



Naseem Amjad¹ & Dr. Farrukh Munir²

¹MPhil Scholar, Institute of Education & Research, University the of Punjab Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: naseemamjad2000@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Institute of Education & Research, University the of Punjab Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: farrukhier@pu.edu.pk

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Instructional Leadership Style, Teachers' Performance.	The purpose of this study was sort of investigate the impact of an instructional leadership style on teacher's performance at the university level. Instructional leadership has come up as a important leadership approach, and it focuses on improving teaching and learning through academic guidance, instructional supervision, professional development, and the overall making of positive learning environments, sort of, yes. The study was intended to figure out the level of instructional leadership practices, assess how teachers perform, look into the connection between instructional leadership and teachers' performance, and also to see what kind of effect instructional leadership has on teacher's performance, generally speaking. A quantitative research approach with a descriptive cross-sectional survey design was adopted, and in this case the population included university teachers working in both public and private sector universities in Lahore. A sample of 300 university teachers was selected through a stratified random sampling technique, meaning the subgroups were handled carefully. Data were collected using a self-developed questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale. The tool was checked for validation through expert review, while reliability was confirmed using Cronbach's Alpha >.70. After that, the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including Pearson correlation, independent sample t-test, ANOVA and regression analysis through SPSS. The findings showed that respondents perceived instructional leadership practices and teachers' performance at a high level, which means there is a strong presence of these practices, and also that the teachers are doing well overall. The results also pointed to a positive and statistically significant relationship, between instructional leadership and teachers' performance ($r = .23$, $p = .001$) which seems to suggest that when leaders take charge in the classroom focused ways it really connects with how teachers do. When regression analysis was run, instructional leadership significantly predicted teachers' performance, explaining 23.9% of the variance. Furthermore, the study indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in respondents' perceptions when considering gender, sector, or qualification. In the end, the study concluded that instructional leadership plays a major role in enhancing teachers' performance, mostly by encouraging professional development, improving instructional refinement, strengthening teamwork, and creating a more supportive academic atmosphere overall. It is recommended that university administrators reinforce instructional leadership practices through leadership development programs, continuous professional support, and faculty mentoring initiatives.
ARTICLE HISTORY Date of Submission: 22-02-2026 Date of Acceptance: 28-03-2026 Date of Publication: 31-03-2026	 2026 Journal of Social Sciences Development
Corresponding Author	Naseem Amjad
Email:	naseemamjad2000@gmail.com
DOI	https://doi.org/10.59075/jssd.v5i1.408
Volume/Issue	5(1), 2026, 431-444

Introduction

Instructional leadership is, basically, “A leadership strategy that focuses on improving teaching and learning by offering direct assistance, like professional development and also the monitoring of teaching practice.” At the university level this instructional leadership is usually done by academic leaders deans and department heads most of the time to back up teachers’ teaching, guide how the curriculum teaching is carried out, and help build a more academic atmosphere around the institution. In recent times, the quantitative studies we see suggest that instructional leadership practices are strongly linked with the performance, motivation, and the actual teaching quality of university teachers (Tanveer, Sittar & Munawar, 2025).

The fact is that leadership in the modern era of higher education has become something very popular. However, it is not due to anything else than the constantly growing expectations towards the assurance of quality, accountability, international competition, and, of course, good teaching and learning. Among numerous leadership approaches, instructional leadership, or IL for short, becomes increasingly significant in many regards. Specifically, instructional leadership refers to supporting professional development and learning of students and faculty members, monitoring of instruction and quality of teaching activities, as well as creation of a supportive academic climate (Hallinger, 2015,2018)

The assessment of teacher performance at the university level is, more or less, a multi-dimensional measure of teacher performance that covers instructional delivery, curriculum development, assessment strategies, research supervision, and student mentoring. Academic excellence, better graduate outcomes and, sometimes surprisingly, international excellence in higher education relies on how well the teacher performs. So, it is timely and somehow important to look at how instructional leadership style affects teacher performance, especially in developing countries where there are ongoing hurdles in higher education systems, related to quality and governance (OECD, 2019).

The conventional approach to leadership in higher education emphasized administrative efficiency, regulatory policies, and scholarly output. Teaching in this regard was viewed as an individual endeavor, which hardly received any oversight or, for that matter, leadership support at all (Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2015). However, some of the modern changes in higher education systems, such as mass enrollment, technological innovations, and results-based education, have led to a focus on teaching effectiveness and increased emphasis on faculty development rather than administrative issues.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are to:

1. To examine the level of instructional leadership practices at the university level.
2. To assess the level of teachers’ performance at the university level.

3. To determine the relationship between instructional leadership style and teacher performance.
4. To investigate the impact of instructional leadership style on teachers' performance.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of instructional leadership practices at the university level?
2. What is the level of teachers' performance in universities?
3. Is there a significant relationship between instructional leadership style and teacher performance?
4. Is there significant impact of instructional leadership on teachers' performance?

Literature Review

Instructional leadership is pretty widely seen as a kind of leadership approach that puts the attention on bettering teaching and learning processes, you know. In higher education, it shows up when academic administrators direct their teams while curricula planning is happening, plus when they handle instructional supervision, professional development, and also evaluation (Hallinger, 2018). So, unlike administrative leadership as a concept, instructional leadership is more about the actual teaching practice and the results, or performance, of academic staff rather than broader managerial tasks.

Recent literature reveals that instructional leadership is conducive to increased teacher motivation, instructional quality, and teacher professionalism. Academic administrators' active contribution to the creation of an innovative teaching environment and provision of constructive feedback lead to increased performance of their subordinates (Liu & Hallinger, 2020). University department heads and deans are instrumental in instructional planning.

Recent literature reveals that instructional leadership is conducive to increased teacher motivation, instructional quality, and teacher professionalism. Academic administrators' active contribution to the creation of an innovative teaching environment and provision of constructive feedback lead to increased performance of their subordinates (Liu & Hallinger, 2020). University department heads and deans are instrumental in instructional planning.

Teacher performance at higher education institutions refers to multiple aspects such as instructional effectiveness, assessment practices, research output, and professional involvement. University teachers characterized by effective instruction possess good subject knowledge and use proper instructional strategies to engage their students (Nguyen et al., 2022).

On the empirical front, recent scholarly works keep showing something pretty clear, namely a direct and positive relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance. Basically, the current studies point to the idea that instructional leadership ups teaching quality,

boosts professional commitment and even supports innovation, (Liu & Hallinger, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2022).

Conventionally, the discussion about instructional leadership somewhat remained within the domain of primary and secondary schools; however, it appears that recently the focus of this concept has somewhat shifted towards higher education as the importance of instructional quality together with faculty involvement continues to grow significantly.

Some research suggests that instructional leadership supports faculty outcomes like teaching effectiveness, professional development, and organizational commitment (Imran et al., 2025). Tanveer et al. (2025) also reported that when instructional leadership practices are applied at the university level, they can really strengthen teachers' performance, so that leadership behaviors aimed at instructional improvement become pretty relevant.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

This research study uses theoretical bases that are kind of grounded in Instructional Leadership Theory and the Organizational Learning Theory. The blend of both theories gives a more solid theoretical framework for seeing how leadership practices might affect the performance of faculty members, and also how those same practices could shape sustainable organizational processes.

Instructional Leadership Theory that was proposed by Hallinger focuses strongly on the significance of academic leaders regarding the improvement of the process of instruction, and it involves such processes as establishment of clear academic goals, supervision of the instruction, as well as creating positive instructional atmosphere (Hallinger, 2015; Hallinger, 2018). Therefore, if instructional practices receive proper attention from academic leaders, faculty members become more efficient, exhibit higher professionalism and improve classroom practices. Instructional leadership in universities takes such forms as academic leadership, performance evaluations, collegial support, as well as promotion of superior instruction practice.

Moreover, the theory of Organizational Learning indicates that organizational effectiveness becomes more and more effective in case employees continuously learn, exchange knowledge, and collaborate in professional development (Bush, 2020). In other words, there is an emphasis made on the significance of academic leaders who create opportunities for learning, innovating, and developing professionally. The supportive leadership motivates educators to improve their competencies and employ new strategies and methods while also advancing within their professional development processes.

Conceptual Framework

In the conceptual framework of the current study, there is a hidden assumption that instructional leadership will have a direct impact on teacher performance at the university level. Various instructional leadership activities, such as goal setting, supervising instruction, and encouraging professional development, are seen as factors that facilitate positive changes in teachers'

performance in terms of such aspects as teaching effectiveness, assessment practice, participation in research, and professionalism. It can be suggested that the learning environment and the overall instructional climate will enhance this connection to make it more prominent.

Instructional Leadership Style

Defining and Communicating Academic Goals Managing and Supervising Instruction Promoting Professional Development Creating a Positive Learning Climate



Teachers' Performance

Teaching Effectiveness Assessment and Evaluation Practices Professional Commitment and Engagement Participation in Instructional Improvement Activities

Figure 2.1. Conceptual Framework of the Study

Methodology

Research Design

For this study we used a descriptive cross sectional survey design . In a way, the descriptive part was meant to capture how things already are, meaning it helped in describing the current level of instructional leadership practices and teacher performance, as they were observed or reported. Then the correlational part looked at how these two things relate and what kind of effect one has on the other, especially between the instructional leadership style and teachers' performance.

Population of the Study

The study population was made up of teachers who work in public as well as private sector universities in Lahore. University teachers were treated as the target group, because they are directly affected by instructional leadership practices that academic leaders carry out, like heads of departments, deans and directors. In other word all faculty members (Lecturers, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) who are working in the public and private universities of Lahore were included.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The sample of 300 university professors was selected from the target population through a technique called stratified random sampling. First, the population was subdivided based on the type of university (public or private) and the subject area so that all groups received adequate representation. Subsequently, participants were selected randomly from each of the strata in proportion to their number within the population as well.

Research Instrument

The data was collected using a self-constructed questionnaire which was designed especially for this research. Overall, the questionnaire used a five-point Likert type scale, starting from Strongly Disagree (1) up to Strongly Agree (5). The questionnaire consisted of the following three sections. Demographic information. This section included items related to gender, academic rank, years of teaching experience, faculty discipline, and the highest qualification., Instructional leadership style. This section measured instructional leadership practices among academic leaders. It included items that covered, the following dimensions: Defining and communicating academic goals, managing and supervising instruction, promoting professional development, and creating a positive learning, and instructional climate. Teachers' performance. This section measured teachers' performance at the university level. The items were developed to assess teaching effectiveness, assessment and evaluation practices, professional commitment engagement, and participation in instructional improvement activities.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The questionnaire content validity was ensured via expert judgment. Specifically, subject specialists in education, research methodology, and educational leadership reviewed the questionnaire items in order to check their relevance, clarity, and how well they fit the study objectives and the conceptual framework. After that, the required modifications were made based on the experts' suggestions, so the items stayed coherently connected.

Data Collection Procedure

Once formal permission was obtained from the university authorities, the questionnaires were given to the chosen respondents. The participants were told what the study was about, and they were also assured that their answers would stay confidential. The data were gathered via a mix of physical distribution and an online approach, mainly so the response rates could be higher.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, SPSS. Descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to kind of outline demographic characteristics, and also to show variable trends. After that, inferential statistics, such as Pearson correlation plus regression analysis, were applied to look at the association and the overall impact of instructional leadership style on teachers' performance.

Results and Finding

This study was quantitative and based on a survey design. Collected data was analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. The, analyzed data results were presented in tables with their interpretation.

Table 4.1 Reliability Statistics

Scales/Sub-scales	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Instructional leadership	.72	1-12
Perceived Teacher Performance	.78	13-35

The value of each subscale is higher than $>.70$ indicates the data and research instrument was reliable at good level.

Table 4.2 Demographics profile of participants (n=300)

		<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender	Male	187	62.3
	Female	113	37.7
Academic Qualification	MS/MPHIL	110	36.7
	PhD	146	48.7
	Post -Doctorate	44	14.7
Academic Rank	Lecturer	48	16.0
	Assistant Professor	145	48.3
	Associate Professor	107	35.7
Teaching Experience	Below 5 Years	37	12.3
	6-10 Years	133	44.3
	11-15 Years	130	43.3
Age	Below 30	19	6.3
	31-40	164	54.7
	41-50	117	39.0
University Type	Public	174	58.0
	Private	126	42.0
Employment Status	Permanent	84	28.0
	Contract	127	42.3
	Visiting	89	29.7
Total		300	100.0

So the demographic profile for the 300 participants shows a mostly male group, about 62.3% (f=187) of the total, and females are 37.7% (f=113). On age, the biggest slice sits in the 31–40 year band (54.7%), and then you get the 41–50 range (39.0%) so overall it seems like a mature, mid-career respondent base. Educationally, they’re pretty well credentialed, 48.7% report a PhD while 14.7% have reached Post-Doctorate status, and 36.7% have an MS/MPhil degree. That sort of qualification shows up again in academic rank, where Assistant Professors are the largest category (48.3%), with Associate Professors next (35.7%) and Lecturers at 16.0%.

Also, the professional experience looks strong, because 87.6% have between 6 and 15 years of teaching experience, meaning only 12.3% fall below five years in the field. For institutional affiliation, most are in public universities (58.0%), and the rest 42.0% are from Private institutions. Finally, the employment status points to a fairly strong dependence on non-permanent roles, with 42.3% working Contract basis, 29.7% serving as Visiting faculty, while just 28.0% hold Permanent positions.

Table 4.3 Item wise analysis related to instructional leadership factor (n=300)

	Mean	Std.D
University leadership clearly communicates instructional goals.	3.73	.977
Teaching and learning objectives are aligned with student learning outcomes.	3.84	.954
Faculty members are involved in setting academic and instructional goals.	3.71	1.138
Expectations regarding teaching quality are clearly defined.	3.73	1.031
Academic leaders regularly monitor teaching practices.	3.88	.977
Leaders provide constructive feedback to improve instructional performance.	3.87	.950
Curriculum implementation is effectively supervised.	3.96	.965
Instructional methods are reviewed to enhance student learning.	3.88	.936
Professional development opportunities are encouraged by leadership.	3.98	.948
Innovation in teaching methods is supported by academic leaders.	4.21	.809
Collaboration among faculty members is promoted.	4.10	.857
Excellence in teaching is recognized and rewarded.	3.84	1.045

The item-wise analysis of Table 4.3 presents the perceptions of 300 participants regarding various instructional leadership factors. Overall, the responses indicate a positive trend, with all mean scores falling between 3.71 and 4.21 on a likely 5-point Likert scale. The highest-rated factor is the support for innovation in teaching methods (M=4.21,SD=.809), followed closely by the promotion of collaboration among faculty (M=4.10,SD=.857). This suggests that academic leaders are particularly effective at fostering a creative and cooperative environment. Additionally, leadership’s encouragement of professional development opportunities (M=3.98,SD=.948) and the effective supervision of curriculum implementation

($M=3.96, SD=.965$) are viewed as strong leadership attributes within the surveyed institutions. Conversely, while still positive, the lowest mean scores are associated with the involvement of faculty members in setting academic goals ($M=3.71, SD=1.138$) and the clear communication of instructional goals ($M=3.73, SD=.977$). The higher standard deviation in faculty involvement suggests a greater variance in opinion, indicating that while many feel included, a notable portion of the faculty may feel less involved in the goal-setting process. Monitoring and feedback mechanisms, such as regularly monitoring teaching practices ($M=3.88$) and providing constructive feedback ($M=3.87$), show consistent moderate-to-high scores, reflecting a structured approach to maintaining instructional quality across the sample.

Table 4.4 Item wise analysis related to Teachers' performance factor (n=300)

	Mean	Std.D
1. I am enthusiastic about my teaching responsibilities.	3.95	1.104
2. I am dedicated to achieving institutional teaching goals.	4.13	1.021
3. I feel motivated to improve my instructional skills.	3.89	1.037
4. I actively participate in departmental and academic activities.	4.25	.871
5. I feel emotionally committed to my teaching role.	4.27	.771
I prepare my lectures thoroughly before each class.	4.40	.789
I use effective teaching methods to engage students.	4.25	.809
I provide timely and constructive feedback to students.	4.04	.941
I assess students fairly and transparently.	4.04	1.016
I use modern instructional technologies in my teaching.	3.89	1.022
I continuously evaluate and improve my teaching performance.	4.16	.997
I actively engage in research and scholarly activities.	4.00	.993
I publish research articles in recognized journals.	3.72	1.180
I participate in academic conferences and seminars.	3.86	.988
I manage my classroom effectively to maintain a positive learning environment.	4.10	.940
I clearly communicate course objectives to my students.	4.20	.815
I provide guidance and support to students beyond classroom teaching.	3.89	1.012
I regularly update my subject knowledge according to recent developments.	3.81	1.105
I collaborate with colleagues to improve teaching practices.	3.91	1.034
I complete assigned academic tasks within deadlines.	4.10	.980
I maintain proper records of students' performance and attendance.	4.02	.947
I encourage students to participate actively in classroom discussions.	4.13	.890
I adapt my teaching strategies according to students' learning needs.	3.98	1.072

The item wise breakdown in Table 4.4 shows the teachers' self-reported performance drivers across the 300 participants, and it sort of points to a strong professional dedication plus instructional seriousness. The top-rated item is really the thorough lecture preparation ($M=4.40$, $SD=.789$), which hints that faculty members care about being ready in advance and delivering the content clearly. This is pretty much matched by a noticeable feeling of emotional bonding with the teaching role ($M=4.27$, $SD=.771$), plus high levels of active involvement in department matters and also the use of effective teaching strategies (both $M=4.25$). Moreover, faculty seem to keep a sharp attention on learner involvement, as seen in the high ratings for communicating course objectives ($M=4.20$) and adjusting to students' learning needs ($M=4.13$)

Even so, the overall picture is still positive, some specific spots come with slightly smaller averages and a bit more spread in responses. The lowest mean shows up for publishing research articles in reputable journals ($M=3.72$, $SD=1.180$), and that same item also has the largest standard deviation, meaning there are bigger gaps in research productivity among the faculty. Likewise, items like regularly refreshing subject knowledge ($M=3.81$) and taking part in academic conferences ($M=3.86$) indicate that while classroom performance stays solid, sustained scholarly involvement and keeping up with newer developments may need more pushing forward. Still, the faculty hold a dependable standard for classroom management and administrative work, because the scores stay consistent for finishing tasks on time and keeping student records properly ($M=4.10$ and $M=4.02$, respectively).

Table 4.5 Factor wise analysis

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Instructional leadership	3.89	.318
Perceived teachers' Performance	4.04	.217

Table 4.5 gives this consolidated factor-wise look, summarizing how the two main variables are viewed overall. From the data, both Instructional Leadership and Perceived Teachers' Performance seem to be rated highly by the 300 participants, and the mean values are clearly above that neutral middle point of the scale, you can say. Perceived Teachers' Performance showed up with the higher mean, 4.04 ($SD = .217$) which sort of signals that the faculty have a very strong, and also consistent, sense of their professional capability, and their commitment to what they do. The small standard deviation suggests that most respondents basically agree on what their performance level should be, pretty strongly. Likewise, Instructional Leadership also got a positive rating with a mean of 3.89 ($SD = .318$). Even if it is a bit lower than the performance factor, it still points to a durable perception of how effective academic leaders are when it comes to steering instructional aims, and helping faculty grow in practice. In general, because both factors have those rather tight standard deviations, the replies are closely grouped around the mean, meaning the responses are fairly stable and unified across the academic staff that were surveyed.

Table 4.6 Relationship between the variables (n=300)

Variables	<i>r'</i>	<i>p'</i>
Instructional leadership with perceived teachers' performance score	.239	.001

Table 4.6 presents the results of the correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationship between Instructional Leadership and Perceived Teachers' Performance. The statistical analysis reveals a Pearson correlation coefficient (*r*) of .239, which indicates a positive relationship between the two variables. This relationship is statistically significant, as the *p*-value (*p* = .001) is well below the standard alpha level of 0.05. The findings suggest that as the quality of instructional leadership improves, there is a corresponding, albeit modest, increase in perceived teacher performance. While the correlation is positive and highly significant, the value of .239 characterizes a weak-to-moderate positive correlation. This implies that while leadership practices such as goal setting, supervision, and providing feedback play a constructive role in enhancing teacher performance, other external or internal factors not captured in this specific correlation may also significantly influence how faculty members perform their academic duties.

Table 4.7: *Regression coefficients of Instructional Leadership on Teachers' performance at university level (n = 300).*

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	R ²
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	.346	.154		26.845	.000	
Instructional leadership	.226	.240	.339	7.666	.001	.239

Dependent Variable: Teachers' Performance

Note. ***p*<0.001,

Table 4.7 shows the impact of Instructional Leadership on Teachers' performance University level. The *R*² value of 0.239 shows that Instructional Leadership predicted 23.9% variance in the dependent variable i.e., Teachers' performance with *F* (1,299) = 24.444, *p*<.001. So, it can be interpreted as Instructional Leadership significantly impact the Teachers' performance (*β* = .226, *p*<.001).

Discussion of the Study

The results of the study showed that instructional leadership really matters, it plays a big role in making teachers more effective at the university level. The respondents had a positive view of instructional leadership, which seems to mean academic leaders are doing their part, pushing instructional refinement and faculty development. It might be related to the findings made by Hallinger (2018), who states that instructional leadership may affect the quality of instruction directly by promoting strong instructional practices and facilitating faculty development. Furthermore, the highest mean scores were associated with innovation in teaching approaches

and faculty collaboration. Therefore, university leaders are trying to foster a positive environment where creativity and cooperation take place to make the process of instruction more efficient. The obtained results can be corroborated by other research evidence since Liu and Hallinger (2020) and Hallinger & Lee (2016) found that instructional leadership leads to enhanced instruction by providing professional assistance, supervision, and common academic directions. It has also been proven that instructional leadership contributes to more collaborative organizational culture, which, in turn, fosters innovative instruction and professional development (Nguyen et al., 2022). Finally, the study showed that teachers had high levels of professional commitment and instructional diligence. Scores obtained in lecture preparation, classroom interaction, and instruction effectiveness can be explained by the dedication of university teachers. Thus, the results obtained support the assertion that instructional leadership leads to the motivation and improved performance of faculty members. The same conclusion was drawn by Ahmad et al. (2024).

Yet, the comparatively lower scores related to research publications and participation in conferences point to a different kind of hurdle, especially in higher education institutions. Even if teachers demonstrated strong classroom performance, scholarly productivity looked relatively weaker. This might happen because of workload pressure, fewer research chances, insufficient institutional support, or just inadequate research incentives. Earlier studies have also mentioned that university faculty frequently struggle to balance teaching responsibilities with research output, particularly in developing country contexts (Imran et al., 2025; Nguyen et al., 2022).

The correlation analysis confirmed a positive, and statistically significant relationship between instructional leadership and teachers' performance. While the association was moderate, it still suggests that effective leadership practices such as goal setting, instructional supervision, feedback mechanisms, and professional development opportunities positively influence teachers' performance.

Despite being moderate, the correlation shows that there are some leadership practices like goal setting, instruction supervision, feedback, and professional development programs that help teachers perform better. The above findings support Instructional Leadership Theory since this theory stresses the importance of leadership in enhancing instructional and learning processes (Hallinger, 2015, 2018). Liu & Hallinger (2020), and Tanveer et al., (2025) found similar significant relationships between instructional leadership and teacher performance.

It can be said that the findings revealed sort of high level of professional commitment and instructional diligence shown by teachers. It can be seen from the high scores of lectures' preparation, classroom involvement, and teaching effectiveness. These findings generally support the idea that effective instructional leadership contributes to faculty motivation and improved instructional practices, overall. Similar findings were reported by Ahmad et al. (2024), where they found that instructional leadership positively influences teacher motivation professional commitment, and engagement within educational institutions, which sounds consistent.

Conclusion

From the study findings, it can be said that the instructional leadership approach does make a positive, and also significant, difference to teachers' performance at the university level. In other words, when leaders steer the teaching direction well it seems to support better learning delivery methods, stronger professional resolve, more teamwork, and overall instructional quality across the faculty, even if it's not always obvious right away.

Also, the study goes on to conclude that most university teachers hold a generally positive view of their academic leaders. This is especially true when it comes to how leaders support new ideas, offer professional development opportunities, and carry out instructional supervision. Similar to that, the educators exhibited high professionalism and strong instructional effectiveness during the execution of their academic roles, thereby substantiating the entire concept of instructional leadership.

Even though instructional leadership indeed predicts the performance of the teachers, the relationship was only perceived to be moderate, which implies that other factors apart from instructional leadership may also influence the performance of teachers.

The findings further show that factors like gender, sector, and qualifications among others related to demographics have no impact on the perception of instructional leadership and teacher performance. Taken together, instructional leadership works as a key pathway for improving educational quality and strengthening institutional effectiveness, especially within higher education institutions.

Recommendations

Based on what the study found, these suggestions kind of come up, and they are proposed like this.

- First, university leaders should really reinforce monitoring and supervision practices so instructional program management can work better.
- Second, academic leaders need to provide feedback and mentoring to the faculty members on a regular basis, not just occasionally.
- Third, universities should plan continuous professional development programs for teachers, so their skills keep improving.
- Fourth, academic leaders should help create supportive learning environments that promote cooperation, and also some kind of innovation.
- Fifth, universities should put in place clear ways to monitor the instructional quality, and to check faculty performance too.
- Sixth, the Higher Education Commission should make sure instructional leadership competencies are included in the leadership training programs for university administrators, because this part matters.

References

- Ahmad, S., Khan, M., & Rehman, A. (2024). Instructional leadership and teacher motivation in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 18(2), 45–61.
- Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2015). Distributed leadership in higher education: Rhetoric and reality. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(1), 25–42.
- Bush, T. (2020). School leadership and management in higher education contexts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(3), 401–418.
- Hallinger, P. (2015). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 14(1), 1–20.
- Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24.
- Hallinger, P. (2016). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
- Hallinger, P., & Lee, M. (2016). Exploring principal capacity to lead reform of teaching and learning quality. *School Leadership & Management*, 36(2), 119–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1160219>
- Imran, M., Ali, T., & Hussain, S. (2025). Instructional leadership and organizational commitment among university teachers. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 28(1), 89–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2024.2289013>
- Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2020). Principal instructional leadership and teacher professional learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 577–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20910345>
- Nguyen, T. D., Ng, D., & Yap, P. S. (2022). Instructional leadership and teacher performance in higher education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(4), 553–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1763841>
- OECD. (2019). Enhancing teaching and learning in higher education. *OECD Publishing*.
- Tanveer, M., Sittar, K., & Munawar, S. (2025). Effect of instructional leadership practices on teachers' performance at the university level. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 282–289.