



Open Access



Instructional Leadership and School Effectiveness: A Correlational Study at Secondary Level Institutions in the Context of District Bannu

Mumtaz¹ Niaz Ali² Rahim Khan³

Abstract: This study examines the correlation between instructional leadership and school effectiveness at secondary-level institutions in the context of district Bannu, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. This study aimed to find out this relationship through a correlational research design. All 1511 teachers from 100 public sector secondary level schools constituted the population of this study. A close-ended 7-point Likert scale questionnaire comprising of 45 items was utilized by the researcher to obtain data from 306 teachers of 80 secondary-level institutions through a stratified random technique. The data that was obtained was analyzed through SPSS using Pearson's R statistics. The findings reveal a strong, significant correlation between instructional leadership and school effectiveness. The study clearly confirmed that the explicit role of an instructional leader leads to successful school effectiveness.

Key Words: Instructional Leadership, School Effectiveness, Correlational Study, Secondary Level Education, Students

Introduction

Education is the foundation of every nation's development, and a society's fate depends on the quality of its education (Adnan, 2023). The statement makes it clear that the country's education system plays a crucial role in setting high standards and achieving success. Education has different meanings for different people in terms of objectives, goals and outcomes, but it is widely accepted that it can be achieved only through effective and efficient institutions (Adnan, 2023; Adnan, Ali & Khan, 2023; Ali, 2017), that leads to school effectiveness.

School effectiveness is the degree to which the desired outcomes are achieved. It is a product that can be achieved through continuous and significant school improvement. Scheerens (2013) defined school effectiveness as "a set of variables that improve academic performance." School effectiveness is the attainment of desired outcomes in terms of a student's intellectual abilities (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). School effectiveness is thoroughly determined by means of quality education, and the worth of quality education is especially determined by effective schooling (Adnan, Ali & Khan, 2023). However, effective schooling or school effectiveness is not possible without instructional leadership (Ali, 2017; Peleg, 2012; Silva, 2014).

The role of a leader in any walk cannot be denied because the worthiness of any educational system is undergoing high-quality leadership (Peleg, 2012). Niqab (2015) is of the view that for a successful educational setup, high-quality leadership is required. Debevoise (1984) is of the view that instructional leadership refers to those actions which are delegated to followers for visionary outcomes, whereas Marsh (1992) believed that instructional leadership is something related to the school head's job. According to Hallinger (2010), as cited in Adnan (2023), instructional leaders will define the mission of the school and

¹ PhD Scholar, Teachers Education Department, Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

² Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Sheringal, Upper Dir, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

³ Associate Professor, Teachers Education Department, Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

▪ **Corresponding Author:** Niaz Ali (niazyoufazai2000@gmail.com)

▪ **To Cite:** Mumtaz., Ali, N., & Khan, R. (2024). Instructional Leadership and School Effectiveness: A Correlational Study at Secondary Level Institutions in the Context of District Bannu. *Qlantia Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(1), 176-183. <https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.679125316>

manage the instructional programs by creating a conducive learning climate, and these are the key dimensions through which school effectiveness could be achieved. Unquestionably, the leadership style of the principal plays a crucial part in high-quality educational programs (Bredeson, 1985). Adnan, Ali and Khan (2023) are of the view that the true aim of instructional leadership is to bring schools to the visionary track. Numerous studies believe that school effectiveness in the absence of instructional leaders is just a dream and deception (Adnan, Ali and Khan, 2023; Yasil & Kaya, 2012).

Objective of the Study

The key objective of the study was:

To find out the correlation between instructional leadership and school effectiveness at secondary-level institutions in district Bannu.

Literature Review

School Effectiveness (SE)

School effectiveness is concerned with the degree to which the institution has achieved its goals or product. According to Van Kesteren (1996), School effectiveness refers to the degree to which the institution manages its all-around matters, while Scheerens, Glas, and Thomas (2003) are of the view that it is the extent to which the desired output is achieved. According to Hoy and Tarter (2006) and Rahman (2021), school effectiveness means achieving desirable outcomes in terms of student's intellectual skills and their achievement. Scheerens (2013) suggests that it is the progressive development of schools. School effectiveness is thoroughly determined by means of quality education, and the worth of quality education is especially measured at the secondary school level. However, in Pakistan, only private institutions are able to provide quality education, and only private institutions can be regarded as effective institutions. This is due only to the high-quality educational program and efficient monitoring mechanism (Iqbal, 2012).

The researcher noticed a disagreement among researchers. Some contend that internal factors affect school effectiveness, while others contend that external factors are involved (Ali, 2017). Coleman et al. (1966) are of the view that a student's socioeconomic status greatly influences school effectiveness, and school internal factors have no role. Later, the research conducted by Ostroff and Schmitt (1993) also confirmed that a number of factors contribute to school effectiveness like leadership style, school climate, school managerial functions, students' academic performance and achievements, public support, parental participation, teacher's professional development, teacher's loyalty and satisfaction.

According to Aggarwal-Gupta and Vohra (2010), Bredeson (1985), Reynolds and Teddlie (2000), as cited in Ali (2017), school effectiveness is related to internal factors. Ali (2017) is of the view that input, procedures and output must be taken into account when evaluating the effectiveness of a school. However, Ostroff and Schmitt (1993) claim that it is very challenging to measure each of these in order to assess institutional performance.

As discussed, school effectiveness is concerned with quality education, and in Pakistan, only private institutions are able to provide such type of education (Khan, 2013b), and only private institutions can be deemed effective (Andrabi, Das & Khwaja, 2008). The reason behind this is the high-quality instructions and efficient monitoring system (Iqbal, 2012; Niqab, 2015; Ali, 2018). The current articles focused on public sector schools for which the following dimensions were developed: high expectations of stakeholders, quality assurance, community involvement, student's academic achievements, teachers' clarity, and material and non-material resources. All these dimensions have a greater and more valuable role in ensuring school effectiveness, but we cannot deny the fact that without instructional leadership, school effectiveness cannot be ensured (Ali, 2017; Adnan, 2023; Adnan, Ali & Khan, 2023; Rahman, 2021) because the heads of the educational setup are the key influencers on the educational system's quality.

Instructional Leadership (IL)

The concept of instruction leadership was acknowledged in the early 1980s with the key aim of how leadership ensured progression in educational outcomes (Adnan, Ali & Khan, 2023; Steward, 2006).



According to Ali (2017), instructional leadership is a significant component of school effectiveness. According to Debevoise (1984), instructional leadership is something concerned with school heads' jobs and their delegation of power to supporting staff. The main goal of instructional leadership (IL) is to turn the school toward its vision by providing insightful instruction. According to Sahin (2011), principals' critical role as instructional leaders has an impact on teaching and student accomplishment, and the fresh theory is that the principal should cope with the learning environment in order to reach a particular result (Elmore, 2000). Because they can successfully turn around their schools, instructional heads are also known as smart and commanding leaders (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Bossert et al., 1982; Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2005; Murphy & Hallinger, 1985; Spillane, 2015).

There can be no denying the importance of leadership in any endeavour because strong leadership determines whether an educational system is worthwhile (Peleg, 2012). According to Hallinger (2010), instructional heads will explain the mission of the school and manage the instructional programs by fostering a positive learning environment. These are the crucial factors that could help the school become more effective. Unquestionably, the principal's leadership style plays a crucial part in high-quality educational programs (Bredeson, 1985). By utilizing a variety of resources, including teacher teaching methods, student academic performance and achievements, extracurricular activities, etc., instructional leadership is able to achieve its visionary goals. According to Adnan, Ali and Khan (2023), these aspects were discussed by Hallinger (2003, 2009 & 2013) in the PIMRS (Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale). To conclude this conversation, the instructional leaders are the institutional builders and goal-oriented individuals (Hallinger, 2009). However, there is a lack of research on instructional leadership in the context of Pakistan (Ali, 2017; Adnan, 2023; Rizvi, 2010). However, the current article will be an empirical addition to the body of knowledge.

Methodology

Design of the Study

The researcher utilized the correlational research design to find out the correlation between instructional leadership and school effectiveness at secondary-level institutions in district Bannu. According to Adnan (2023) and Ali (2017), the correlational research design is appropriate in a state where the researcher wants to measure the correlation among variables.

Population of the Study

All the Government secondary-level teachers of district Bannu in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province constituted the population of this study. According to the annual statistic report 2017-18 regarding government schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, there are 1511 working teachers in 100 secondary-level schools (EMIS 2017-2018).

Sampling Technique and Sample Size

Keeping the nature of the geographical division of locality into urban and rural, the stratified random technique was utilized for respondents' selection. According to Ali (2017), Adnan, Ali and Khan (2023), Chua (2011), and Rahman (2021), stratified Random sampling is considered best in a situation if the respondents are present in groups/divisions. The sample size (respondents: 306, schools: 80) was taken through the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table.

Research Instrument

A close-ended seven (7) points Likert scale questionnaire comprising 45 items was utilized to obtain primary information from respondents related to the stated problem.

Data Collection Procedures

Keeping all the ethical principles in mind, the investigator personally obtained the data from the public sector secondary-level teachers of district Bannu.

Data Analysis Techniques

Keeping the nature of the research, the collected data was analyzed through Pearson's r correlation by using SPSS. The data was analyzed through the key principles of Pearson's r . Pearson's r is denoted by ρ and has a reference value ranging from -1 to $+1$. The negative and positive signs show the quality of the relationship among variables. The values ranged from 0 to $0.29 \pm$, showing weak correlation. Values ranging from 0.30 to $0.49 \pm$ is showing a moderate correlation, while values from 0.50 to $1.00 \pm$ are showing a strong correlation (Cohen, 1988 as cited in Adnan, 2023).

The current analysis was done in reflection of the research hypothesis (There is no significant relationship between instructional leadership (IL) and school effectiveness (SE) at the secondary school level in district Bannu). Table 1 shows the rest of the details.

Table 1

Correlation analysis [IL and SE (N=306)]

(SE)	(IL) =	DSM	MIP	CSLC	Entire (IL)
HES	0.601 **		0.541**	0.511**	0.595**
RES	0.639**		0.599**	0.531**	
CI	0.512**		0.619**	0.540**	
SAA	0.584**		0.513**	0.529**	
TE	0.609**		0.544**	0.514**	
QA	0.617**		0.601**	0.589**	
Entire (SE)					

$\rho^{**} < 0.01$, $\rho^* < 0.05$ (Sig: 2-Tailed), ** indicate significance

Table 1 represents a strong correlation. The entire values of correlation between IL and SE ($\rho = .595^{**}$, $\rho < 0.01$) clearly indicate a positive relationship between instructional leadership and school effectiveness at the secondary school level in the context of district Bannu.

Explaining further all the dimensions of IL and SE, the cited table clearly demonstrates that HES (high expectations of stakeholder) has a high positive correlation with DSM (defining school mission) (.601, $p < 0.01$), MIP (managing instructional programs) (.541, $p < 0.01$), and CSLC (creating positive school learning climate) (.511, $p < 0.01$).

The table further showed that RES (material & non-material resources) has a high positive correlation with DSM (defining school mission) (.631, $p < 0.01$), MIP (managing instructional programs) (.591, $p < 0.01$) and CSLC (creating positive school learning climate) (.531, $p < 0.01$).

CI (community involvement) also reveals a positive and high correlation with the DSM (defining school mission) (.512, $p < 0.01$), MIP (managing instructional programs) (.619, $p < 0.01$) and CSLC (creating a positive school learning climate) (.540, $p < 0.01$).

The SAA (students' academic achievements) indicate a positive-high correlation with the DSM (defining school mission) (.584, $p < 0.01$), MIP (managing instructional programs) (.513, $p < 0.01$) and CSLC (creating a positive school learning climate) (.529, $p < 0.01$).

The TE (teachers' efficacy) points out a positive-high correlation with the DSM (defining school mission) (.609, $p < 0.01$), MIP (managing instructional programs) (.544, $p < 0.01$) and CSLC (creating school learning climate) (.514, $p < 0.01$).

The last sub-dimension of school effectiveness, QA (quality assurance), also demonstrate a high correlation with the DSM (defining school mission) (.617, $p < 0.01$), MIP (managing instructional programs) (.601, $p < 0.01$) and CSLC (creating school learning climate) (.589, $p < 0.01$).

In reflection of the cited statistics, it is evidently proved that instructional leadership has a significant relationship with school effectiveness. This means that the research hypothesis mentioned above (There is no significant relationship between instructional leadership and school effectiveness at the secondary school level in district Bannu) is strongly rejected.



Findings

The current statistics explicitly elucidate that IL (Instructional Leadership) has a strong, significant relationship with SE (School Effectiveness). The current result acknowledged the strong rejection of the hypothesis (*There is no significant relationship between instructional leadership and school effectiveness at the secondary school level in district Bannu*).

Discussion

The non-material resources (RES) (the dimensions of SE) and the defining school mission (DSM), managing instructional programs (MIP) and creating school learning climate (CSLC) (the dimension of IL) have the strongest and most significant relationships in the examined connection. It is verified that the instructional leader's attitude toward defining the school's mission is closely related to the resources on hand. The current finding is similar to Ali's study (2017).

CI-community involvement, the next sub-dimension of school effectiveness, has a noticeable relationship with managing instructional programs, defining the school mission and creating a school learning climate. According to MacBeath and Cheng (2008), the principal is in charge of developing and overseeing the educational programs. It was found that instructional leaders manage instructional programs by involving the community and focusing on school effectiveness. The stated result of the study is similar to the study of Ali (2017) and Rahman (2021). Teachers and students are inspired by the community through praise. The results of this study support Payen's (2006) assertion that the role of the principal was to act as a liaison between the school and the community. The instructional leader is responsible for managing instructional programs, fostering a positive learning environment, and involving staff and the community in the development and definition of the school's mission.

This study unequivocally showed that defining a school mission, managing instructional programs and creating a school learning climate have a strong relationship with quality assurance. To guarantee the quality of the schools, the instructional leaders must first make clear the objective of the institution. These findings are similar to Khan's study (2013b). The instructional leaders promote a learning environment to uphold the institution's standards. Ayeni and Adelabu (2011) discovered that facilities, including lecture rooms, staff offices, archives, amenities, and furnishing kinds of stuff and sporting goods, are necessary in order to promote the instructional process in schools successfully.

The stated study explicitly indicates that teachers' efficacy has a strong relationship with the dimensions of instructional leadership. The closer their relationship is examined, the clearer the definitions of the school's mission and teacher effectiveness become. Seashore et al. (2010) reached a similar result about how successful teachers encourage motivation and mastery experiences as this study did. The study showed that instructional leaders in successful schools are responsible for fostering a learning environment at the school. These arguments are closely related to Hughes and Pickeral's study (2013).

Furthermore, the findings of the study are similar to the studies of Ahmad and Bin Said (2013), Ali (2017), Halawah (2005), Hallinger (2009 & 2010), Hughes and Pikeral (2013) and Scheerens (2004).

Conclusion

In view of the cited discussion regarding the relationship between the dimensions of instructional leadership and school effectiveness, it is evidently clear that instructional leadership has a leading role in school effectiveness. This statement indicates that school effectiveness could be confirmed in a situation if there is an explicit role of instructional leader present.

References

- Adnan, M., Ali, N., & Khan, R. (2023). A Correlational Study of the Principals' Instructional Leadership and School Improvement at Secondary School Level in District Mardan. *Global Educational Studies Review*, VIII(II), 159–166. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2023\(VIII-II\).15](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2023(VIII-II).15)
- Adnan. M. (2023). *Relationship between principal's instructional leadership and school improvement through mediation of effective teaching practice at secondary school level*. PhD. Dissertation, submitted to the

- department of teacher education, Qurba University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar campus, 2023.
- Aggarwal-Gupta, M., & Vohra, N. (2010). Measuring effectiveness of schools in India: a multiple stakeholder framework. *e-Journal of Organisational Learning and Leadership*, 8(2), 1-13. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Meenakshi-Aggarwal-Gupta/publication/265878970_Measuring_Effectiveness_of_Schools_in_India_A_Multiple_Stakeholder_Framework/links/5915415faca27200fe4eaf13/Measuring-Effectiveness-of-Schools-in-India-A-Multiple-Stakeholder-Framework.pdf
- Ahmad, I., & Bin Said, H. (2013). Role of school principal in promotion of school home relationship: case of government secondary schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 4(1), 115-124. <https://arastirmax.com/tr/system/files/dergiler/111041/makaleler/4/1/arastirmax-role-school-principal-promotion-school-home-relationship-case-government-secondary-schools-khyber-pakhtunkhwa-pakistan.pdf>
- Ali, N (2017). *Teachers' Perceptions Of The Relationship Between Principals' Instructional Leadership, School Culture And School Effectiveness In Secondary Schools In Pakistan*. Institute Of Educational Leadership University Of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Ali, N. (2018). *The relationship among Principal's Instructional Leadership, School Culture and School Effectiveness in secondary schools in Pakistan*. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP TO THE FORE Research and Evidence. 26-36.
- Andrabi, T., Das, J., & Khwaja, A. (2008). A dime a day: The possibilities and limits of private schooling in Pakistan. *Comparative Education Review*, 52(3), 329-355. <https://doi.org/10.1086/588796>
- Ayeni, A. J., & Adelabu, M. A. (2011). Improving learning infrastructure and environment for sustainable quality assurance practice in secondary schools in Ondo state, south-west, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 1(1), 61-68. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2012.vii1.20>
- Bamburg, J. D., & Andrews, R. L. (1990). School goals, principals, and achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2(3), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345910020302>
- Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional leadership role of the Principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64.
- Bredeson, P. V. (1985). An analysis of the metaphorical perspectives of school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(1), 29-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x85021001004>
- Chua, Y. P. (2011). *Kaedah dan statistic penyelidikan: kaedah penyelidikan* [Research methods and statistics]. McGraw-Hill Education, Shah-Alam, Malaysia.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for behavioural sciences*. New Jersey, USA: R Erlbaum.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, dc, 1066- 5684.
- DeBevoise, W. (1984). *Synthesis of Research On The Principal As Instructional Leader*. https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_1984.02_bevoise.pdf
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Knowing the right thing to do: School improvement and performance based accountability*. Washington, D.C.: NGA Center for Best Practices.
- Halawah, I. (2005). The relationship between effective communication of high school principal and school climate. *Education*, 126(2), 334+. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A142057921/AONE?u=anon~b1393c05&sid=googleScholar&xid=94a2b798>
- Hallinger, P. (2009). *Leadership for 21st century schools: From instructional leadership to leadership for learning*. Hong Kong: The Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- HALLINGER, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005>
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793>



- Hallinger, P. (2010). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(2), 271–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x10383412>
- Hallinger, P. (2013). A conceptual framework for systematic reviews of research in educational leadership and management. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(2), 126–149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231311304670>
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*, Ed.8. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, A. W. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425–446. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043003425>
- Hughes, W., & Pickeral, T. (2013). School climate and shared leadership. *School climate practices for implementation and sustainability*, 26(1), 1–56
- Iqbal, M. (2012). Public versus private secondary schools: a qualitative comparison. *Journal of Research and Reflection in Education*, 6(1), 40–49. <http://ue.edu.pk/jrre/articles/61004.pdf>
- Kesteren, J.H.M. (1996). *Doorlichten en herontwerpen van organisatie-complexen: De ontwikkeling van een methodiek om non-profit organisaties bij te sturen op organisatorische effectiviteit*. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, dissertatie.
- Khan, A. (2013). A case study of instructional contributions of community and government secondary school administrators in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 4(2), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.22610/jevr.v4i2.100>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- MacBeath, J. & Cheng, Y.C. (2008). *Leadership for learning: International perspectives*. The Netherlands: Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1985). Effective high schools— what are the common characteristics? *NASSP Bulletin*, 69(477), 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658506947704>
- Niqab, M. (2015). *The relationship between principal leadership skills, organizational citizenship behavior, and intellectual capital in secondary Schools in Pakistan*. Muhammad Niqab (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
- OSTROFF, C., & SCHMITT, N. (1993). Configurations of organizational effectiveness and efficiency. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6), 1345–1361. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256814>
- Payne, R. (2006). *Working with parents: Building relationships for students' success*. Highlands, TX: Aha. Process Peleg, S. (2012). The role of leadership in the education system. *Education Journal*, 1(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20120101.12>
- Rahman, A. U. (2021). *A correlational study of principals' instructional leadership, teachers' motivation, and school improvement*. Department of education shaheed benazir bhutto university wari campus khyber pakhtunkhwa, pakistan. Session (2019–2021).
- Reynolds, D., & Teddlie, C. (2000). The processes of school effectiveness. In Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (Eds.), *The international handbook of school effectiveness research* (pp135–159). London: Falmer Press.
- Rizvi, S. (2010). *A Transnational Approach to Educational Leadership Capacity Building: A case study of the masters of education programmed at Notre Dame*. (Doctoral dissertation, Australian Catholic University).
- Sahin, S. (2011). The Relationship between Instructional Leadership Style and School Culture (Izmir Case). *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 11(4), 1920–1927. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ962681.pdf>
- Scheerens, J. (2004). Review of school and instructional effectiveness research. Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005, *The Quality Imperative*. <http://doc.utwente.nl/92593/1/Effective-teaching-scheerens.pdf>
- Scheerens, J., Glas, C., & Thomas, S. M. (2003). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring: A systemic approach*. Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.
- Scheerens, J. (2013). The use of theory in school effectiveness research revisited. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 24(1), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2012.691100>
- Seashore-Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K.L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreas_ofFocus/EducationalLeadership/Documents/Learning-fromLeadership-Investigating-Links-Final-report.pdf

Spillane, J. (2015). Leadership and learning: Conceptualizing relations between school administrative practice and instructional practice. *Societies*, 5(2), 277-294. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc5020277>

Yesil, S., & Kaya, A. (2012). The role of organizational culture on innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 6(1), 11-25.