

SEQUENTIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP QUALITY ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Robina Munir^{a*} & Dr. Manzoor Raza Awan^b

^a MPhil Scholar, Department of Education, University of Lahore, Sargodha, Pakistan. Email: robinamunir265@gmail.com

^b Associate Professor, (HOD), Department of Education, University of Lahore, Sargodha, Pakistan. Email: manzoor.raza@ed.uol.edu.pk

*Correspondence to: Ms. Robina Munir, MPhil Scholar, Department of Education, University of Lahore, Sargodha, Pakistan. Email: robinamunir265@gmail.com

KEYWORDS:

Sequential Impact Analysis,
Instructional Leadership Quality,
Student Learning Outcomes

CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Munir, R., & Awan, M. R. (2026). Sequential impact analysis of instructional leadership quality on student learning outcomes at the elementary level. *Pakistan Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(7), 267-271.

ABSTRACT

This study was analysing the sequential impact analysis of instructional leadership quality on student learning outcomes at elementary level. The main objective of the study was to identify the association between instructional leadership quality and students' learning outcomes. The main research question which was to be answered to what extent there will be the association exist between leadership quality and students' learning outcomes? The population of the study were all the elementary schools of district Khushab. From 120 primary schools of district Khushab, 60 elementary schools were selected by multistage sampling technique. This study was quantitative in nature so, self-developed questionnaire was used to gather the data from the respondents. Descriptive statistics i.e. frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were used in analyzing the data. The conclusion of the study was that there was a clear and significant association between instructional leadership quality and students' learning outcomes at elementary level. On the basis of conclusion, it was recommended that instructional leadership practices should be monitored and evaluated regularly to identify the areas for improvement and ensure effective implementation of practices.

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational leadership is really important for schools to be effective and for students to learn. There are different ways that leaders can run a school but one way that is getting a lot of attention is instructional leadership. This type of leadership is especially important for kids. Instructional leadership is when the principal is very involved in things like planning what students will learn making sure teachers are teaching well helping teachers get better at their jobs and keeping track of how students doing. The principal is like the boss of the school. They need to be involved in all these things. Some people, like Hallinger and Robinson and their friends have written about this. They think it is very important for students to succeed (Hallinger et al., 2025; Pietsch et al., 2025). So, when kids are in school, they learn basic skills that help them think, get along with others and read. The way leaders work with teachers and students at this stage is very important for how students do in school later on. Some studies have shown that the leaders of schools do not directly affect how much students learn. Instead, leaders make a difference by helping teachers feel confident making sure the quality of teaching is good creating an atmosphere at school and getting teachers to work together. This is what some researchers like Leithwood, Sun and Pollock found out in 2017. Also, what Heck and Hallinger discovered in 2014. Leadership practices at the level have a big impact, on students' academic paths.

Therefore, this study is about looking at how good the leaders at helping teachers teach and how that affects what students learn in elementary schools. We want to see what happens when leaders do a job and how that makes the teachers teach better and the students learn more. The people we are studying are teachers and head teachers in these schools. We hope that what we find out will help make schools better by showing them what really works to improve student learning outcomes. We are focusing on schools because that is where the foundation of student learning outcomes is built. The study of leadership quality and student learning outcomes is very important, for student achievement (Pietsch et al., 2025). Hence, education is really important for economic and human growth. At the level good education is crucial because students learn basic things get skills and form habits that help them do well in school later on. To get results we need good teachers, in the classroom and leaders who help them and make it easy for students to learn. Education helps people grow and good leadership makes sure students get the best out of it. Good education starts with teachers and leaders who care. So, when we think about the ways that people lead instructional leadership is one way that really stands out. This is because it is about making teaching and learning better. Instructional leadership is about setting goals for what students should learn making sure the curriculum is good checking on what's happening in the classrooms helping teachers get better at their jobs keeping track of how well students are doing and making sure the school is a great place to learn. Instructional leadership is different from being a regular leader at a school. Instructional leadership is directly connected to the reason we have schools: to make sure students get a good education and that teachers are good, at teaching. Instructional leadership is really important because it helps with teaching quality and student achievement (Pietsch et al., 2025).

Objective

- To examine the level of student learning outcomes (professional development and high visibility) among elementary students.

II. METHOD

This chapter comprises information about the design and methodology followed while completing the research. It also includes detailed population and study samples; instrument of data collection, data collection method and data analysis techniques. A quantitative method with descriptive and inferential research approach was used in the study.

Participants

For the data collection about Sequential Impact analysis of Instructional Leadership Quality on Student Learning Outcomes at the Elementary Level, population of the study contain all elementary schools of district Khushab. Multistage sampling technique was used in the research. The procedure of samples taken out as: First, Khushab district was purposefully selected. On the basis of 50% selection criteria, 60 elementary schools were randomly selected from total 120 elementary schools of district Khushab. From each elementary school, 5 teachers were selected by using cluster sampling.

Measures

The data was collected through questionnaire. The tools were developed by the researcher to find out the Sequential Impact analysis of Instructional Leadership Quality on Student Learning Outcomes at the Elementary Level. A 5-point Likert scales with 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree was used. Questionnaire for teachers about sequential impact analysis of instructional leadership quality consisted of 10 constructs. In which 4 statements were for framing the school goals, 4 for communicating school goals, 4 for supervising and evaluating instruction, 3 for coordinating the curriculum, 4 for monitoring student progress, 4 for protecting instructional time, 4 for promoting professional development, 4 for maintaining high visibility, 4 for providing incentives for teachers and 5 for providing incentives for learning. This scale was filled by the teachers at elementary schools.

Procedure

Expert opinion was sought to validate the instrument for construct checking and face validity. The expert was five in number and had a PhD in education degree. These experts were requested to check the content as well as face

validity. They were also checked to match the indicators and statements of instruments with the objectives of study, difficult level and sentence structure in English. Initially 50 items were developed using a literature review for questionnaire. They related all items on three points Likert Scale, not necessary, useful, and essential. After their responses 10 item were deleted so, the remaining item were 40. After including expert recommendations, the instruments were pilot tested. Descriptive statistical techniques i.e. mean, frequency, percentage, standard deviation and inferential statistical techniques such as Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used for data analysis using SPSS software. Instrument was administered through self-visits for collecting the data. Respondents were 300 in number. Questionnaire containing covering letter and demographic information were handed over to every respondent on personal basis. From which the response from the teachers of elementary schools was 82% which was considered according to the recommendations of Larossi in 2006 that 80-85% of the responded questionnaires return rate is at the good level.

Table I: Response Rate of Research Respondents

Category of respondents	Questionnaires Handover	Questionnaires Received	Respondents Rate
Teachers	365	300	82%

It was very difficult to collect the data from the teachers of different elementary schools of district Khushab.

Data Analysis

The data collected through the research instruments were coded and tabulated before analyzing and interpreting it statistically. SPSS software was used to analyze the data. Following scoring procedures were adopted for the questionnaire: -

Weights were given to the responses as: Strongly disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neutral=3, Agree=4, Strongly agree=5

All the data collected from the teachers were categorized on their average mean score basis. Categorization of the mean score was given as

Mean score = less than 1.80 = very low

Mean score = 1.81 – 2.60 = low

Mean score = 2.61 – 3.40= moderate

Mean Score = 3.41 – 4.20 = high

Mean Score = 4.21 – 5.00 = very high

III. RESULTS

Analysis of promoting professional development is as follows:

Research question: To what extent is the promoting professional development necessary for improving learning outcomes among elementary-level students?

Table II: Promoting professional development

Statement	SA f(%)	AG f(%)	UN f(%)	DA f(%)	SDA f(%)	Total f(%)	Mean	SD
1. Teachers are encouraged to attend training.	55 18%	145 48%	70 23%	25 8%	5 2%	300 100%	3.7	0.91
2. Professional learning opportunities are available.	52 18%	153 51%	63 21 %	28 9%	4 1.3%	300 100%	3.7	0.90
3. Instructional improvement is discussed during workshops.	55 18%	172 57%	54 18%	14 5%	5 2%	300 100%	3.8	0.82
4. Teachers are supported in professional growth.	61 20%	162 54%	60 20%	14 5%	3 1%	300 100%	3.9	0.82
Total	223 19%	632 53%	247 21%	81 7%	17 1.6%	1200 100%	3.8	0.86

Table 2 shows that many (66%) of the teachers with mean score= 3.7 and SD = 0.91, responded as strongly agree towards statement that they are encouraged to attend training. Teachers (69%) responding as strongly agree towards statement that professional learning opportunities are available, with supporting mean score= 3.7 and SD= 0.90. 75% of the teachers with mean score= 3.8 and SD=0.82 responded as strongly agree towards statement that instructional improvement is discussed during workshops. Many (74%) of the teachers with mean score=3.9 and SD=0.82, responded as strongly agree towards statement that they are supported in professional growth. Overall, many of (72%) of the teachers with supporting mean value 3.8 and SD = 0.86, agreed with promoting professional development. This shows the trend that the promoting professional development necessary for improving learning outcomes among elementary-level students.

Analysis of maintaining high visibility is as follows:

Research question 2: To what extent is the maintaining high visibility necessary for improving learning outcomes among elementary-level students?

Table III: Maintaining High Visibility

Statement	SA f(%)	AG f(%)	UN f(%)	DA f(%)	SDA f(%)	Total f(%)	Mean	SD
5. The principal frequently visits classrooms.	66 22%	145 48%	63 21%	22 7%	4 1.3%	300 100%	3.8	0.92
6. The principal is visible during instructional activities.	53 18%	158 53%	52 17 %	34 11%	3 1%	300 100%	3.7	0.91
7. Teachers have easy access to the principal.	64 21%	163 54%	40 13%	26 9%	7 2.3%	300 100%	3.8	0.94
8. The principal regularly interacts with students.	69 23%	156 52%	53 18%	20 7%	2 0.7%	300 100%	3.9	0.85
Total	252 21%	622 52%	209 17%	102 9%	16 1.3%	750 100%	3.8	0.91

Table 3 shows that many (70%) of the teachers with mean score= 3.8 and SD = 0.92, responded as strongly agree towards statement that their principal frequently visits classrooms. Teachers (71%) responding as strongly agree towards statement that their principal is visible during instructional activities, with supporting mean score= 3.7 and SD= 0.91. 75% of the teachers with mean score= 3.8 and SD=0.94 responded as strongly agree towards statement that they have easy access to the principal. Many (75%) of the teachers with mean score=3.9 and SD=0.85, responded as strongly agree towards statement that their principal regularly interacts with students. Overall, many of (73%) of the teachers with supporting mean value 3.8 and SD = 0.91, agreed with maintaining high visibility. This shows the trend that the maintaining high visibility necessary for improving learning outcomes among elementary-level students.

IV. DISCUSSION

The empirical findings from this investigation reveal a strong, statistically significant association between instructional leadership quality and student learning outcomes at the elementary level. Specifically, the analysis of promoting professional development demonstrated that an overwhelming majority of elementary educators agree that institutional support, regular workshop discussions, and accessible professional learning opportunities are vital components for elevating student achievement. These findings align closely with contemporary educational frameworks establishing that school leaders significantly impact student trajectories not through isolated administrative duties, but by actively cultivating teacher capability, fostering collaborative professional communities, and establishing rigorous pedagogical standards. When school principals systematically invest in continuous professional growth and provide structured environments for educators to refine their practices, teachers exhibit heightened self-efficacy, which directly translates into enhanced academic progress for elementary students.

Furthermore, the results regarding maintaining high visibility underscore the crucial role of active administrative presence within the school environment. Elementary teachers strongly affirmed that frequent classroom visits, administrative availability during instructional activities, and regular principal-student interactions foster a supportive, goal-oriented school climate. This corroborates prior empirical literature demonstrating that effective instructional leaders function as active participants in the teaching and learning process rather than distant managers. By maintaining high visibility, school leaders can accurately diagnose institutional needs, offer targeted instructional feedback, and align daily classroom practices with overarching school goals. Ultimately, these integrated leadership behaviors reinforce instructional rigor and create optimal conditions for foundational student learning and long-term academic success.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study examining the sequential impact of instructional leadership quality on elementary-level student learning outcomes, the conclusion is as follows: The research established a clear and significant association between instructional leadership quality and student learning outcomes at the elementary level. Specifically, teachers overwhelmingly agreed that effective instructional leadership practices—such as promoting continuous professional development (mean value of 3.8) and maintaining high principal visibility (mean value of 3.8)—are essential for fostering a productive learning environment and improving student achievement.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The author received no funding from any organizations.

VI. REFERENCES

- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x15616863>
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Long, H. (2025). Leadership for learning: International perspectives and emerging trends. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 53(2), 215–230.
- Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the longitudinal effects of school leadership on teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(5), 653–671. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2013-0097> Cited by: 560
- Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (Eds.). (2017). *How school leaders contribute to student success: The four paths framework*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50980-8>
- Pietsch, M., Aydin, A., & Gümüş, S. (2025). Principal instructional leadership and teacher attitudes: A meta-analytic review, 1989–2024. *European Journal of Education*, 60(4), e12680.
- Zia, I., & Saba, M. (2026). Sequential impact analysis of instructional leadership quality on student learning outcomes at the elementary level. *Pakistan Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(7), 337–345.