Instructional Leadership and Role of Module Leaders

**$SAGE

Afzal Sayed Munna[1] ⓘ

Abstract

Leadership plays an important role in an educational establishment as they help to manage the day-to-day activities. Instructional leadership has always played a distinct role in higher education as the role of instructional leadership was always to influence on effective teaching and learning processes. The purpose of this research is intended to identify the role of instructional leadership, including the relationship between instructional leadership and the role of module leaders in higher education using their own institution as a case study. The author conducted a small scall semistructured interview where two programme leaders were selected from the School of Business and Health and Social Care and were approached directly by sending formal email and also over the phone and asked if they were willing to participate. Research findings suggest that instructional leadership enables the programme/module leaders to establish a shared belief around the learning and can improve the learner's achievement.

Introduction

According to Nixon (2015), Instructional leadership is one of those terms that has been used frequently over the past few years, and we tend to make assumptions about what it means." She goes on to say that "Instructional leadership is not a static term.

[1]University of Wales Trinity Saint David London, Vassal, London, UK

Corresponding Author:
Afzal Sayed Munna, University of Wales Trinity Saint David London, Winchester House, 11 Cranmer Rd, Vassal, London, UK.
Email: a.munna@uwtsd.ac.uk

It does not mean the same thing universally." She further explains that "An instructional leader in a small school will necessarily be quite hands-on, while in a larger school they will focus on building the leadership capacity of other staff." Even, "There is also a place for instructional leadership outside the school setting because anyone who influences learning outcomes is an instructional leader." Given this, it can be argued that there is no explicit definition for the term instructional leadership and could be used in different educational settings, but instructional leaders' role may differ in various settings, although, all instructional leaders influence learning outcomes (Wolverton et al., 2005). Consequently, the term instructional leadership can be explained in this article as anyone who influences learning outcomes (Nixon, 2015).

The article initially examines some models of instructional leadership through literature review. It will further show that relationship between instructional leadership and module leaders using one of the models discussed earlier. The final part of the article discusses the relationship between instructional leadership and module leaders in their setting.

Literature Review

Instructional Leadership

Some literature from international educational contexts suggests that students' learnings are primarily influenced by classroom practice and leadership approach (OECD, 2005; Hallinger & Heck, 2011). These studies show that leadership influence is very crucial characteristics of an instructional Leadership (IL), which mainly focuses on improving teaching and learning. On a contrarily, Dimmock and Walker (2000) see educational policy and practice as a very important element of instructional leadership (IL) by analyzing the impact of globalization on educational leadership and management. Also, Hallinger and Heck (1997) identified IL as one of the most significant leadership concepts, especially in English speaking countries. Yet, the authors agreed that IL is technical. For example, Leithwood et al. (1999) believe that ''*IL typically assumes that the critical focus for attention by leaders is the behaviour of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students*'' (Leithwood et al., 1999, p. 8). On the other hand, Elmore (2000) suggested, teaching improvement as a focal point as it helps improve the learning outcome. The contribution to leadership in management has its immense impact, which also was addressed high-quality professional development, which alternatively requires IL approach or orientation (Sammons et al., 2011). Hallinger (2009) also identified and agreed that the instructional leadership reached its global phenomenon and created a distinct form of leadership of learning (LfL). As a result, the development of this new concept of leadership of learning was encouraged (Barth, 1990; Day et al., 2001).

It seems the development of IL can be promoted through instructional leadership framework. Instructional leadership framework was defined by involving the

leadership activities to create an effective departmental head (*in a school setting, the principal*)-teacher interaction to improve the quality of teaching and learning Hallinger and Murphy (1985). The framework captured the understanding of the knowledge settings, curriculum, professional development and also the strategy followed by the vision of the institution. Southworth (2002) believed that this factor has a powerful influence on creating an inclusive learning environment and have suggested a three-point strategy those are: learning-centered leadership, Modelling and monitoring and mentoring. Within this instructional perspective, learning refers to the student's academic progress and teacher's professional growth while the educational leaders contribute to the hallmark of improvement (Locke et al., 1990).

Hallinger and Murphy's Instructional Leadership Model (1985). Gumus et al. (2016) reported that almost half of all the studies on leadership models focused on instructional leadership from 1980 to 1995. Among which the most well-known theory of instructional leadership was developed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) from their model of instructional management by examining the instructional leadership behavior of 10 elementary school principals and reviewing the literature on school effectiveness. According to Hallinger and Murphy (1985), instructional leadership has seen as a strong and directive leadership that focuses directly on curriculum and instructional practices. They believed that instructional leaders are the people who bring about the institution's effectiveness, especially in terms of teaching and learning. The model is widely used because of its high validity and reliability which comprises three main dimensions (*defining mission, managing instructional programs and promoting positive culture*). However, with the evolving of the transformational leadership in 1990, Cuban (1988) and Lambert (1998) highlighted on the limitation of the Hallinger and Murphy (1985) model as they believed that instructional leadership only focuses on the principal as the center expertise, power and authority by deliberately ignoring the other facets which ultimately put the burden for any one person. The application of this model also can only be viewed in a school setting and very much absent in higher education.

Murphy's Instructional Leadership Framework (1990). In a comprehensive review of literature on instructional leadership, Murphy (1990) noted that principals of effective schools, where the quality of teaching and learning was very strong, demonstrated instructional leadership both directly and indirectly. Using this review, he later provided a systemic and comprehensive framework for instructional leadership. However, this framework has not been empirically tested (Hallinger & Heck, 1997). The framework consists of four dimensions broken down into sixteen different roles or behaviors. The framework dimensions are very largely connected with this current research as it mostly supports student engagement and student performance (Hallinger, 2005). The prime framework elements are as follows: developing the mission and goal, promoting quality instruction and monitoring student progress, promoting an inclusive environment of learning, creating a supportive working environment which was also

mentioned by Murphy (1990). The framework considers the school settings only and limits the role of principals and does not allow understanding the nature of various other roles involved while managing a school (Hallinger, 2012). It also suggests that the strategies and application of the instructional leadership in schools are largely depending on the schools' size, language background, community and socioeconomic status of the school.

Weber's Instructional Leadership Model (1996).   Weber's Model (1996) of instructional leadership model incorporates shared leadership and empowerment of informal leaders. Weber points to the need for an instructional leader even with the absence of the principal. In this regard Weber (1996) claims that effective instructional leadership would depend on a large extent on two important factors, that is, the flexibility of the principal in sharing leadership duties and the clarity of this leadership duty is matched with individuals who can perform them collaboratively. Weber (1996) identified five essential domains of instructional leadership which include: defining the mission, managing the curriculum and instruction, promoting a positive learning environment, observing and improving instruction, assessing the instructional programme.

According to this model, the instructional leaders play an important role in initiating and contributing to the planning, designing, administering and analyzing the effectiveness of a curriculum. Continuous scrutiny of the instructional program, in turn, enables the teachers to meet the needs of the students through constant refinement and revision (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Thus, Weber's model, in general, incorporates research about shared leadership and empowerment of informal leaders to create a School that emphasizes student achievement. Similar to Murphy's (1990) model, this model also has not been empirically tested. Therefore, it is very unclear if an instructional leader demonstrating these behaviors will result in high student achievement (Trowler & Trowler, 2010).

All three models depicted above summaries and agreed on the following fundamental functions-

1. The models help define and communication institutions goals
2. All of them provide and monitor feedback on the institutions teaching and learning process and
3. All of them strongly promote and emphasize on the importance of continuous professional development

Hoy and Miskel (2012) stated that these three models and processes are most consistent with Locke and Latham's goal-setting theory, which is indeed an effective theory of motivation. Locke and Latham's goal-setting theory (2002) established that the most challenging goals creates strong motivation among the leaders (only when accepted) as it requires appropriate individual attention, mobilized efforts, enhance persistence and finally sets the vision and strategies for goal accomplishment. On the other hand, the theory also agrees that feedback is equally important as it enhances

performance National College for School Leadership (NCSL, 2004). The three funda-mental functions cited above features that instructional leadership demonstrate the goal-setting theory in practice in an educational setting.

Alig-Mielcarek and Hoy's Instructional Leadership (2005). Alig-Mielcarek (2003) found three distinct similarities that emerged from a study of the three models discussed (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 1990; Weber, 1996). All these indicated the importance of instructional leaders defining and communicating goals, monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process and promoting and empha-sizing the importance of professional development. Alig-Mielcarek (2003) used these three common dimensions to come up with his framework of instructional leadership which he tested empirically. It was found principles have an indirect influence on stu-dent achievement. Rather the linkage between school leadership and student learning as Hallinger and Heck (1997) suggested, ''is inextricably tied to the actions of others in the school'' (p. 24) such as teachers who work hard, and orderly learning environ-ment, diligent students who respect the success of others and high achievable goals set for students.

Socioeconomic status of the students was factored into the model by Alig-Mielcarek and Hoy (2005), further developing the original instructional leadership model by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), Murphy (1990) and Weber (1996). Bush (2017) in his editorial reinforced students' socioeconomic factor does impact learning and that will, in turn, affect leadership responses. The student who comes from low socioeconomic status could be ''unprepared learners'' and resulting in no or little learning.

Instructional Leadership in England. National College for School Leadership's (NCSL) proposed ten leadership approaches among which instructional leadership was one of them. On their proposition, they highlighted the leadership develop-ment framework, which they believed to be the great influential factor for effec-tive learning. The framework was designed to ensure the active engagement of teachers and activities, which affect the quality of teaching and learning. Hopkins et al. (1997) evidenced the systematic review of the educational leadership in England, which advocate the prominent role of instructional leadership application to improve organizational capacity by measuring the impact of student's achieve-ments and leanings. Southworth (2002) also found evidence of a strong connection between student's achievements and teacher's professional growth in his primary school research. The emerging literature from Higham et al. (2007) also agree with Southworth findings from the England schools. However, Dimmock argued that the instructional leadership by the head of the institution is constrained by the govern-ment policy priorities and thus measured by the league table results. This argument was supported by the research from Day et al. (2011) where they identified that there is a strong direct and indirect influence of academic results by the practice

of instructional leadership, which also correlate the findings from Leithwood et al. (2006).

In 2009 OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) in England thus came out to set expectation about the leadership practice which improve the teaching and learning by enabling learning-centered leadership, curriculum enhancing creativity, and also personalized learning as a measure to monitor the progress. The similar vision was reflected in a higher educational setting by QAA where they set a nine-point expectation and practices for learning and teaching (QAA, 2018). The core practices by the QAA identify the provision of qualified and skilled staff members to deliver high-quality academic experience, which only can be achieved by allowing the professional development program. It also identifies the use of appropriate learning resources along with student support, which is responsible for inclusive teaching, and learning environment (Gunn & Fisk, 2013).

Bryman (2007) stated that during the first decade of 21st century the knowledge available for the study of effective leadership was very limited which later was echoed by Middlehurst and by her working colleagues 2 years later where they also stated that higher education was very much under-represented in regards to the leadership study and research (Middlehurst, 2009). Ersozlu and Saklan (2016) and Wang and Berger (2010) mentioned that instructional leadership has never been sufficiently examined in the context of higher education. Therefore, it was not advanced with a thorough analysis of the impact of leadership in higher education. Kezar et al. (2006) proposed and agreed to a change in the landscape of the higher education which was later reflected by Hofmeyer et al. (2015) and Potter and Devecchi (2020) where they noticed a significant growth and development of literature on higher education.

According to Clegg and McAuley (2005) and Goffee and Jones (2009), the collegial and democratic environment in the academic world the leadership application and approaches in the higher educational institutions has always been questioned with authority and having limited legitimacy. In higher education, the leadership is always viewed as the first among equals where it is assumed that the leaders have more responsibility and power but actually, it stands at the same level as the other faculty members (Altbach, 2011; Dopson et al., 2019). McCaffery (2019) explained the situation as complex and complicated because the leadership roles in higher education can be assigned on an honorary basis. After all, it is the transitory nature and could be a temporary task to a faculty member which might be a rationale for a predetermined period.

Barth (1990) defined the instructional leadership as the process of a top-down approach of educational leadership approach which seeks to manage the lecturers by providing guidance and direction to achieve the department goals through strong central power. On a different note, Aas and Brandmo (2016) mentioned, instructional leaders apply the leadership by holding the control to implement of improvements through a defined hierarchical governing structure and the faculty members are informed what they are supposed to do.

Module/Subject Leadership

According to Garnett (2012) school leadership has been its highest interest for the last two decades; particularly the school improvement has been linked with the activities related to the leadership approach and practice at various levels. The concept of developing the subject/module leadership was an initiative to empower teachers with the curriculum responsibilities to recognize their roles in leading the subject.

Role of Programme Leadership

Programme leadership has been taken seriously as an effective tool for operations in most of the UK universities. The role mainly remaining as shadowing the principle programme leader who is often called programme director or programme managers. Though the area of operation has taken seriously unfortunately there was almost no academic literature and also no appropriate guidance's to perform the role. The role occupies an ambiguous position in the organisation with very limited responsibility to adhere (Henderson, 2013). It is very ambiguous often where there is a distinct differentiation on the depart or disciple of the programme. However, the general programme leadership have a range of responsibilities, including course management, staff timetable, curriculum development, coordinating assessment, collating external samples, marketing, liaising with key stakeholders and central services, and supporting students in difficulties (Murphy & Curtis, 2013). However, McNay (2001) has provided with a different view by analysing the shift from collegial to the corporate enterprise. And according to his view, the role of programme leadership is not only performing the task assigned and make the person responsible, but it is also indeed jostling for position over departmental workloads and introduction of tactical micro-political maneuver. This was similarly and strongly agreed by Worthington and Hodgson (2005) where they mentioned that this enables an individual to take responsibility and ensure to pursue their research and improve career interest with an additional burden of responsibility.

They also highlighted that with this extended workload it is still a popular agenda among the UK universities because most the UK universities believe this enables their staff members most close to their students which in return improve the student experience. They believe that the academies those are involved in the programme leadership roles, particularly, those are occupying the middle management roles can significantly contribute to the aspects of support and pastoral care. The continuous involvement allows them to practice pedagogy on the curriculum design which reflects on the relationship building and creating the bond among the learner's set.

Bennis (1989) suggested academic leadership as an esthetic beauty as people normally do not recognise it but can feel it when applied. Alimo-Metcalfe et al. (2001) highlighted the qualities from the followers' perspectives and levelled those as top qualities for leaders which include: genuine concern for others, demonstrate inspirational communicator skill and have the ability to empower others. Berthoin et al.

(2001) suggest that a successful leader should have the ability to perform situational leadership by balancing act between personal variables and situational variables. Immediately next year Yuki (2002) suggested that situational variables are important because it determines the critical success factor for the leader. The research from Yuki (2002) also suggests that having good personality characteristics a leader can still fail if he/she does not demonstrate the ability to evaluate the situational variables.

Leadership Development: Setting Up a Learning System

The concept of leadership development has been focused on the interpersonal development, skills and attributes which contributes to organisational performance improvements. It has been evidenced by the research that the organisations that invest in leadership development results in a positive impact on the business performance vis-à-vis on student performance. A CIPD survey reported that one of the most effective employee retention strategies was to invest in employee management and leadership skills (CIPD, 2010). This was also agreed by Mumford (2000) who believes that there is a real value on employee development. In today's HR management concept, it has been greatly valued that, implementation of HRD interventions are crucial to improve performance which leads towards leadership development. However, Day (2000) and Dalakoura (2010) agreed that the concept of leadership development is contradictory to leadership development though the concept is significantly important in sustainable leadership. They believed that it is important to ensure that the leaders contain the value of individual leadership characteristics which they interact with others to promote the value. The key concept of this is the true openness to encourage sharing and integration of leadership practice to gain a sense of others.

Aasen and Stensaker (2007) on the other hand mentioned in their research that the leadership being a concept of investigating and highly contested field of study. Like as Day (2000) and Dalakoura (2010); Middlehurst (1993) also stated that leadership identified various challenges which links to other social concepts such as power and authority. The leadership theory also states that it is very important to consider the lay understandings of the concept which significantly influence everyday interrelations with others. The interrelationships determine of what leadership involves, including the teacher's perspective and also the academic engagement. The leadership theory reveals that *Leadership is conceived as being control, having power and influence over others, and is frequently associated with a managerial role*. The similar concept was also explained by Middlehurst (1993) where the author mentioned, the leadership is a combination of many roles but only performing the roles does not guarantee the successful leadership, it is instead requiring the passionate approach of human characteristics including social interaction, personal qualities and values.

Relationship Between Instructional Leadership and Module Leaders

Like own organisation which explicitly includes subject expertise, curriculum design and the ability to move the department forward (Schaufeli et al., 2002). It is believed to be true that the instructional leadership can raise the standard of teaching and learning and allocating the module leader responsibility on the subject specialist help raise the academic standards within the curriculum area (Schleicher, 2012). Instructional leadership enables the module/subject leaders to establish a shared belief around the learning and can improve the learner's achievement (Day et al., 2011). The literature of the article suggests that there is an immense need of the module leaders to develop their leadership skills to increase the job satisfaction experience within the roles. Instructional leadership practice for the module leaders could also be important to drive an innovative evidence-based practice at the workplace.

Models for Higher Education Setting

From the evidence of data collected from the module leaders and also from the literature review, the author found no single model can solely be used and applied to a higher educational context. While reviewing the need for higher education engagement it was evidenced that the most important role higher education institutions play is to direct and guide the society. As a result, the role of having a leader's quality of faculty members are closely related to develop the teaching quality and ensuring the purpose of organizational achievement. The role an instructional leader will be playing in the higher educational institutions or departmental achievement is to increase and transform all educational components to encourage faculty members gaining various knowledge and skills (Balwant, 2017). The author has evidenced the presence of instructional leadership at this university which supports and encourage accomplishment, knowledge management and help implement the instructional process. This was supported by the Leithwood et al. (2004) research which was directed to school setting but simultaneously can also be used in the higher educational settings. It was evidenced by the authors own practice that leadership is one of the important steps for providing the educational reforms and organizational development. The model also supports encouraging the instructional leaders to develop the faculty members skills through continuous professional development, building strong interpersonal communication skills, create an effective (Office for Standards in Education [OFSTED], 2009) communication network and also help to build a democratic environment .

The author also evidenced from everyday practice that; the institution strongly supports Weber instructional leadership model (1996). Weber (1996) believed that effective leadership largely depends on the approach of leadership sharing, especially sharing the duties between the department managers (for instance, currently the university equally shares the programme managers roles between weekdays and weekend programme coordinators) and the individuals who demonstrate and can perform the duties collaboratively. On the other hand, the five domains of the model also can be

evidenced by the university practice (Jimerson et al., 2002). At the university, we currently allocating the module leaders the responsibility of managing the curriculum and instruction, promoting a positive learning environment, observing and improving instruction, assessing the instructional programme (Irving, 2012).

Methodology

The ground fieldwork was undertaken at a University based in London. Two interviews were conducted between April 2020 to June 2020. Programme leaders were selected from the School of Business and Health and Social Care to take in the study. They were contacted directly via emails and telephone calls. The participants were given consent forms to complete before the study and asked if they were willing to participate. Both of them agreed willingly to take part. To protect the confidentiality of the respondents and comply with the GDPR 2018 Act, their names were kept anonymous. As both the module leaders are from the same university and also from the same department, they showed a lot of similarities in their responses in the semistructured interviews. The participants gave their views on various characteristics they believed are useful to make the instructional leadership successful. The questions were based on years of teaching, highest qualification achieved and professional membership to establish how they see the leadership deployment within the department.

Moreover, the participants were asked to share their views on whether they believe that it is important to promote professional development that positively impacts on students learning. Also, they were asked what strategies institutions should follow to improve teaching and learning. The interviews were based on only 4 open-ended questions and followed a semi-structured in terms of questions and guidance. The questions were designed to focus mainly on the programme and module leadership.

Also, the assessment of the modules evaluation results for one term (*completed by students anonymously*) was used to make valuable inputs to the research findings. Consequently, a mixed-method research design was used to collect and interpret data. Initially, it was planned to conduct a face-to-face interview to collect the primary data which later was cancelled due to the COVID-19 and arranged in Zoom video call.

The responses of the participants were examined for any major themes that are relevant during this research. The collected data were analyzed to identify issues and concerns related to the creation of an inclusive teaching and learning environment.

Findings/Discussion

The two programme/module leaders interviewed shared a similar feeling of being empowered with the role and also enjoying the opportunity they have to engage and shape the curriculum and enhance the learning experiences, both equally felt overloaded with responsibilities leading to stress. Two main themes were created from the interview findings which are as follows:

- No Power Role (*Leading to confusion*)
- Unwanted burden (*Leading to stress*)

No Power Role (Leading to Confusion)

To strike the conversation when asked, *describe your role* the participants responded with a smile as they are confused and not very sure what involved in their role. Both described their role having vague definition which leads to blurring of boundaries between different roles and positions. One of the participants described his role as very confusing when it comes to student support. His primary role includes responding to and supporting his students. However, if he decides to communicate with the students, he needs to be dictated from the line manager what to say and what not to. Moreover, he also cannot make any decision which leads to frustration to the students and himself. On another note, the participants mentioned that when it comes to communicating students on general matters it seemed administration and student service colleagues serve better than him which a quality issue.

On the other hand, the other participants mentioned that being a programme/module leader he remains busy doing a lot of report writing and often called to cover lessons (when module lecturers are off sick), he seems communicating less than he wanted which lead him more leading than engaging with the students.

Both the participants equivocally agreed that their role is not clear and is paradoxical nature which requires accountability but no authority. And they further agreed that being accountable without authority, they have no effective contribution to student engagement and departmental development. They also have a very rare opportunity to contribute to the allocation of resources leading to frustration and unwanted stress. Both of them viewed the notion of leadership as an artificial distinction. They often felt powerless even though the title awarded them empowerment.

Unwanted Burden (Leading to Stress)

Both the participants mentioned that the institutional practices often lead them to feel unwanted in their department which also created obstacles to effective leadership practice. They mentioned that there was no such clear message on what is expected from them which often lead them to anger. One of the participants cited that there are clear concerns on the ability of the institutions to provide effective administration. He mentioned about his experience on the upcoming timetabling which helps him to believe that the administrative support is often perceived to be ineffective and inadequate.

The participants proposed to have a group of lecturers who are much more engaging and demonstrates a mentorship approach to be included in the team. He also proposed the allocation of the modules based on the teaching, industrial and research experience which seems to be ignored by the timetabling colleagues. On the other hand, the other participants mentioned he was not called for the discussion as his line manager lead the timetabling for their trimester. He also believes that institutional

imperatives could easily act as obstacles by creating an unwanted burden on the colleagues.

The data findings also revealed many recommendations from both the participants which they believe is key to the departmental success.

Recommendation

Despite all the challenges both the participants highlighted, there is a lot of opportunities for them to effectively contribute to the decision-making process and with the overall departmental approach, they felt encouraged to reflect with the little support mechanism the university provides to them. It became clear from the research and findings that programme leadership requires training before taking the role. It was also evidenced by the research that the r needs to cope with the administrative load as it was identified as one of the major challenges.

The participants felt that they could have done better with systematic guidance and support from the department and also by making sequencing of the work and tasks. It was also evidenced that the empowering the leaders (Programme/Module Leaders) will enable them to take the appropriate initiative to engage more with the students on their programmes. Both the participants mentioned about continuous professional development (CPD) as a crucial support mechanism at the institutional level which might be an essential tool concerning student support and improve the student experience.

Equally, there has been a need identified to conduct a regular peer review and benefits policy guidance from senior management. It was also evidenced that there is a clear need for QAA quality code compliance by the senior management including those who are in the leadership role. Programme leaders wanted to boost their confidence and thus a QAA quality code revision might rest assure the quality of the provision they had responsibility for.

The research also identified the need for skills development at various levels of the leadership role. There was a clear confusion that at the time of assigning the leadership role, the development of relevant skills was emphasized less than the knowledge and the understanding of the subject/module. It was evidenced that leaders require *people skills* most than subject knowledge when dealing with people in a variety of contexts. Last but not least, there are few more recommendations could be made to enhance the leadership roles attractive that the roles involve someone to be: a peoples' person, having extraordinary communication skills, know how to delegate work to others, diplomacy skills especially when dealing with negatives feedbacks and finally avoid dominance and ensure inclusiveness.

Conclusion

The research intended to address by putting some insight into the characteristics of quality teaching, instructional leadership and the student's achievements. The research explored

the literature evidence the skills and expertise required to perform the roles which explicitly includes subject expertise, curriculum design and the ability to move the department forward.

The author believes that the instructional leadership can raise the standard of teaching and learning and allocating the module leader responsibility on the subject specialist help raise the academic standards within the curriculum area. The literature and research findings also suggested that instructional leadership enables the programme/module leaders to establish a shared belief around the learning and can improve the learner's achievement. It can also be added on concluding remarks that there is an immense need of the module leaders to develop their leadership skills to increase the job satisfaction experience within the roles. Instructional leadership practice for the module leaders could also be important to drive an innovative evidence-based practice at the workplace.

Analyzing the end of module evaluation feedback and also after careful review of the programme/module leader role descriptions it is evidenced that the university largely relies on the programme/module leaders in the development, delivery and management of their provisions. The role is high in workload and low in recognition and reward, high is a responsibility but low in authority. While exploring different branches of the leadership and leadership approach the author identified significant areas for the university to address in terms of ensuring the equality and balance. This alternatively means that the university requires to promote the collegiality and teamwork on an institutional level where all academic members expected to take a fair chance of responsibility to ensure overall programme quality.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

ORCID ID

Afzal Sayed Munna https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7302-8037

References

Aas, M., & Brandmo, C. (2016). Revisiting instructional and transformational leadership: The contemporary Norwegian context of school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *54*(1), 92–110.

Aasen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2007). Balancing trust and technology? Leadership training in higher education. *Journal of Educational Management*, *27*, 371–383.

Alig-Mielcarek, J. (2003) *A model of school success: instructional leadership, Academic Press and student achievement* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Ohio State University.

Alig-Mielcarek, J., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). *Instructional leadership*. Information Age Publishers.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B., & Alban-Metcalfe, R. J., Alimo-Metcalfe, R. (2001). The development of a new transformational leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317901167208

Altbach, P. G. (2011). The past, present, and future of the research university. In P. G. Altbach & J. Salmi (Eds.), *The road to academic excellence* (pp. 11–32). The World Bank.

Balwant, P. T. (2017). The meaning of student engagement and disengagement in the classroom context: Lessons from organisational behaviour. *Journal of further and higher education*, *42*, 1–13.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W. G. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Addison-Wesley.

Berthoin, A., Lenhardt, U., & Rosenbrock, R. (2001). Barriers to organisational learning. In M. Diekes (Ed.), *The handbook of organisational nowledge and learning* (Ch. 39). Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2007). *Effective leadership in higher education, research and development series*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Bush, T. (2017). Leadership and context: Why one size does not fit all. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, *46*(1), 3–4.

CIPD. (2010). *Annual survey report*. Resourcing and talent planning, CIPD.

Clegg, S., & McAuley, J. (2005). Conceptualising middle management in higher education: A multifaceted discourse. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(1), 9–34.

Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. SUNY Press.

Dalakoura, A. (2010). Differentiating leader and leadership development: A collective framework for leadership development. *Journal of Management Development*, *29*, 432–441.

Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *4*(1), 39–56.

Day, C., Sammons, P., Leithwood, K., Hopkins, D., Gu, Q., Brown, E., & Ahtaridou, E. (2011). *Successful school leadership: Linking with learning and achievement*. Open University Press.

Day, D. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 581–613.

Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2000). Developing comparative and international education leadership and management: A cross-cultural model. *School Leadership & Management*, *20*(2), 143–160.

Dopson, S., Ferlie, E., McGivern, G., Fischer, M. D., Mitra, M., Ledger, J., & Behrens, S. (2019). Leadership development in higher education: A literature review and implications for programme redesign. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *73*(2), 218–234. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12194

Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Albert Shanker Institute.

Ersozlu, A., & Saklan, E. (2016). Instructional leadership in higher education: How does it work? *British Journal of Education*, *4*(5), 1–15.

Garnett, S. (2012). *The subject leader: An introduction to leadership & management*. Crown House Publishing.

Goffee, R., & Jones, G. (2009). Clever: Leading your smartest, most creative people. *Harvard Business Review*.

Gumus, S., Bellibas, M. S., Esen, M., & Gumus, E. (2016). A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational research from 1980 to 2014. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, *46*(1), 25048.

Gunn, V., & Fisk, A. (2013). *Considering teaching excellence in higher education*. Higher Education Academy.

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(3), 221–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793

Hallinger, P. (2009). *Leadership for 21st century school: From instructional leadership to leadership for learning*. The Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Hallinger, P. (2012). Instructional leadership in East Asia. *Asia Leadership Roundtable*, *42*.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1997). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *8*(4), 1–35.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Leadership for learning: Does collaborative leadership make a difference in school improvement? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, *38*(6), 654–678.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011). Exploring the journey of school improvement: Classifying and analysing patterns of change in school improvement processes and learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *22*(1), 1–27.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, *86*(2), 217–247. https://doi.org/10.1086/461445

Henderson, F. P. (2013). Commandership: The art of command. *The Marine Corps gazette*, *97*(7), 9–12.

Higham, R., Hopkins, D., & Ahtaridou, E. (2007). *Improving school leadership: Country background report for England, Report for the Department for Children, Schools and Families for the OECD Activity Improving School Leadership Education and Training Policy Division*. Institute of Education, University of London.

Hofmeyer, A., Sheingold, B. H., Klopper, H. C., & Warland, J. (2015). Leadership in learning and teaching in higher education: Perspectives of academics in non-formal leadership roles. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, *8*(3), 181–192.

Hopkins, D., Harris, A., & Jackson, D. (1997). Understanding the school's capacity for development. *School Leadership and Management*, *17*(3), 401–411.

Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2012). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Irving, C. (2012). *Leadership in higher education: A longitudinal study of local leadership for enhancing learning and teaching* (unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Liverpool.

Jimerson, S., Campos, E., & Greif, J. (2002). Toward an understanding of definitions and measures of school engagement and related terms. *The California School of Psychologist*, *8*, 7–27.

Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). *Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership*. Wiley.

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. National College for School Leadership (NCSL).

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Open University Press.

Leithwood, K., Louise, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences students learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

Locke, E. A., Latham, G. P., Smith, K. J., & Wood, R. E. (1990). *A theory of goal setting & task performance*. Prentice-Hall.

McCaffery, P. (2019). *The higher education manager's handbook: Effective leadership and management in universities and colleges* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

McNay, V. J. (2001). *Mandating accountability: Educational change and the local impact of state policy of an urban elementary school*. University of Kansas.

Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading academics*. Open University Press.

Middlehurst, R. (2009). Why research leadership in higher education? Exploring contributions from the UK's leadership foundation for higher education. *Leadership*, *5*(3), 311–329.

Mumford, M. D. (2000). Leadership skills: Conclusions and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 155–170.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school* (Vol. 1). JAI Press.

Murphy, M., & Curtis, W. (2013). The micro-politics of micro-leadership: Exploring the role of programme leader in English universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *35*(1), 34–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.727707

National College for School Leadership (NCSL). (2004). *Learning to lead: NCSL's strategy for leadership learning*. NCSL.

Nixon, L. A. (2015). *School leaders decision-making process for academic program placement: A phenomenological study* (Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 3228). https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3228.

Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED). (2009). *Twelve outstanding secondary schools: Excelling against the odds, The office for standards in education, children's services and skills*.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2005). *Improving school leadership: Rationale and plans for the activity*. *Meeting of National Representatives*, Paris.

Potter, J., & Devecchi, C. (Eds.). (2020). *Delivering educational change in higher education: A transformative approach for leaders and practitioners*. Routledge.

QAA. (2018). *UK Quality code, advice and guidance: Learning and teaching [Online]*. https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/learning-and-teaching#

Sammons, P., Gu, Q., Day, C., & Ko, J. (2011). Exploring the impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes: Results from a study of academically improved and effective schools in England. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *25*(1), 83–101.

Schaufeli, W. B., Martinez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in the university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*(5), 464–481.

Schleicher, A. (Ed.). (2012). Developing effective school leaders. In. *Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world*. OECD Publishing.

Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & Management*, *22*(1), 73–91.

Trowler, V., & Trowler, P. (2010). *Student engagement evidence summary*. Higher Education Academy.

Wang, V. C. X., & Berger, J. (2010). Critical analysis of leadership needed in higher education. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies*, *6*(2), 3–12.

Weber, J. (1996). Leading the instructional programme. In S. Smith & P. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership* (pp. 253–278). Clearinghouse of Educational Management.

Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(2), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800500120126

Worthington, F., & Hodgson, J. (2005). Academic labour and the politics of quality in higher education: A critical evaluation of the conditions of possibility of resistance. *Critical Quarterly*, *47*(1-2), 96–110. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0011-1562.2005.00617.x

Yuki, G. (2002). *Leadership in organisations*. Prentice-Hall.

Author Biography

Afzal Sayed Munna is a Doctoral Researcher in Business and Education. Afzal also serves as an education oversight consultant and an entrepreneur by profession. Afzal is a Bangladeshi born, lives in Essex, United Kingdom and currently working as a Lecturer, Module Leader, and Academic Coordinator at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David, London. Afzal also is working as Associate Professor and Lecturer respectively at the Richmond, The American International University in London, Bath Spa University, and UNICAF University, Ireland. Afzal holds a Qualified Teacher Status and a Certified Management and Business Educator (CMBE). Afzal is a Fellow in the Higher Education Academy and a Member of the Society for Education and Training and the British Educational Research Association (BERA). Afzal serves as a peer reviewer for Journal of Education: SAGE Journal and sit in the editorial board of International Journal of Asian Education (IJAE), International Education and Culture Studies and Gnosi: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis.