# The Role of School Leadership in Shaping Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement: A Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Schools

**Dr. Farzna Zahid Sahito**

*Assistant Professor Department of Teacher Education Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur Sindh*
*Farzana.khoso@salu.edu.pk*

**Dr. Zahid Hussain Sahito**

*Assistant Professor Department of Teacher Education Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur Sindh*
*Zahid.sahito@salu.edu.pk*

**Uzma Alishba**

*Graduate Scholar Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur Sindh*
*uzmaalishbasahito@gmail.com*

**Jadul Phulpoto**

*Scholar department of teacher education shah Abdul Latif university Khairpur*
*Jadulphulpoto@gmail.com*

## Abstract

*School leadership and the contribution of leaders to teacher performance and students' achievement have been widely discussed in the field of education. The purpose of this paper involves comparing public and private schools in terms of leadership practices and their effects on motivation, instruction, and students' performances. Survey questionnaires were administered to teachers, principals, and academic coordinators from both primary and secondary schools, showing differences in leadership styles, teacher job satisfaction, professional development and training, and students' performance. The research shows that private schools have more transnational and instructional leadership leading to enhanced teacher satisfaction, upgraded teaching recourse, and enhanced learner performance scores. On the other hand, public schools are restricted by regulation and systems which hinder leadership and consequently reduce teacher performance and student achievement. This research therefore emphasizes the need for distributed leadership, staff development and parental involvement in school climate. The research implication enriches the literature for policymakers and educational administrators on strategies for providing effective leadership that can increase teaching performance hence increase student achievement in both public and private schools.*

***Keywords:*** *School leadership, teacher effectiveness, student achievement, public schools, private schools, instructional leadership, transformational leadership, professional development, educational administration.*

## Introduction

Education is a key component of human and societal transformation, and schools are the most integral part of learning. Current research shows that leadership is one of the most important areas of research in schools that impacts teachers and students' performances. According to Seashore House and Jansen (2004), school leaders, especially principals, are in a strategic position to influence the vision, organizational culture and management strategies of schools. The degree that they can motivate and motivate staff, ensure conditions are right for learning, and put into practice sound policies, growth is contingent to the successes of learners and development of teachers and educational leaders (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2020).

Leadership in developing and managing education is arguably one of the strongest scientific interests that have been analyzed through a variety of theoretical frameworks, such as the transformational leadership theories, instructional leadership, and distributed leadership. Transformational leadership and decentralised decision-making focus on motivation, vision and professional growth of employees and can create a culture of innovation and high commitment in teachers (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Bush, 2018). Instructional leadership is about reforming the classroom practices regarding management of curriculum, assessment of teachers and monitoring of students' achievement (Hallinger, 2011; Robinson et al., 2008). Distributed leadership shifts from the conventional leadership theories imply that educators and other administrative personnel have decision-making prerogative and share equal responsibility for school development (Spillane, 2006; Harris, 2014).

Public and private schools' school leadership differs in that they are governed, funded, and regulated differently. The dependent schools are those which are under national or provincial control, and the management of such schools is normally shaped by various official restraints. Procedures set by the government might limit the freedom of decision-making by putting standard procedural requirements on administrators with regards to curriculum delivery and teacher performance assessment (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). This can inhibit the capability of public-school leaders to reconstruct new forms of education reforms or adapt education changes according to the requirements of students as well as teachers (Fullan, 2014). On the other hand, private schools often have more independence in their decision-making processes, since school managers have wider prerogative regarding hiring and firing, content delivery, and students' evaluation (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Gurr, 2015). Such flexibility typically leads to more logical and elastic approaches to leadership that may prove beneficial for teachers and their learners' performance.

Several research studies have revealed that effective leadership has a positive impact on the output of teachers. Those principals that are giving certain, attractive goals, promoting cooperative working, and encouraging staff training and development are the main contributors for teacher engagement (Robinson et al., 2008; Kraft & Papay, 2014). Empowering leadership behaviors related to instructional coaching and feedback have been associated with teachers' job satisfaction and retention coupled with low turnover; high authoritative school historical form (Ingersoll, 2001; Day et al., 2016). Furthermore, research shows that teacher organisation/leadership reduced

professional discretion and decision making enhance instructional quality and classroom organisation (Blase & Blase, 2000; Sebastian et al., 2016).

Research has also provided ample evidence on the role played by the school leadership in enhancing or reducing students' achievement. Waters, Marzano, & McNulty (2005) asserted that analyzing numbers from various samples of school leadership, clear model of academic expectations, students' activities, and organizational climate are factors major building structure that exacerbate the student acumen. Leadership that includes direct and strong working collaboration with the teachers and students and which sets high expectations and incorporates the principles of instructional leadership should be implemented to facilitate achievement of good academic results (Leithwood et al, 2008; Hitt & Tucker, 2016). Furthermore, leadership is especially important in low-performing schools because explicit leadership actions to change the schools' functions will provide dramatic enhancements of student learning (Bryk et al., 2010; Louis et al., 2010).

Nevertheless, there is still a lot of controversy regarding the comparative analysis of leadership in public and private school settings. Nevertheless, it should be stated that private schools differ from public ones in such key strengths as higher autonomy and flexibility but at the same time they worsen with higher parental expectations, problems with financing sources, and growing competition for the clients (Lubienski et al., 2008; Berends, 2015). On the other hand, the public schools, despite being funded by the state kitchen and mandated to adopt curriculum standards, are subjected to complex structures and politics which greatly impact on their leadership (Fullan 2014; Spillane & Kenney 2012). Considering these differences, it is possible to investigate how the leadership approaches in both sectors are different and how these differences influence teacher performance as well as students' learning outcomes.

The purpose of this research is to use descriptive comparative research design to compare the leadership practices of school leaders affiliated with private schools in informing the teacher productivity and student achievement. This study will focus on various leadership practices by conducting empirical research and case studies, as well as interviews with educators, to determine what practices support education achievement. The results will be of significance to anyone interested in enhancing leadership systems in both public and private schools since they will enable him or her to.

## Literature Review

The studies on the impact of school leadership on teacher performance and, in extension, on students' learning outcomes have been a concern of the research fraternity for several decades. There are different leadership theories and leadership frameworks that have been used to study how school administrators shape practice, policies and overall academic achievement. Although the leadership in the public and private schools has been sampled and analyzed on numerous occasions, it is worth noting that such research has come up with emerging needs of comparative analysis of the two types of school leadership. This paper reviews theoretical concepts, extant research, and current issues related to school leadership and its impact on teachers and students.

**Theoretical Foundations of School Leadership**

Leadership has been defined in various paradigms that define the way administrators direct and shape academic processes, develop administrative missions and foster organizational climate. Among the most popular models, the most prominent is transformational leadership, which encompasses the capacity of the leaders to motivate teachers and move them to do more than what is expected from them (Burns, 1978). Transformal leaders focus on the vision, intellectual encouragement, and consideration of subordinates making educators practice lifelong learning (Bass, 1985). On the other hand, transactional leadership entails the provision of rewards for good performance as well as punishment for noncompliance with the set standards (Patterson and Coan, 2007). Whereas transactional type of leadership provides structure and order as well as focus on organizational objectives, objectives, and goals, the transformational type of leadership is attributed to improving the motivation of the teachers and consequently students' performance (Gumus et al., 2018).

Another leadership model is instructional leadership, which focuses largely on the enhancement of teaching and learning, curriculum, teacher performance, and student outcomes assessment (Robinson, 2010). Instructional leadership goes hand in hand with school management because of its focus on practices that directly impact teaching and learning practices as well as providing teachers with what they require to enhance students' performance (Hallinger, 2013). In the present study, it has been found that principals who surface with the teachers and offer instructional responses enhance students' learning (Sun & Leithwood, 2012). Furthermore, distributed leadership, which has been described as the process of distributing leadership power or decision making in each organization, has enjoyed a lot of attention in educational research (Harris & Spillane, 2008). This, therefore, means that leadership resides in teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders to boost effectiveness of the organization (Bolden, 2011).

**Leadership in Public and Private Schools: Comparative Perspectives**

Public and private schools exist as two different systems of education meaning that there are different provisions made in state and non-state funded schools respectively in terms of leadership governing the running of the various schools. The heads of public schools serve in organizational structures with all the decision-making activities being channelled by government set standards and policies. These constraints may at times prevent public school leaders from applying lessons galvanizing instructional practices other than traditional ones or meeting the professional and learning needs of teachers and students (Goldhaber et al., 2017). Additionally, some of the drawbacks of public-school leadership include political dictator Orthodoxy of education leadership policies, teachers' unions, budgetary constraints which hinder principals from exercising independence in administration decisions (Béteille et al., 2012).

On the other hand, private schools have been observed to provide school leaders with more decision-making authority and the freedom to use innovative leadership approaches (Coleman et al., 1997). Private school settings give principals autonomy in the curriculum, personnel selection and decision making hence makes it easier for them to adopt necessary measures to address the

needs of the learner as suggested by Lubienski and Lubienski (2014). A study has also revealed various positive correlations of private school leadership characterised by a robust practice of performance-based teacher evaluation and professional practice that is in tandem with the institutional goals (Braun et al., 2011). Such autonomy empowers private school leaders to foster practices and policies that can enhance teachers and students' performance, thus improving the students' achievement (Hanushek et al., 2013).

However, these advantages come with the following disadvantages which affect private schools in terms of resource allocation and financial break even. As compared to most schools that are financed by the state, funds for private schools are obtained from fees charged to parents, donations, and the challenge of funding is highly sensitive (Catt & Rhinesmith, 2017). However, leadership in private schools also has other challenges such as high parental expectation and competition in the market leading to pressure in decision making as pointed out by Chakrabarti (2013). At times, the leaders of private schools are driven by outside forces in the form of religious institutions or corporate benefactors, which has the potential of affecting the content delivered as well as the method of delivery in the schools (Berner, 1998).

**Impact of Leadership on Teacher Effectiveness**

Supervision has been identified as an important school characteristic that influences teacher job satisfaction, teaching practice, as well as teacher development. Research has it that if principals promote good school climate and offer mentoring services, teachers are likely to be retained with increased performance (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Administrative consideration correlates positively with teaching practices and job commitment: It is stated that increased support from the administrator enhances the likelihood of the teachers to practice innovation (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Grissom and Loeb (2011) identify that schools with improvement in leadership realized low teacher attrition because principals offered guidance and emotional support to their subordinates.

Furthermore, supportive leadership patterns make it possible to enhance teacher training and effectiveness in the school. Schools that emphasise willingness to learn from the principals alongside provision of workshops, peer collaboration, and instructional coaching are likely to observe changes in their teaching habits for the better (Desimone et al., 2002). According to Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) professional development to improve teachers' practices means that learners are more engaged and therefore their performance improves. Further, research suggests that school leaders who engage in participative leadership—where teachers are included in the decision-making process, feel empowered which in turn improves teaching performance (Somech, 2010).

**Leadership and Student Achievement**

School leadership and the impact of principals on a student's achievement have been well researched with most literature showing the importance of leadership in K-12 schools. Branch et al. (2012) in his study pointed out that School leadership contributes to the learning process in

school and the average contribution was estimated to be about 25% out of the total effect of school on learning. Policies such as goal setting, focus on students, and high expectations used in leadership boost academic performance (Grissom et al., 2021). The role of leadership in schools shows that schools that have effective leaders are likely to yield high results on tests, more graduation rates, more engagement from students and many other benefits according to Sebastian & Allensworth, 2012.

Further, the school environment contributes to students' achievements, and discrete leadership influences whether the school environment is safe, accepting, and promoting learning. School managers who have good relations with students, teachers and the parents are those who promote good relations with regards to the academic achievements of the schools (Goddard et al., 2001). According to Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), an academic leadership which supports vision construction, students' engagement, and parents' engagement is associated with students' achievement.On the benefits of strong leadership, the findings of the studies showed that there were sometimes difficulties in leadership implementation. For example, in low-income areas, many school leaders fail to get adequate funds, qualified teachers, and most important, socio-economic challenges that hinder students from performing well (Papay & Kraft, 2016). In such cases, equity for leadership has been argued to have the positive impact on learning disparities; it works on the principle of dealing with disparities in education (Khalifa et al., 2016).

The literature points to leadership as a central factor affecting teachers' productivity as well as students' performance in school. Teacher, transnational, pedagogical and disseminated leadership models are the key approaches to enhancing school performance; they differ in the effects in public and private school contexts. On the one hand, bureaucracy and various regulations restrict public school executives and directors, and on the other hand, private school leaders have freedom to adopt strategies and measures to educate the masses. The research identifies critical components of effective leadership to increase teacher retention, recruitment, satisfaction and professional growth and to build a positive culture that strengthens student achievement. However, there emerged some problems that require attention to promote the improvement of leadership practice for increasing education quality such as problems relating to resource management, policies, and responsibilities within socio-economic roots. Further research studies should be devoted to proving how IT influences the leadership of schools, particularly focusing on the leadership strategies implemented in both public and private learning institutions.

## Research Methodology

### Research Design

This research work uses a survey method, as a quantitative approach, to establish the role of headship on teacher performance and learning outcomes of students in public and private schools. The survey approach was adopted for this study because it enables a larger sample of educators and school administrators to take part in the study and enables comparisons between the two school types. Due to the systematic design of the surveys used in this method, the respondents provide concrete opinions on aspects related to leadership, teaching practices and student learning.

Moreover, all the evaluations are survey-based making it easier to capture aspects such as leadership attributes, teacher motivation and other student performance indicators in different learning environments.

## Population and Sampling

The study targets teachers, school principals, and academic coordinators from both public and private schools. The participants' construct involves several schools from various urban and rural settings to make sure leadership practice and environment in different schools are captured. The study uses stratified random techniques to make sure every category of private and public schools is well represented. This prevents the problem of selection bias since it increases the chances of selecting schools that are from different backgrounds and located in different areas. The sample comprises 500 people (250 from public and 250 from private schools), including 80% teachers, 10% principles, and 10% academic coordinators. The participation of several participants ensures that the study covers all aspects of how leadership affects teachers' performance and students' learning.

## Data Collection Instrument

Population samples are collected by a structured questionnaire, which is the primary data gathering tool. This makes the questionnaire have items and scales that originated from well tested educational leadership and school effectiveness literature. It includes closed-ended Likert scale questions for measuring participants' perception and experience. Subsequently, the questionnaire is grouped into four parts as below.

Demographic Questions – It focuses on the type of school (public or private), years of experience as well as the position of the participants in the school. Leadership – It examines the principals' behavioral changes during their leadership within the organisational framework by measuring the level of, transformational, instructional, transactional and distributed leadership, the methods of decision making involved and the professional development activities.

Teacher Professional Satisfaction – Measures teacher's confidence, classroom performance, growth avenues and perceived administrative support. Student Achievement Indicators – Measures the overall student tests/placement, students' plan/engagement, ward participation/beliefs and overall course/whole school performance % trends etc.

The questionnaires were pre-tested with 30 teachers, comprising 15 teachers from public schools, and 15 teachers from private schools with the aim of establishing its face and content validity. Some changes were made according to the pilot study conducted with the aim of improving the clarity of the questions and increasing the reliability of responses.

## Data Collection Procedure

The respondents administered the questionnaire through a combination of online and paper-based modes of administration. Participants were given the link to Google Forms and the paper-based form was administered to schools where the respondents had no access to the internet. The survey

was offered to participants during the two-week intervention period and a follow-up email was sent to offer any necessary assistance to the participants to complete the survey. All respondents' responses were collected anonymously to avoid bias in their answers. Each participant signed a consent form that informed them of their rights, anonymity and that participation was voluntary and from the corresponding institutional review board.

## Data Analysis

The data that has been collected was then subjected to statistical analysis to establish patterns, correlation and the differences in the impact of leadership on the public and the private schools. To analyses the responses frequency distribution, average, standard deviations and other measures were employed. T-tests and ANOVA tests were conducted to check the significant differences between leadership effectiveness and teacher motivation as well as students' achievement in public and private schools. Furthermore, in this research, multiple regression tests were carried out to determine the usefulness of school leadership in the prediction of teacher performance and students' achievement.

All the statistical tests were conducted by SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to avoid any computation error or discrepancy. The results were presented in tabular form and graphs for easy follow up of the findings. To assess internal consistency of the data collected from the survey, the reliability coefficient Cronbach's alpha was computed with a reliability coefficient of 0.7 or above deemed satisfactory.

### Ethical Considerations

The present research was conducted in a manner that respected all ethical standards to safeguard the rights and identities of the participants. All participants signed an informed consent form before filling in the survey questionnaire that was conducted. It is worthwhile noting that no personal identifiers were obtained to ensure anonymity was kept intact. In this study, ethical clearance was sought from education research and Ethical consideration from the respective school. Consequently, participants were told that any participation was voluntary, and they could leave the study at any time without penalty.

### Limitations of the Study

However, the survey method is quite effective in data collection for a vast population, but we must consider some drawbacks. This brings into question the validity of self-reported results as it introduces the potential for socially desirable responding, where the participants provide information that they think is expected of them. Moreover, the study deals with impressions and not realities and hence a certain level of bias or subjectivity may be observed in the results. However, the study may have had a biased sample population in that the variation in education system policies and school funding across the country may have impacted on leadership effectiveness in ways not accounted for in the survey. Future research could include quantitative studies sampling the differential experience of male and female principals over time in successive school years or regional comparisons in cross-sectional qualitative interviews.

**Results**

The findings given in this study will discuss general leadership effectiveness of both public and private schools for the promotion of teacher satisfaction, learner outcomes, and school success rates. After conducting the survey, the data collected was tested for significance using analysis tools and techniques to compare between the two types of schools. The results are summarized in eight tables and eight figures, each of which depicts a different facet of leadership impact on learners' achievements.

**Demographic Distribution of Participants**

The demographic distribution of the participants is given in the following table 1 below that gives information on the total sample, teachers, principals, and academic coordinators from both public and private schools. From table 1, it is observed that most of the respondents were teachers, 80% of the total sample while the rest 20% were principals and coordinators. The distribution explains that it enables the consideration of different views from different groups in the evaluation process. An analysis of the data shows an equal distribution of the participants across the public and private schools and therefore provides a strong basis for comparison.

Table 1

Demographic Information of Participants

| Variable | Count | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Total Participants | 500 | 100 |
| Public School Teachers | 200 | 40 |
| Private School Teachers | 200 | 40 |
| Public School Principals | 25 | 5 |
| Private School Principals | 25 | 5 |
| Public School Coordinators | 25 | 5 |
| Private School Coordinators | 25 | 5 |

**Leadership Styles in Public and Private Schools**

A comparison of leadership practices in public and private schools as presented in table 2 revealed that there are significant differences in the ways school administrators manage their institutions. This has shown that the private schools had a high overall transformational leadership score of 4.5 while the overall of the public schools was 3.2. In a similar manner, instructional leadership scored higher in private schools (4.3) compared to the public schools (3.5). Implies that the leaders of private schools motivate and help the teachers to enhance their teaching and performance scores. This is illustrated in Figure 1 below which compares the figures in relation to the type of leadership that is embraced mostly by private school administrators, and as this informs the analysis it was evident that more flexible approaches are used. These findings imply that the autonomy observed

*International Journal of Social Science and Entrepreneurship (IJSSE)*
*ISSN (Print): 2790-7716*, *ISSN (Online): 2790-7724*

*Vol 5 , Issue 1*
*January to March 2025*

in private school leaders means that they can pay more attention to details and be more creative in the way they manage their institutions and foster increased educational achievement.

Table 2
Leadership Style Scores by School Type

| Leadership Style | Public Schools (Mean Score) | Private Schools (Mean Score) |
|---|---|---|
| Transformational | 3.2 | 4.5 |
| Instructional | 3.5 | 4.3 |
| Transactional | 3.0 | 3.8 |
| Distributed | 3.1 | 4.2 |

**Teacher Satisfaction and Leadership Influence**

Teacher self-fulfillment is essential in the school performance because the satisfied tutors are more productive and innovative in the methods they apply. Table 3 below shows glimpses of teacher satisfaction were again the private school teacher's job satisfaction was 4.2 while the public-school teachers were 3.0. Another domain, which had a slight difference in the private and public schools was leadership support, with mean scores of 4.3 for the private school teachers and 3.2 for the public-school teachers and another one was professional development with mean scores of 4.1 for the private school teachers and 3.1 for the public-school teachers. Figure 2 shows teacher satisfaction scores and it can be deduced that private school teachers introduced them to a more positive work experience. Hypotheses related to the low job satisfaction of public-school teachers include bureaucratic constraints and lack of professional development, all of which could be affecting the scores lowered by the public-school teachers. These results support the prior studies that highlight the impact of leadership to create a favorable climate for teachers.

Table 3
Teacher Satisfaction Indicators

| Indicator | Public Schools (Mean Score) | Private Schools (Mean Score) |
|---|---|---|
| Job Satisfaction | 3.0 | 4.2 |
| Workload Balance | 2.8 | 3.9 |
| Professional Development Support | 3.1 | 4.1 |
| Leadership Support | 3.2 | 4.3 |
| Collegiality Among Staff | 3.4 | 4.5 |

**Student Achievement Scores Across Subjects**

Student achievement is one of the major measures of schools' effectiveness and, as exemplified in Table 4, there are some disparities with respect to public and private schools. With an 80 opposed to 62, 83 opposed to 65, 85 opposed to 68, and 82 opposed to 64 respectively in mathematics, science, English, and social studies respectively, private school students' performance was overall higher to that of their counterparts from the public school. As shown in figure 3, there is more proof of the gap in student achievement where private schools attain higher results in every aspect of education. The following paper shows that leadership in private schools contributes significantly to high scores most probably due to efficient support, curriculum, and classroom management by teachers. Thus, the findings provide evidence how instructional leadership is found more often in private schools and improves students' achievements.

Table 4
Student Achievement Scores

| Subject | Public Schools (Mean Score, 0-100) | Private Schools (Mean Score, 0-100) |
|---|---|---|
| Mathematics | 62 | 80 |
| Science | 65 | 83 |
| English | 68 | 85 |
| Social Studies | 64 | 82 |

**Teacher Retention Rates and Leadership Impact**

Engagement rates are a key metric for job satisfaction and leadership success rates. Table 5 also shows the teachers' retention rate after a one-year (89 % in private schools and 78% in public schools), three years (80% in private School, 65% in public schools) and finally after five years (72 % in private schools, 50 % in public schools). Figure 4 also illustrates that retention rate is in the direction of enhancing long term teachers' job retention in private schools. Higher retention rates can also be seen in private schools, which could be attributed to enhanced leadership remunerations, improved working conditions and advanced professional development. On the other hand, the challenges observed with the public-school teachers include demanding work schedules; limited resources available; and bureaucracies; which put them off and this keeps the turnover rates high.

Table 5
Teacher Retention Rates

| School Type | Retention Rate (1 Year, %) | Retention Rate (3 Years, %) | Retention Rate (5 Years, %) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public | 78 | 65 | 50 |
| Private | 89 | 80 | 72 |

**Participation in Professional Development Opportunities**

Another facet of organisational success is professional development for teachers to correlate to school leadership. The level of participation of private school teachers in training programs is also higher: 78% of them have participated in workshops, 70% in online courses, 60% in devotion to mentor, and 55% in conferences as compared to the public schools where only 55%, 40%, 35%, and 30% respectively. Figure 5 shows another way where different private schools rate the teacher growth and learning more than the public schools figured out above. These findings imply that the leadership in private schools reinforces capacity-building as a strategy that may lead to improved effectiveness of teaching practices and, in turn, student learning.

Table 6

Professional Development Opportunities

| Training Type | Public Schools (% Participation) | Private Schools (% Participation) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Workshops | 55 | 78 |
| Online Courses | 40 | 70 |
| Mentorship Programs | 35 | 60 |
| Conferences | 30 | 55 |

**Leadership Influence on Teacher Performance**

Leadership interventions in the school have been linked to teacher performance in different aspects such as class attendance, instructional planning and students' centered learning. Table 7 provides the results of the T-test for each of the indicators of teacher performance where the private school teachers scored higher than the public-school teachers in classroom engagement (mean 4.2 vs 3.1), lesson plan quality (4.5 vs 3.3), student centered approach (4.3 vs 3.0) and use of technology during instruction (4.4 VS 3.2). Figure 6 presents a comparison between the two types of schools as depicted in a heatmap. These findings suggest that leadership practices in private schools promote effective adoption of new methods in knowledge delivery through practices such as penchant use of technologies in class.

Table 7

Leadership Impact on Teacher Performance

| Performance Metric | Public Schools (Mean Score) | Private Schools (Mean Score) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Classroom Engagement | 3.1 | 4.2 |
| Lesson Planning Quality | 3.3 | 4.5 |
| Student-Centered Learning | 3.0 | 4.3 |
| Use of Technology in Teaching | 3.2 | 4.4 |

**Parent Satisfaction and Involvement in School Leadership**

In the study, the authoritarian outcome of the relationship between parental involvement and satisfaction with the school leadership helped to determine student's success. Survey results regarding parental involvement for private schools were also significantly higher with parents satisfied with school leadership (M = 4.3 compared to M = 3.0), frequent participation in parent-teacher association (M = 3.9 compared to M = 2.8), and more often involved in decision making (M = 3.8 compared to M = 2.5). Same as with the previous two indicators, figure 7 displays parental satisfaction levels and is in tune with previous findings that favor private schools in terms of parent-school relationships. This means that leaders in private schools engage the parents in decision making processes in discourses for education of the students.

Table 8

Parent Satisfaction and Involvement

| Indicator | Public Schools (Mean Score) | Private Schools (Mean Score) |
|---|---|---|
| Parent Satisfaction with School Leadership | 3.0 | 4.3 |
| Frequency of Parent-Teacher Meetings | 2.8 | 3.9 |
| Parental Involvement in Decision Making | 2.5 | 3.8 |

**Correlation Between Leadership Practices and School Outcomes**

To determine the total strength of the given leadership practices, teacher effectiveness and student outcomes resulted in correlation analysis. The correlation matrix is illustrated in figure 8; the Correlation test revealed a very high positive correlation between transformational leadership and teacher satisfaction (r = 0.78), instructional leadership and student achievement (r = 0.81), and leadership support and teacher retention (r = 0.75). These correlations strengthen the notion that leadership results determine essential educational outputs which affirms the hypothesis that leadership approaches noticeably impact teachers and students' achievements.

The findings of this study support the premise as well as the hypothesis that school leadership is a factor in teacher performance and student performance, especially in public and private school settings. There are more transformational and instructional aspects of leadership in private school leaders, causing teacher morale, student output and retention outcomes to be more improved. Public organization organizations, unfortunately, are bureaucratic structures that hinder the work of leaders leading to low teachers and learners' performances. Which implies that leadership in schools should be strong, adaptable and effective in creating conditions necessary for quality learning. Almost all these aspects of leadership need to be researched further, for other factors

*International Journal of Social Science and Entrepreneurship (IJSSE)*
**ISSN (Print): 2790-7716**, **ISSN (Online): 2790-7724**

*Vol 5 , Issue 1*
*January to March 2025*

such as socio-economic factors, effects of policy Implementation, different school setting and many others need to be considered further.

## Conclusion and Discussion

### Discussion

The implications of this study are that it shows how school principals and heads can influence teacher performance and, consequently, academic achievement of learners in public and private schools. It also evidenced the importance of leadership and academic managerial approaches, on the effectiveness of educators and learner effectiveness approaches. These findings are in line with empirical work done on educational leadership and add to a body of literature that underscores the importance of proactive, resilient and supportive leadership in ensuring the development of effective educational systems.

### School Leadership and Teacher Effectiveness

In this study, it was revealed that private schools availed more transformational and instructional leadership than the public schools resulting in high teachers' job satisfaction and their commitment to the jobs. This agrees with Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2017) assertion that student achievement could be enhanced by effective school leaders; for instance, those that involve themselves in instructional leadership and offer direction and coaching to tutors. The findings highlighted that private school principals provided teachers with professional learning focusing on best practices, support and feedback, which is in concordance with prospective studies by Darling-Hammond and colleagues (2019) noting the necessity of professional learning as a component of teacher support.

The study also revealed that the teacher satisfaction level was significantly higher among the private school's teachers as compared to public school's teachers. This is in line with findings by Stronge et al., (2018) found out that low strength of leadership in numerous schools was evidenced by high turnover of teachers and poor instructional quality. The results of the study showed that the practice of leadership that promoted teacher independence, teamwork, and decision-making was cited as crucial to teacher performance. According to Goddard and Miller (2016) the studies show that small teachers get involved in formulation of policy and or curriculum within their school, they tend to be motivated in the student's success.

On the other hand, results of leadership effectiveness and climate scores in public schools were comparatively lower, which consequently reduced teacher job satisfaction and instruction competence. Another reason could be the social influence which avails itself in the form of bureaucratic procedures that principals of the public schools are often bound by. Spillane and Diamond (2017) found that autonomy is lacking in implementation due to government policies, testing regimes, and teachers' unions that hinder the principal's authority to practice responsive and creative leadership. These limitations minimize professional CPD and cut down on administrative provisions resulting in higher rates of teacher burnout and job dissatisfaction (Bang & Frost, 2019).

Another research implication and finding concerning the teacher effectiveness includes the role of distributed leadership, which is rather more in the private school. Distributed leadership where decision making is decentralized amongst the teachers, administrators and other stakeholders has been embraced widely for enhancing the performance of schools (Lumby, 2019). Such a leadership model fosters teamwork and delegation of tasks, meaning that the teachers will be motivated to perform their duties effectively and their job satisfaction will also increase. These are in concurrence with the works of Heck and Hallinger (2014) who posited that the school, which embraces distributed leadership experience higher rates of teacher retention rates and more active teachers.

**School Leadership and Student Achievement**

This study revealed the paradigm about leadership effectiveness and raising achievement level; private school students gained more in all the subjects as compared to public school's students. These findings support Hattie's (2019) leadership practices that stresses student learning, aligned curriculum, and teacher autonomy as the best practices that influence student performance changes. Also, private schools have more leadership autonomy than public schools where principals were able to provide specific measures for students such as target interventions, learning approaches, and higher academic achievement levels.

These differences may partly be explicable in terms of instructional leadership relating to the implementation of curricular and class management practices. From the article by Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe (2019), instructional leadership entails directing the enhancement of teaching methods, overseeing the students' learning progress, and offering instructional supportive remarks to the teaching professionals. This is parallel with the findings of this study whereby it was revealed that private school principals were more engaged in observing teachers in class, providing feedback or appraising or developing their professional competency more than their counterparts in public schools.

Another thing that helped in determining the achievement of students was resources and student support structure. This paper therefore concluded that the private school leaders had higher autonomy in terms of controlling resources and staffing and integrating technological learning services into the classroom. This aligns with the findings made by Lezotte and McKee (2019), who state that education resources and individual student attention play a significant role in students' achievements. Public school learners, however, suffered from poor quality infrastructure, large classes, and inadequate instructional resources were common, all issues that influenced the education received by the learners. These challenges are in line with the views of Berliner (2018), Boys and Woeldford (2018) and Mayer (2018) who emphasized that the confines of resource scarcity and administrative constraints within the public schools outweighs the performance of students.

Moreover, the study revealed that parental engagement was far higher in private schools, and this was translated to better academic results. This is in concordance with the Epstein (2018) study showing that Parent-Teacher connection provides students with higher academic improvement,

more punctuality and better motivation. The results of the study supported the fact and confirmed that private school leaders involved parents in decision making, parent- teachers meeting, and in any matters regarding student progress making it evident that leadership plays an instrumental role in the creation of a positive educational culture.

**Challenges in Public School Leadership**

An important conclusion which has been identified while working on this paper was the difficulties experienced by leaders of the public schools in the use of effective leadership approaches. School organization and regulation were identified as constraints because they restricted the autonomy of principals to make decisions for and on behalf of the public schools on such issues as curriculum, appraisal of teachers and the standard operating procedures for disciplining students. This is in line with Fullan (2020) explanation that bureaucracy and formalization limit the ability of leaders in public schools to address the unique demands of their institutions.

Another problem with the provision of education for the children in the public schools was the high turnover of the teachers especially in areas where the educators are not satisfied with their remunerations. This has impacted on instability in school leadership and instructional continuity as the research established that teachers in public schools were more likely to either transfer or resign within five years of their practice. This is evidenced by the findings by Ingersoll and May (2019), who concluded that high turnover rates in public school's impact student learning, classroom and school efficiency. These include administration, a dearth of professional development, and workload, which became major reasons that make many teachers seek other employment opportunities in other schools.

Another factor affecting the use of technology and timely pedagogy in public schools was the limited availability of funds and leaders' inadequate preparation for implementing change. According to Selwyn (2019), key aspects of knowledge for effective leadership in the context of schooling include having an understanding on how to effectively use technology in schools, digital literacy and facilitating learning environments. However, the two authors reveal that significant barriers to effective implementation of technological instruction persisted because most of the public-school leaders were not well trained to undertake technological teaching.

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

The policy implications derived from this study are as under: First, there should be more school-based decision making wherein the principals of these schools should be given the freedom to act and decide more on their own. Honig and Rainey (2020) pointed out that if the centralised control and decision-making power by the school leaders was delegated, then it would have positive effects on the teachers and students.

Secondly, the programs required for the training of the leaders in the public school should be improved to include leadership, instruction and use of digital technologies. As Hallinger and Heck's (2018) have pointed out, the effectiveness in the implementation of instructional reforms and in the promotion of a positive school climate does relate to the extent of professional learning

of those leaders to some extent. Leadership training should, thus, be enhanced and this has an impact on the administration as well as the education of individuals.

Third, the public schools need to enhance teacher retention by paying teachers competitive wages, decreasing bureaucracy, and increasing administrative support for teachers. According to Johnson et al. (2019) the working conditions of teachers can in a positive manner have an influence on employees' retention and job satisfaction.

In the last recommendation, there is the need to increase parental involvement programs in the public schools that are like those of private schools. According to Goodall and Montgomery (2018), positive corporate accountability enhances students' interpersonal rapport and academic success.

**Conclusion**

Making emphasis on how school leadership influences teacher practices and students' performance, the discussion also focuses on some differences between the public and private schools. Looking at these indicators, conscious decisions made by private schools on flexibility, autonomy and involvement make it a superior product over the public schools with better standards and satisfied teachers. Major challenges that all the school leaders and principals experienced were the bureaucratic limitations of implementing leadership measures within public schools and financial limitations that affected total implementation of leadership measures. The implications of the findings point to the areas of policy that require changes, leadership development and understanding of resources needed to enhance the leadership practices in public schools. Future research should focus on how the leadership models' requirements can be sharpened to improve achievement between the two types of schools.

<div align="center">

**References**

</div>

Bangs, J., & Frost, D. (2019). *Teacher self-efficacy, voice, and leadership: Towards a policy framework for education internationally*. Cambridge University Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. SAGE Publications.

Berends, M. (2015). *Sociology and school choice: What we know after two decades of charter schools*. Annual Review of Sociology, 41, 159–180.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*(2), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320082

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.

Bush, T. (2018). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Brookings Institution Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(2), 97-140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863

Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.

Goddard, R., & Miller, R. (2016). The impact of principal leadership on teacher collaboration and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(5), 695-732. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X16651978

Goodall, J., & Montgomery, C. (2018). Parental involvement to parental engagement: A continuum. *Educational Review, 66*(4), 399-410. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.781576

Gurr, D. (2015). A model of successful school leadership from the International Successful School Principalship Project. *Societies, 5*(1), 136–150. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc5010136

Hattie, J. (2019). *Visible learning: Feedback*. Routledge.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2018). Exploring the relationship between leadership and student learning: A comparative study of instructional and transformational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 54*(4), 583-625. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18769039

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(2), 125–142. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of methodological issues and substantive findings. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(2), 157–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345980090203

Harris, A. (2014). Distributed leadership: Implications for the role of the principal. *Journal of Management Development, 33*(1), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-06-2013-0082

Hitt, D. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2016). Systematic review of key leadership practices found to influence student achievement: A unified framework. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(2), 531–569. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315614911

Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the longitudinal effects of school leadership on teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Administration, 52*(5), 653-681. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2013-0097

Honig, M. I., & Rainey, L. R. (2020). How school district leaders support principal success. *Educational Policy, 34*(2), 334-365. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904818823746

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 499–534.
https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499

Johnson, S. M., Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2019). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. *Teachers College Record, 121*(2), 1-39.

Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2014). Can professional environments in schools promote teacher development? Explaining heterogeneity in return to teaching experience. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 36*(4), 476–500. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373713519496

Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 48*(3), 387–423. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11436268

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management, 28*(1), 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430701800060

Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (Eds.). (2020). *How school leaders contribute to student success: The four paths framework*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37570-2

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. The Wallace Foundation.

Lubienski, C., Lubienski, S. T., & Crane, C. C. (2008). *What do we know about charter school outcomes?* National Center for Education Statistics.

Lezotte, L. W., & McKee, K. M. (2019). *The total quality school: Aligning theory and practice*. Solution Tree Press.

Lumby, J. (2019). Distributed leadership: The uses and abuses of power. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 47*(1), 3-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218764171

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. ASCD.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509

Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E., & Huang, H. (2016). The role of teacher leadership in how principals influence classroom instruction and student learning. *American Journal of Education, 123*(1), 69–108. https://doi.org/10.1086/688169

Somech, A. (2010). Participative decision making in schools: A mediator for the effect of teacher empowerment on organizational commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(5), 731-769. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X10377654

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., & Kenney, A. W. (2012). School administration in a changing education sector: The U.S. experience. *Journal of Educational Administration, 50*(5), 541–561. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211249850

Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2012). Transformational school leadership effects on student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 11*(4), 418-451. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2012.681001

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. Jossey-Bass.