



## **Role of Leadership in Promoting Quality Education at the Elementary Level**

**Amber Qadar**

*Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan*  
[amber.qadar@iub.edu.pk](mailto:amber.qadar@iub.edu.pk)

**Muhammad Athar Hussain**

*Associate Professor, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan*  
[athar.hussain@iub.edu.pk](mailto:athar.hussain@iub.edu.pk)

**Atta ul Munam**

*M. Phil Scholar, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan*  
[attaulmunam4@gmail.com](mailto:attaulmunam4@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

*This study was conducted to find out the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level. The objectives of the study were: to investigate the role of leadership, to assess the head teachers' opinion regarding the implementation of quality indicators, and to ascertain the difference between head teachers' opinions regarding the role of leadership in promoting quality education. To achieve these objectives, this study used a descriptive survey design. All the male and female head teachers (171 males and 145 females) of elementary schools and 302 head teachers (157 males and 145 females) of high schools from the four Tehsils (Rahim Yar Khan, Khan Pur, Liaqat Pur, and Sadiqabad) of District Rahim Yar Khan participated in this survey. The population was small therefore census sampling technique is used. The whole population was considered as a sample of the study. A 45-item questionnaire, self-structured was used. 618 questionnaires were distributed among the head teachers and 583 questionnaires were finally returned and the response rate was 94.33%. The data were analyzed by using SPSS and a combination of descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings revealed that leadership plays an ample role in promoting quality education at the elementary level.*

**Keywords:** *Leadership, Quality Education, Elementary Level*



## **Introduction**

Quality education at the elementary level is fundamental to the development of a knowledge-based society. It creates the foundation for lifelong learning and has a crucial role in determining the destiny of both individuals and the country as a whole. One cannot exaggerate how crucial leadership is to promoting high-quality education. Leaders play a key role since they have direct control over educational practices and outcomes, particularly at the primary school level.

Leadership in the field of education encompasses more than just managerial duties. It involves creating a strategic plan to realize the educational mission, fostering an excellence and learning culture, and constructing an educational vision. The principal and senior instructors are typically in charge of fostering a high-quality learning environment in elementary schools. They act as a blueprint for the development of the curriculum, teacher preparation, student involvement, and school culture.

According to studies, effective leadership is connected favorably with high standards of instruction and student accomplishment (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Leaders can shape the pedagogical strategies used by instructors, establish performance benchmarks, and encourage a learning-friendly climate. Leaders may also help students and staff feels a sense of belonging, inclusivity, and respect for one another, all of which can improve the educational experience.

Leadership in primary education, however, presents a number of difficulties, including resource limitations, teacher turnover, a range of student needs, and shifting educational policies. Leaders that are effective exert influence in a manner that helps all stakeholders achieve their goals (Nanjundeswaras and Swamy, 2014). As a result, different leadership styles have an impact on an organization's performance. Adeyemi (2003) defines leadership as behaviors in which one person (the leader) exerts influence over others in order to achieve goals. It is a method for persuading a group of individuals to work toward a common objective (Kiboss, 2014).

Various elements of leadership knowledge and skills have been recognized by researchers on the subject of leadership. In order to be a good leader, you need to have a wide vision, be able to set good goals, be critical in your decision-making, have strong interpersonal and intrapersonal



communication skills, and be able to collaborate and cooperate with your team members in order to develop their leadership skills (Mendenhall et al., 2017).

When a leader has characteristics that motivate people to work together to achieve a common goal, they are the ones who prepare them for change by engaging with them, motivating the staff to work together by creating synergy, and exceeding the usual practices and authorities. They also influence the behavior of the people under their management (Altnay, 2015). When it comes to educational leadership, there are a number of distinct characteristics that must be met by educational leaders in order for them to effectively manage all educational activities in the appropriate direction. For Haider (2008), it is the systematic process of bringing together all the energy, knowledge, and abilities of the school community to achieve its common educational goals that makes education leadership a complex process. Because the leader is the controller and determinant of the route that the institution intends to follow toward achieving its goals, success or failure is determined by the leader.

Therefore, the need for educational quality improvement is critical, and it is part of the public's obligation to hold schools accountable. It's because, in today's globalized world, public accountability and transparency are essential for development sector management. Improvement and change in management are crucial aspects of attempts to improve the quality of education. This paper attempts to contribute to the existing body of literature by examining the role of leadership in providing quality education at the elementary level in district Rahim Yar Khan.

This study also aims to assess the head teachers' opinions regarding the implementation of quality indicators at the elementary school level. Moreover, it attempts to ascertain the difference between head teachers' opinions regarding the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level. As this study investigates the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level, that's why this study will be beneficial and useful for teachers and higher authorities in understanding the role of leadership in promoting quality elementary education. This study will also be useful for educational leaders, managers, and policymakers in understanding the role of leadership in promoting elementary-level quality education.



## **Literature Review**

Schools have become a place where young people can be honed and polished to their full potential. The role of school leaders is similar to that of other company leaders because they must deal with the challenges of ensuring the institution's goals are met and the needs of the students are met. In the context of the classroom, "exercising leadership" refers to the process of encouraging and monitoring other educators so that they might work with a burning desire toward the accomplishment of educational objectives. It would appear that the leadership styles of head teachers and their level of job satisfaction are linked when it comes to the way in which they carry out their jobs and responsibilities in order to get the work done through their personnel. There are a variety of approaches to leadership that principals use, and they also have a variety of mentalities that they exhibit (Hinic et al., 2017).

As with any organization or institution, educational management relies heavily on leadership because it has a greater impact on the achievement of educational goals. Organizational improvement and developing a set of agreed-upon and valuable rules for the organization are two of the most important aspects of leadership (Louis et al. 2010). Educational leadership is a dynamic process in which a person is accountable for teamwork and actively seeks group effort, as well as channeling the dedication of all team members to achieve specific goals in a given situation. This requires the individual to channel the commitment of all team members to accomplish these goals (Pazey & Cole, 2013). Leadership in this context involves determining the objectives that are to be attained and the individual who will be responsible for putting them into action. In addition, leadership in this context seeks to improve the characteristics of reinforcement, such as identification, service environment, confidence building, compulsion, and payment, in order to improve the performance of educational institutions (Balunywa, 2000).

There is a broad variety of definitions that can be found in the literature because different academics and professionals in business place different amounts of emphasis on certain facets of leadership commitment. The vast bulk of these explanations revolves around routine activities. When someone is said to be "bound by his or her behaviors", for example, attention is drawn to the outward manifestations of that bond, such as the person's facial expressions and the way he or she conducts himself in public. This can be a useful approach to getting insight into a person's character. As a consequence of this, members of the organization have a propensity to focus their



attention, rather than the theoretical or philosophical parts of their dedication, on the behavioral component. Their unwavering commitment to the needs of their company is one of the primary reasons for their accomplishments at work (Pineda, 2013).

In the framework of advancement and success in the industrial and business sectors, the topic of leadership commitment has been the subject of a great deal of research; however, surprisingly few studies have been undertaken on the topic in the context of the education sector (Madanchian et al., 2016). The extent to which individuals inside an organization feel a sense of belonging to the group is also crucial to this discussion. Employees are influenced by their leaders' level of commitment, which in turn shapes how they think about their own work. When CEOs don't invest in their people, morale tanks and burnout rates go through the roof (Nasomboon, 2014). Businesses must have strong connections and feelings of attachment from both their leadership and their employees if they are to be sustainable and provide the results that were intended. The dedication that members have to an organization serves as a driving force that brings them together (Taing et al., 2011). Leadership that is successful in elementary and secondary schools is not the same as leadership that is successful in colleges and universities. It has been observed that being in charge of a school is difficult because of the many responsibilities that come with the position. These responsibilities include controlling the outcomes of the budget, being accountable for the performance of staff, resolving concerns brought up by students, and maximizing productivity.

Some of the leaders of the schools have referred to them as the "meat in the sandwich". In contrast, the leader of a university is not held accountable for the acts of his or her staff or the results of the institution's budget when the university is a higher education institution. The principal has historically been the key power source in public schools. Pierce (2000) calls the principal the school's success passport. Leaders influence both instructors and students directly. Effective school management involves the use and allocation of human, physical, and financial resources in ways that promote learning for students (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). The main effects are logical persuasion, learning, inspiration, consultation, personal appeals, exchanges, alliances, and the strain on these resources (Leithwood et al., 2006). In addition, good school leaders build and sustain competitive schools and enable others to take important decisions. Develop and implement strategic school improvement programs and give instructional guidance



(Leithwood et al., 2004). To add one more layer to the discussion, Brewer (2001) proposed that instructional leaders make the transition from management to leadership. It is crucial for efficient leadership to “work on the system” rather than “work in the system” when performing administrative responsibilities. In a manner that is quite analogous, Robinson (2006) proposed that effective leadership ought to be regarded as the core role of teaching and learning in order to return it to its rightful position within the educational system. According to the research that Fida (2000) conducted on the subject in the context of Pakistan, strong management leadership opens the route for efficient organizational control. This research was conducted in Pakistan. Rizvi and Amjad (2008) investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and effective leadership in Pakistan (the academic and banking sectors). They observed a positive correlation between the two, but when they controlled for factors such as gender and industry, they did not find any differences (teachers versus bankers). The findings presented here point to emotional intelligence's involvement as a basic trait in successful leadership across both sexes, both in the academic sphere and in the financial sector.

In Rowold's (2008) study utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, several kinds of leadership, such as transactional and transformational leadership, were linked to pastoral leadership. The first section of the study focused on the effectiveness of pastoral leadership, particularly transactional and transformational management styles. During the first phase, the focus was on pastoral leadership conduct, the extra efforts of the followers, the effectiveness of the individual working groups, their contentment with the leader, and the job satisfaction of the followers. Rowold (2008) conjectured that the data showed that the subjective outcome criteria were both transactional and transformative leadership. He has proven that only transformative leadership has a favorable relationship with the extra effort of its followers, their effectiveness, and their job and leadership satisfaction. Lin and Chuang (2014) conducted a study to investigate the effects of different leadership styles on the levels of student learning motivation in elementary schools. They found that primary school teachers used a combination of transactional and transformative leadership styles in their classrooms. It was found that there was a moderate connection between the two leadership styles that were discussed earlier and the level of student learning motivation as well as the variation in management styles that encompassed both transformational and transactional methods. School leadership has a favorable and significant effect on student performance. Waters and Marzano (2006) observed that good educational



leadership significantly boosts student performance. Kruger et al. (2007) found that school leaders influence student outcomes and school culture indirectly using path analysis.

Kurt (2009) indicated that school administrators' transformational leadership styles predicted the collective efficacy of teachers considerably at a moderate level, but transactional types of leadership predicted the teachers' collective efficacy at a lower level. School principals' leadership styles have been linked to collective teacher efficacy among teachers in a province. Leadership styles, school principals, and the efficacy of instructors were found to have a moderately positive association. It was also discovered that school principals' laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational leadership styles might predict the aggregate efficacy of teachers individually (Akan, 2013). Quality improvement activities are linked to learning and service quality improvement, despite the fact that they are not directly related. The ultimate goal of quality improvement is to maintain a higher level of quality over time (Gvaramadze, 2008). All parts of a school's operations, including individual professors, departments, and courses, are included in the term "whole institution". It also includes the institution's organizational infrastructure. It is the major goal of quality improvement strategies to promote advanced instruction and educational development in the classroom by focusing on improving English language teaching and learning (Biggs & Tang, 2011).

School leaders can influence student achievement by influencing the settings and climate in which teaching and learning take place. Over time, a substantial body of research on school effectiveness has consistently underlined the importance of school leadership in making schools more effective (Townsend, 2007). A number of leadership roles and duties have been found to have a positive effect on student learning. A number of reviews and meta-analyses have lately consolidated the findings of the study on leadership effects. These findings support the notion that effective leadership is linked to an increase in student achievement (Robinson, 2007).

Morton et al. (2011) argue that school administrators may transform their institutions because of the personality qualities and abilities they possess and that the arrangements of leadership and administrative tasks exemplified by the school administrator are essential to the success of the institution. Leadership vision is critical for reform, innovation, and change, which affect proactive behaviors by influencing intrinsic motivation, according to the study's findings (Yi et al., 2019). School principals who are more imaginative and inspirational are likely to have more



transformational leadership traits, and a visionary leader who designs a change-based leadership understanding is a trusted, respected social architect who communicates frequently with his or her followers (Mi et al., 2019).

### Research Methodology

A quantitative survey design was employed to conduct the study. In this study, the population comprised all the male and female head teachers of elementary schools and high schools from the four Tehsils Rahim Yar Khan, Khan Pur, Liaqat Pur, and Sadiq Abad of district Rahim Yar Khan. The population of the study consists of 316 head teachers of elementary schools and 302 high schools from all Tehsils of district Rahim yar khan. Because the population was small, the census sampling technique was used. The whole population was considered a sample for the study. In this study, a questionnaire based on a 5-point Likert scale was utilized to analyze the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level. A questionnaire was validated by expert opinion and a pilot study. These instruments have two distinct sections labelled A and B. Section A examines respondents' personal and demographic data, and Section B enquires about the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level.

### Sample of Study

Table 1  
Tehsil wise and Level wise detail of Sample

District	Tehsil	Head Teachers Elementary School			Head Teachers High School (in which Elementary Classes)		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Rahim Yar Khan	Rahim Yar Khan	57	46	103	54	51	105
	Khan Pur	39	34	73	34	30	64
	Liaqat Pur	35	31	66	35	31	66
	Sadiq Abad	40	34	74	34	33	67
	Total	171	145	316	157	145	302

Table 1 demonstrates that the sample was selected using a census sampling technique. As a result, a representative sample included 316 head teachers (171 males and 145 females) from elementary schools and 302 head teachers (157 males and 145 females) from high schools in which elementary classes exist.





## Data Analysis

Software application (SPSS 20.0) was used to analyze the data. The percentages and frequencies of solutions have been computed. The findings had been expressed as a proportion of entire replies. Conclusions had been reached, and guidelines have been given as a result.

### Statement wise analysis of Head Teachers' Data

#### A. Job Satisfaction

Table 2  
Frequency Distribution for Job Satisfaction

Sr. #	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
1	I am satisfied by my job.	243 (41.7)	231 (39.6)	52 (8.9)	46 (7.9)	11 (1.9)	4.11	.99
2	I am satisfied by behaviour of higher authorities.	220 (37.8)	241 (41.3)	23 (3.9)	76 (13.0)	23 (3.9)	3.95	1.13
3	I am satisfied by progress of my school.	207 (35.5)	252 (43.2)	40 (6.9)	64 (11.0)	20 (3.4)	3.96	1.08
4	I am satisfied by my teaching staff.	213 (36.5)	241 (41.3)	51 (8.7)	67 (11.5)	11 (1.9)	3.98	1.04

SA = strongly agree    A = agree    N = neutral    D = disagree    SD = strongly disagree  
M = mean    SD = standard deviation

Table 2 explains the results of Section A (Job Satisfaction) of the questionnaire. 81.3% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with their job with M (mean) (4.11) and SD (standard deviation) (.99), and participants (79.1%) either agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with the behaviour of higher authorities with M (3.95) and SD (1.13). This table also elaborates that head teachers are satisfied with the progress of their school, as 78.7% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with M (3.96) and SD (1.08). They (head teachers) are satisfied with their teaching staff, which has M (3.98) and SD (1.04), according to 77.8% of respondents.



## B. Administrative Measures

Table 3  
Frequency Distribution for Administrative Measures

Sr. #	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
1	I consult with colleagues in difficulty in teaching.	233 (40.0)	254 (43.6)	40 (6.9)	47 (8.1)	9 (1.5)	4.12	.95
2	I attend staff meeting regularly.	196 (33.6)	295 (50.6)	36 (6.2)	47 (8.1)	9 (1.5)	4.06	.92
3	I arrange meeting with parents.	288 (49.2)	181 (31.0)	66 (11.3)	42 (7.2)	6 (1.0)	4.20	.97
4	I check performance of students regularly.	244 (41.9)	220 (37.7)	72 (12.3)	37 (6.3)	10 (1.7)	4.11	.96
5	I follow orders by higher authorities in the school.	309 (53.0)	167 (28.6)	62 (10.6)	30 (5.1)	15 (2.6)	4.24	1.00

Table 3 explains the results of Part B (Administrative Measures) of the questionnaire. With a mean of 4.12 and a standard deviation of .95, respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they consult with colleagues on teaching challenges, and with a mean of 4.06 and a standard deviation of .92, participants agreed or strongly agreed that they regularly attended staff meetings. According to the data in the table, both the mean (4.20) and the standard deviation (0.97) suggest that they (80.2%) should contact the parents. Most respondents (79.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that they routinely use the mean (M = 4.11) and standard deviation (SD =.96) to evaluate student performance. In addition, 81.6% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “*I accept commands from school superiors*”, with a mean of 4.24 and a standard deviation of 1.00.

Table 4  
Frequency Distribution for Administrative Measures

Sr. #	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
6	Best teacher award ceremony is arranged in school.	282 (48.4)	172 (29.5)	69 (11.8)	50 (8.6)	10 (1.7)	4.14	1.04
7	Co-curricular activities are arranged in my school.	283 (48.6)	208 (35.7)	28 (4.8)	51 (8.7)	13 (2.2)	4.19	1.02
8	Students take part in co- curricular activities.	255 (43.8)	185 (31.7)	68 (11.7)	60 (10.3)	15 (2.6)	4.03	1.09
9	Awards are arranged for winner students.	268 (46.0)	197 (33.8)	62 (10.6)	48 (8.2)	8 (1.4)	4.14	.99
10	National days are celebrated in school.	270 (46.3)	233 (40.0)	36 (6.2)	33 (5.7)	11 (1.9)	4.23	.93

Table 4 explains the results of Part B (Administrative Measures) of the questionnaire. 67.9% of participants endorsed the statement that the best teacher award ceremony is held at school, with M



(4.14) and SD (1.04). This table also shows that 84.3 percent of respondents affirm that co-curricular activities are organized at my school with  $M$  (4.19) and  $SD$  (1.02). 75.5% of participants either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that students take part in extracurricular activities with  $M$  (4.03) and  $SD$  (1.09). Furthermore, with  $M$  (4.14) and  $SD$  (.99), 79.8% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that awards are arranged for winning students, and participants (86.3%) endorsed the statement that national days are celebrated in school having  $M$  (4.23) &  $SD$  (.93).

### C. Maintenance of Record

Table 5  
Frequency Distribution for Maintenance of Record

Sr. #	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
1	Students attendance register are maintained in school.	226 (36.8)	250 (42.9)	48 (8.2)	49 (8.4)	10 (1.7)	4.08	.97
2	Teacher attendance register is maintaining in school.	174 (29.9)	260 (44.6)	79 (13.6)	58 (9.9)	12 (2.1)	3.90	1.00
3	Admission registers are maintained in school.	197 (33.8)	281 (48.2)	40 (6.9)	46 (7.9)	19 (3.3)	4.01	1.01
4	Log book registers are maintained in school.	141 (24.2)	250 (42.9)	65 (11.1)	105 (18.0)	22 (3.8)	3.65	1.14
5	Dairy dispatch register is maintained in my school.	155 (26.6)	256 (43.9)	63 (10.8)	90 (15.4)	19 (3.3)	3.75	1.11

Table 5 shows the results of Section C (Maintenance of Records) of the questionnaire. Respondents (79.7%) affirm the statement that student attendance registers are maintained in school with  $M$  (4.08) and  $SD$  (.97), and the majority of the participants (74.5%) endorsed the statement that teacher attendance registers are maintained in school, as did respondents with  $M$  (3.90) and  $SD$  (1.00). Respondents (82.0%) either agreed or strongly agreed that admissions registers are maintained in schools with  $M$  (4.01) and  $SD$  (1.01). With  $M$  (3.65) and  $SD$  (1.14), 67.1% of participants favor that log book registers being kept in school. In addition, 70.5 percent of respondents endorsed the statement that a diary dispatch register is kept in my school, with  $M$  (3.75) and  $SD$  (1.11).



Table 6  
Frequency Distribution for Maintenance of Record

Sr.#	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
6	Visitor book is maintained in my school.	176 (30.2)	242 (41.5)	62 (10.6)	87 (14.9)	16 (2.7)	3.81	1.10
7	Personal files of staff are maintained in my school.	121 (20.8)	286 (49.1)	70 (12.0)	88 (15.1)	18 (3.1)	3.69	1.05
8	Progress report register is maintained in my school.	200 (34.3)	245 (42.0)	55 (9.4)	73 (12.5)	10 (1.7)	3.94	1.04
9	Result register is maintained in my school.	134 (23.0)	253 (43.4)	100 (17.2)	87 (14.9)	9 (1.5)	3.71	1.02
10	Leave register is maintained in my school.	163 (28.0)	261 (44.8)	74 (12.7)	75 (12.9)	10 (1.7)	3.84	1.02

Table 6 shows the results of Section C (Maintenance of Records) of the questionnaire. The statement that a visitor's book is kept in their school was agreed upon or strongly agreed upon by 71.7 percent of participants with *M* (3.81) and *SD* (1.10). Respondents (69.9%) either agreed or strongly agreed that the personal files of staff are maintained in their school, with an *M* of 3.69 and an *SD* of 1.05. Participants (76.3%) affirm the statement that a progress report register is maintained in the school with *M* (3.94) and *SD* (1.04). Furthermore, 66.4 percent of head teachers endorsed the statement that a result register is maintained in their school having *M* (3.71) and *SD* (1.02), and 72.8 percent of participants coincide with the statement that a leave register is maintained in their school having *M* (3.84) and *SD* (1.02).

#### D. Physical Facilities

Table 7  
Frequency Distribution for Physical Facilities

Sr.#	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
1	School building is standardized.	159 (27.3)	221 (37.9)	82 (14.1)	105 (18.0)	16 (2.7)	3.68	1.13
2	My school is neat and clean.	167 (28.7)	266 (45.6)	59 (10.1)	77 (13.2)	14 (2.4)	3.84	1.05
3	Rooms are airy.	208 (35.7)	239 (41.0)	61 (10.5)	65 (11.1)	10 (1.7)	3.97	1.03
4	My school building has boundary wall.	161 (27.6)	240 (41.2)	106 (18.2)	63 (10.8)	13 (2.2)	3.80	1.02
5	Electricity facility is available in my school.	209 (35.9)	241 (41.3)	53 (9.1)	74 (12.7)	6 (1.0)	3.98	1.02



Table 7 shows the results of D (Physical Facilities) of the questionnaire. Head teachers (67.2%) endorsed the statement that school buildings are standardized with  $M$  (3.68) and  $SD$  (1.13), and 74.3% of the participants (74.3%) coincide with the statement that the school is neat and clean, as respondents agreed with  $M$  (3.84) and  $SD$  (1.05). 76.7% of respondents affirm that rooms are airy with  $M$  (3.97) and  $SD$  (1.03). Participants (68.8%) endorsed the statement that their school building has a boundary wall with  $M$  (3.80) and  $SD$  (1.02). Furthermore, 77.2% of head teachers coincide with the statement that electricity facilities are available in their school, which has  $M$  (3.98) and  $SD$  (1.02).

Table 8  
Frequency Distribution for Physical Facilities

Sr.#	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
6	Fans are available in all rooms of my school.	171 (29.4)	242 (41.5)	77 (13.2)	80 (13.7)	13 (2.2)	3.81	1.06
7	Tube lights are available in all rooms of my school.	221 (37.9)	251 (43.1)	33 (5.7)	64 (11.0)	14 (2.4)	4.02	1.04
8	Furniture is available in my school according to need.	208 (35.7)	275 (47.2)	28 (4.8)	59 (10.1)	13 (2.2)	4.03	1.00
9	My school has separate staffroom.	228 (39.1)	239 (41.0)	50 (8.6)	60 (10.3)	6 (1.0)	4.06	.98

Table 8 shows the results of D (Physical Facilities) of the questionnaire. 70.9 percent of participants endorsed the statement that fans are available in all rooms of their school, which has  $M$  (3.81) and  $SD$  (1.06). Head teachers (81.0%) coincide that tube lights are available in all rooms of the school, having  $M$  (4.02) and  $SD$  (1.04). With  $M$  (4.03) and  $SD$  (1.00), 82.9% of participants affirm the statement that furniture is available in their school based on need. Furthermore, 80.1% of head teachers either endorsed the statement that their school has separate staff rooms with  $M$  (4.06) and  $SD$  (.98).



Table 9  
Frequency Distribution for Physical Facilities

Sr. #	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
10	My school has separate office.	189 (32.4)	268 (46.0)	47 (8.1)	64 (11.0)	15 (2.6)	3.94	1.03
11	My school has drinking water.	164 (28.2)	274 (47.0)	69 (11.8)	63 (10.8)	13 (2.2)	3.87	1.00
12	My School has washrooms according to need.	220 (37.8)	211 (36.2)	64 (11.0)	79 (13.6)	9 (1.5)	3.94	1.08
13	Washrooms are neat in my school.	206 (35.4)	210 (36.0)	71 (12.2)	78 (13.4)	18 (3.1)	3.86	1.12
14	My school has facility of computer lab.	153 (26.3)	231 (39.6)	81 (13.9)	95 (16.3)	23 (3.9)	3.67	1.14
15	Computer lab in myschool is in working position.	169 (30.0)	237 (40.7)	68 (11.7)	95 (16.3)	14 (2.4)	3.77	1.10
16	Science lab in my school is furnished.	165 (28.3)	233 (40.0)	61 (10.0)	106 (18.2)	18 (3.1)	3.71	1.14
17	My school has facilityof library.	210 (36.0)	259 (44.4)	55 (9.4)	48 (8.2)	11 (1.9)	4.04	.97
18	My school has playgrounds.	185 (31.8)	244 (41.9)	46 (7.9)	98 (16.8)	10 (1.7)	3.84	1.09

Table 9 shows the results of D (Physical Facilities) of the questionnaire. Head teachers (78.4%) coincide with the statement that their school has separate offices with  $M$  (3.94) and  $SD$  (1.03), and 75.2% of the participants affirm the statement that their school has drinking water, as did respondents with  $M$  (3.87) and  $SD$  (1.00). 74% of head teachers endorsed that their school has washrooms according to need, having  $M$  (3.94) and  $SD$  (1.08). With  $M$  (3.86) and  $SD$  (1.12), participants (71.4%) coincide that washrooms in their school are clean. Furthermore, 65.9% of head teachers endorsed the statement that their school has a computer lab with  $M$  (3.67) and  $SD$  (1.14), and 70.7% of participants affirmed the statement that the computer lab in my school is in a working position with  $M$  (3.77) and  $SD$  (1.10). Respondents (68.3%) coincide that the science lab in school is furnished with  $M$  (3.71) and  $SD$  (1.14). Participants (80.4%) affirm the statement that the school has a library with  $M$  (4.04) and  $SD$  (.97). 73.7% of head teachers coincide with the statement that their school has playgrounds with  $M$  (3.84) and  $SD$  (1.09).



### E. Academic Performance

Table 10  
Frequency Distribution for Academic Performance

Sr. #	Statements of Questions	SA f(%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M	SD
1	My school's result was above 80% in 2020.	146 (25.1)	316 (54.2)	41 (7.0)	64 (11.0)	16 (2.7)	3.87	.99
2	My school's result was above 80% in 2021.	169 (30.0)	258 (44.3)	69 (11.8)	77 (13.2)	10 (1.7)	3.85	1.03
3	My School's result was above 80% in 2022.	115 (19.8)	284 (48.7)	87 (14.9)	86 (14.8)	11 (1.9)	3.69	1.00

Table 10 shows the results of Section E (Academic Performance) of the questionnaire. Head teachers (79.3%) endorsed the statement that their school's result was above 80% in 2020 with *M* (3.87) and *SD* (.99), and the majority of the participants (74.3%) coincide with the statement that their school's result was above 80% in 2021 with *M* (3.85) and *SD* (1.03). This table also elaborates that the school's result was above 80% in 2022, such that 66.5 percent of head teachers affirm with *M* (3.69) and *SD* (1.00).

### Analysis of Difference between Head Teachers' Opinions Regarding the Role of Leadership in Promoting Quality Education at the Elementary Level

Here are the findings of our investigation examining the diversity of view held by principals across demographic characteristics including gender, geographic location, educational attainment, professional certification, and years of classroom experience. Using one-way ANOVA and the t-test for independent samples, the data were analyzed.

Table 11  
Difference between Male and Female Head Teachers' Opinions

Variables	Category	N	Mean	SD	Df	t	Sig.
Gender	Male	292	177.07	19.12	580	.35	.72
	Female	290	177.54	12.05			

Table 11 shows the difference between male and female head teachers' opinions. When comparing the perspectives of male and female educators, the calculated significance value (.72) is bigger than the significance level () of 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference.



Table 12

Difference between Head Teachers' Opinions by Locality

Variables	Category	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Locality	Urban	293	177.46	15.73	580	1.80	.07
	Rural	290	168.30	26.53			

Table 12 shows the difference between head teachers by locality. There is no statistically significant difference in the opinions of urban and rural school principals, as the computed significance value of .07 is larger than the significance threshold of .05.

Table 13

Difference between Head Teachers' Opinions by Academic Qualification

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	722.63	3	240.87	.94	.42
Within Groups	147761.69	578	255.64		
Total	148484.33	581			

Table 13 indicates the difference between head teachers' opinions by academic qualification. The (.42) significance value computed is larger than the (.05) threshold shown in the table. Statistical analysis reveals no discernible variation in the viewpoints of school principals concerning the level of education. F-value (.94) also lends credence to the claim.

Table 14

Difference between Head Teachers' Opinions by Professional Qualification

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1015.36	1	1015.36	3.99	.04
Within Groups	147468.96	580	254.25		
Total	148484.33	581			

Table 14 indicates the difference between head teachers' opinions by professional qualification. The significance threshold (0.05) is higher than the value calculated (.04). This demonstrates that the viewpoints of principals vary significantly depending on their level of education and experience. F value (3.99) also lends credence to the argument.





Table 15  
Difference between Head Teachers' Opinions by Teaching Experience

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	404.18	3	134.72	.52	.66
Within Groups	148080.14	578	256.19		
Total	148484.33	581			

Table 15 indicates the difference between head teachers' opinions by teaching experience. The significance threshold was set at 0.05, and the estimated value was .66. This demonstrates that there is no discernible trend in attitudes among principals with respect to years in the classroom. The claim is also supported by the F value (.52).

## Discussion and Conclusion

### Discussion

The main objective of the study was to investigate the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level. Leadership is crucial to educational administration because it affects goal achievement. Principals have different leadership styles and mindsets (Louis et al., 2010; Hinic et al., 2017).

Leadership enhances both student learning and organizational success. It remains the foundation of organizations and greatly impacts students' learning (Leithwood et al., 2006). School leadership boosts student performance. Waters and Marzano (2006) found that strong instructional leadership improves student achievement. Path analysis by Kruger et al. (2007) showed that school leaders indirectly affect student results and culture.

The school's success depends on the head teacher's clear goals, high standards, and instructional leadership. Management and styles affect school performance. School leadership influences teachers and students to attain educational goals. Good leaders analyze school performance, ask critical and constructive questions, highlight systematic evidence, and support diligent student growth monitoring (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).



According to research on leadership and teacher effectiveness, educational leaders' involvement in teaching strongly influences student learning (Emmanouil et al., 2014). However, good leadership policies empower educators. Recognizing and rewarding excellence underpins the quality of education. For quality, leadership, teamwork, measurement, and problem-solving must be balanced (Brucaj, 2014).

Morton et al. (2011) suggest that school administrators' personality traits and abilities can transform their institutions and that their leadership and administrative arrangements are crucial to the institution's success. According to the study, leadership vision drives reform, creativity, and change, which affect proactive behavior by affecting intrinsic motivation (Yi et al., 2019).

Head teachers determine school success. Leaders must motivate, moderate, guide, direct, and listen to succeed. These traits make a good head teacher. School leadership is like sailing amid rough seas. So, school principals are increasingly judged by academic performance (Eren, 2014). The findings suggest that leadership plays an ample role in promoting quality education at the elementary level.

## **Conclusion**

The first objective was to analyze the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level. The result shows that effective leadership plays a vital role in enhancing leadership in school. Leadership plays a significant role in keeping teachers' passion for teaching alive, inspiring them to cultivate constructive working relationships among themselves, and empowering them to grow professionally, all of which contribute to the development of the teachers, students, and the institution as a whole. Ultimately, the quality of education is promoted in the school.

The second objective of the study was to investigate the head teachers' opinions regarding the implementation of quality indicators at the elementary school level. It was discovered that quality indicators, such as staff meetings held on a regular basis, meetings with parents, checking students' performance on a regular basis, arranging co-curricular activities, keeping records, and providing physical facilities in the school, had been implemented in the schools.

The third objective of the study was to ascertain the difference between head teachers' opinions regarding the role of leadership in promoting quality education at the elementary level. The



findings revealed that there is statistically no significant difference between head teachers' opinions by gender, locality, academic qualification, professional qualification, and teaching experience.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings and analysis, the following suggestions were made:

1. The majority of respondents are of the view that the leadership of the school plays an important role in promoting quality education in the schools. It's recommended that the head teacher plays an effective role in the school.
2. It is highly recommended that there be job satisfaction among staff because it is very important in promoting quality education.
3. The head teachers should take administrative measurements in an effective way.
4. Most of the respondents argued that maintaining records is very important for enhancing the quality of education at the school level.
5. Most of the respondents argued that physical facilities should be provided according to the demand and needs of the schools.

### **Future Research**

Future studies can expand the scope of the elements influencing successful school leadership and educational quality results by looking into the following direction:

1. More research can be conducted to understand the correlation between academic success and leadership styles used by head teachers. Case studies that go into great detail about successful institutions may especially be helpful.
2. Comparative studies can be carried out to explore the differences in various leadership practices and perceptions of quality education in different types of schools, regions, districts, or populations.

### **References**

- Adeyemi, T. O. (2013). Head Teachers ' Leadership Styles ' and Teachers Job Satisfaction in Primary Schools in Ekiti State , Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 2(2), 69–79.
- Akan, D. (2013). The relationship between school principals ' leadership styles and collective teacher efficacy. *Academic Journals*, 8(10), 596–601.  
<https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2013.1167>



- Altnay, F. A. (2015). Are headmasters digital leaders in school culture? *Education & Science*,40(182), 77–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2015.4534>
- Balunywa, W. S. (2000). *A handbook of business management*. Kampala: Makerere University School. Ugandan Press.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university*: McGrawHill International.
- Brucaj Skender,(2014) Quality in private higher education system; New challenges regarding student's satisfaction, *The online Journal of Distance Education and e-learning*, Vol-2, Issue 2, pp- 11-16.
- Emmanouil, K., Professor, A., Design, D. of P.-S. E. and E., Aegean, U. of the, Greece, MA, A. O., UK. (2014). The Impact of Leadership on Teachers' Effectiveness. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(7 (1)), 289–294.
- Eren, A. (2014). Uncovering the links between prospective teachers' personal responsibility, academic optimism, hope, and emotions about teaching: a mediation analysis. *Social Psychology of Education*, 17(1), 73-104.
- Fida, K. M., (2000). *The Role of Leadership in Organizational Control* (Unpublished master's thesis). Department of Psychology, Government, MAO College Lahore, Pakistan.
- Gvaramadze, I. (2008). From quality assurance to quality enhancement in the european higher education area. *European Journal of education*, 43(4), 443-455.
- Haider, S. Z. (2008). Challenges in higher education: Special reference to Pakistan and South Asian developing countries. *Nonpartisan education review*, 4(2).
- Hinic, D., Grubor, J., and Brulic, L. (2017). Followership styles and job satisfaction in secondary school teachers in Serbia. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 45(3), 503-520.
- Kiboss, J. K., & Jemiryott, H. K. S. (2014). Relationship Between Principals' Leadership Styles and Secondary School Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Nandi South District, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3(2), 493–509.
- Krüger, Meta & Witziers, Bob & Slegers, Peter & Improvement, International. (2007). The Impact of school leadership on school level factors: validation of a causal model. [http://lst-iiep.iiep-unesco.org/cgi-bin/wwwi32.exe/\[in=epidoc1.in\]/?t2000=024232/\(100\).18.10.1080/09243450600797638](http://lst-iiep.iiep-unesco.org/cgi-bin/wwwi32.exe/[in=epidoc1.in]/?t2000=024232/(100).18.10.1080/09243450600797638).
- Kurt. (2009). *Examination of Relationship Between Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles of School Principals and Collective Efficacy and Self-Efficacy of Teachers*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis (Gazi University, Ankara).
- Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C, Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful school leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning*. University of Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.



- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Earl, L., Watson, N., & Fullan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership on a large scale: The case of England's National Literacy and Numeracy Strategies. *Journal of School Management and Leadership*, 24(1), 57–79
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Lin, M., & Chuang, T. (2014). The Effects of the Leadership Style on the Learning Motivation of Students in Elementary Schools. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 7(February), 1-10.
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., Anderson, S. E., Michlin, M., and Mascall, B. (2010). Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement/University of Minnesota and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/ University of Toronto, 42(1), 50-72.
- Madanchian, M., Hussein, N., Noordin, F., & Taherdoost, H. (2016). Effects of Leadership on Organizational Performance. *Economics and Education*, 115- 119, ISBN: 978-1-61804-369-6.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., Stevens, M. J., Maznevski, M., & Stahl, G. K. (Eds.). (2017). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. Routledge.
- Mi, L., Gan, X., Xu, T., Long, R., Qiao, L., & Zhu, H. (2019). A new perspective to promote organizational citizenship behaviour for the environment: The role of transformational leadership. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118002>
- Morton, K. L., Barling, J., Rhodes, R. E., Mâsse, L. C., Zumbo, B. D., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2011). The application of transformational leadership theory to parenting: Questionnaire development and implications for adolescent self-regulatory efficacy and life satisfaction. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 33, 688–709.
- Nanjundeswaras, T. S., & Swamy, D. R. (2014). Leadership styles: Review Paper. *Advances In Management*, 7(2), 57–63.
- Nasomboon, B. (2014). The relationship among leadership commitment, organizational performance, and employee engagement. *International Business Research*, 7(9), 77.
- Pazey, B. L., and Cole, H. A. (2013). The role of special education training in the development of socially just leaders: Building an equity consciousness in educational leadership programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 243-271.
- Pierce, M. (2000, September/October). Portrait of the "super principal". *Harvard Education Letter* (online). Retrieved June 30, 2007, from Harvard University Publishing Group Web Site: <http://www.edletter.org/past/issues/2000-so/principal>.
- Pineda, A. (2013). Total Quality Management in Educational institutions: Influences on customer satisfaction. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education*, 2(3), 31-39.
- Rizvi, N. & Amjad, N. (2008). *Relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership*, (Unpublished Master's thesis). Department of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore- Pakistan.
- Robinson, V. M. J. (2007). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why*, Australian Council for Educational Leaders, Winmalee, NSW, Australia.



- Robinson, V.M. J. (2006). Putting education back into educational leadership. *Leading & Managing*, 12(1), 62-75.
- Rowold, J. (2008). Effects of transactional and transformational leadership of pastors. *Pastoral Psychology*, 56, 403-411. doi: 10.1007/s11089-008-0121-6
- Taing, M., Granger, B., Groff, K., Jackson, E., & Johnson, R. (2011). The multidimensional nature of continuance commitment: Commitment owing to economic exchanges versus lack of employment alternatives. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 26(2), 269-284.
- Towsend, T. (ed) (2007). *International Handbook of School Effectiveness and Improvement*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Waters, T. J., & Marzano, R. J. (2006). School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement. Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved from ERIC (ED494270).
- Yi, L., Uddin Md, A., Das, A. K., Mahmood, M., & Do, S. M. S. (2019). Transformational leaders engage employees in sustainable innovative work behaviour? Perspective from a developing country. *Sustainability*, 11, 2485. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092485>