective commitment, then they go over normative commitment, and finally, they provide a brief explanation of continuous commitment.

Recommendations

The research recommendation was the following:

1. University leadership should prioritize continuous professional development programs focused on instructional leadership. Workshops and seminars on effective teaching strategies and leadership models should be provided regularly.
2. Develop and implement leadership training modules specifically tailored for university administrators and department heads to foster effective instructional leadership skills.
3. Encourage shared leadership models where faculty members participate in decision-making processes, enhancing collaboration between leadership and teachers.



References

- Akande, F. B. (2014). *Assessment of the Relationship between Conditions of Service and Teachers' Job Performance In Secondary Schools in Kogi State, Nigeria*.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130–141. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320082>
- Celikten, M. (2001). The instructional leadership tasks of high school assistant principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(1), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230110380742>
- Chen, Y.-G., & Cheng, J.-N. (2017). Exploring Differences from Principals' Leaderships and Teachers' Teaching Performances in Public and Private Schools. *The Journal of International Management Studies*, 12(2), 65–81.
- Demitras, O., & Karaca, M. (2020). *A Handbook of Leadership Styles*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Dewi, D. N., & Sowiyah. (2021). Instructional Leadership Practices in School: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, 4(10), 1326–1336. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V4-i10-15>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The elementary school journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945–980. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800>
- Khan, Z. (2012). *Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Job Performance in Secondary Schools in the Province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Gomal University.
- Kwan, P. (2020). Is transformational leadership theory passé? Revisiting the integrative effect of instructional leadership and transformational leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly: EAQ*, 56(2), 321–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x19861137>
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. and Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Open University Press, Philadelphia.
- Limon, İ., & Nartgün, Ş. S. (2020). Development of teacher job performance scale and determining teachers' job performance level. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 13(3), 564–590.
- Lyonga, N. A. N. (2018). Supervise and supervise teachers' work performances in primary schools in Konye Sub-Division in Cameroon. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 8(2), 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jesr-2018-0022>
- Maclean, I. F. (2018). In-Service Training and Teachers Job Performance in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Rivers State. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 11(3B), 493–520. <https://publications.afropolitanjournals.com/index.php/ajhcer/article/view/133>
- Mannan, F. (2017). *The relationship between women principal instructional leadership practices, teacher organizational commitment and teacher professional community practice in secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya (Malaysia)).
- McEwan, E. K. (2002). *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership*. Corwin Press.
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human resource management review*, 11(3), 299–326. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(00\)00053-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X)
- Mitchell, D. E., Ortiz, F. I., & Mitchell, T. K. (1987). *Work orientation and job performance: The cultural basis of teaching rewards and incentives*. SUNY Press.
- Quinn, D. M. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of educational administration*, 40(5), 447–467. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230210440294>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2019.1582075>
- Saleem, A., Aslam, S., Yin, H.-B., & Rao, C. (2020). Principal leadership styles and teacher job performance: Viewpoint of middle management. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3390. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12083390>
- Sungu, H., Ilgan, A., Parylo, O., & Erdem, M. (2014). Examining teacher job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision behaviours: A comparative study of Turkish private and public school teachers. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 60(1), 98–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/t55587-000>

- Wardhana, R. A. N. (2016). The Effect Principal's Leadership, Professionalism And Teacher Training On The Implementation Of Curriculum 2013 In SMKN Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Akuntabilitas Manajemen Pendidikan*, 4(2), 257–269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31851/jmksp.v7i2.12097>
- Whitworth, B. A., & Chiu, J. L. (2015). Professional development and teacher change: The missing leadership link. *Journal of science teacher education*, 26, 121-137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9411-2>