ISSN: 0975-833X

Available online at http://www.journalcra.com

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 16, Issue, 05, pp.28158-28168, May, 2024
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.47141.05.2024

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH

RESEARCH ARTICLE

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND EFFICIENT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN A CHINA UNIVERSITY

***Tian Wang**

Emilio Aguinaldo College, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 19th February, 2024
Received in revised form
09th March, 2024
Accepted 25th April, 2024
Published online 20th May, 2024

Key words:
Teaching Leadership, Educational Resources, Allocation.

Corresponding author:** ***Tian Wang

ABSTRACT

This paper takes the current situation of teaching leadership and educational resources allocation in Qingdao University (QU) and investigates the current situation of teaching leadership and educational resources allocation in the institution through survey questionnaires.In addition, it investigates the current situation of leadership and educational resources allocation in education in QU and analyzes the ability of leadership to effectively mobilize and allocate educational resources in QU. The study uncovered substantial and highly positive correlations between instructional leadership and efficient resource management among administrators. The interconnection between personal attributes, teaching philosophy, skills, and resources emphasizes the importance of a holistic approach to leadership development in educational institutions. These insights stress the need for cultivating not only specific skills but also personal qualities and a coherent teaching philosophy to facilitate effective resource management and the attainment of educational objectives.

Citation: ***Tian Wang.*** **2024.** "Instructional Leadership and Efficient Resource Management in a China University*".* *International Journal of Current Research*, 16, (05), 28158-28168.

INTRODUCTION

In this new era ofhigh quality education development, the leadership of principals is being tested to see how the proposition of building high quality school education can be transformed into a vivid school practice. Articles 30 and 41 of the Higher Education Law of the People's Republic of China specify that the president of a university is fully responsible for teaching, scientific research, and other administrative management of the university. The Dictionary of Education defines the leadership of the university president as "the highest person in charge of the administration of the university. He represents the university externally and presides over the overall affairs of the university internally. Appointed or delegated by educational administrations at all levels, relevant school sponsoring bodies, or individuals, or elected through certain procedures." The leadership of the president is indispensable in accelerating the development of higher education and the construction of first-class universities and first-class disciplines in the new era. How to further improve the leadership of universities in the context of the new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics, so as to improve and allocate teaching resources more favorably, is an important topic that needs to be studied in the construction of first-class universities.

Instructional leadership is one of the key means by which educational leaders function. The core mission of instructional leadership is to lead the college in achieving educational goals and ensuring student learning outcomes and professional development for teachers. Instructional leadership includes, but is not limited to, instructional policy development, curriculum design, and assessment of instruction to promote continuous improvement in the quality of education and teaching at a certain educational institution.

Background of the study: With the rise of global educational reform, growing awareness for educational efficacy, and standard-based responsibility frameworks in the 21st century, principals' instructional leadership has received greater scrutiny (Pan *et al*. 2015; Zhao 2018) and is regarded as among the most essential of the leadership concepts (Hallinger *et al*. 2015; Zheng *et al*. 2017). The instructional leadership of learning institutions is crucial to the success of their academic programs (Hallinger, 2011). The broad definition of instructional leadership includes the development and implementation of goals, school culture, and instructional management aimed at improving student learning outcomes, according to Musungu and Nasongo (2008). The narrow definition concentrates on instructional leadership as an independent role from management and solely encompasses operations that are straight associated

with the teaching and learning process, such as method of instruction, and lesson observation.

A favorable climate for teaching and learning to accomplish academic and social school goals is what is meant by instructional leadership practice (Leithwood, 2019). Furthermore, there is a connection between student accomplishment and school environment, and good academic achievement is challenging sans an educational culture that fosters harmony and efficiency. Good educational leaders need to fully understand the needs of the school, assess the effectiveness and efficiency of teaching and resource use, and make the best use of internal school resources such as premises, finance, teachers, and students. For those subsystems or mobilizations that bring high quality, effective instructional leadership, they continually seek ways and means to utilize existing educational resources and create new ones to support their instructional leadership. The ultimate goal is to achieve a synergistic development of educational leadership and educational resourcing, to improve the quality of education and services, and to create more opportunities and realize more potential for the future development of students.

Considering the aforementioned, it is essential to note that what Qian, Walker, and Yang (2016), Siu (2008), and Walker and Qian (2015) mentioned that the sociocultural setting in China is classified as hierarchical due to its more top-down communication patterns and a respect for authority culture.The formulation of a new model of leadership that may include both technical and teacher-leader relational elements may be required in educational research. The accountability of school administrators to guarantee that all pupils perform well has risen as China's education reforms have become more intense. Administrators build leadership techniques that allow them to successfully lead a school community; they are less interested in academic disputes on the effectiveness of different methods of leadership. They are involved with motivating, supporting, and developing personnel, as well as ensuring that teaching and learning improve. While they aren't always the hands-on instructional leaders that were desired in the 1980s, as evidenced by the study in (Hardy *et al*., 2006, Gurr, 2007; Gurr *et al*., 2010), they are very successful in ensuring advancement in instruction, pedagogy, and assessment, most often by collaborating with other educational administrators in order to influence the way educators practice.

Statement of the problem: This study assesses the potential effects of instructional leadership on school resourcing management, as evaluated by faculty members. The findings of the study can be used in academic and professional development programs.

Specifically, this study answers the following questions

- What is the assessment of teachers on the factors that exhibit the instructional leadership of administrators?
- What is the assessment of teachers on the factors that exhibit administrators' efficient resource management?

Significance of the study

The results of this investigation may be of benefit to:

School Administrators: The results of this topic may inspire them to combine practical and relevant leadership management strategies with existing strategies to provide a variety of means to improve the allocation of teaching and learning resources.

Teachers: The findings of this study may provide them with insights into the different leadership styles of headmasters. The results may also provide them with an understanding of important instructional leadership conditions that affect their use of instructional resources.

Policymakers: This study holds significance for policymakers by providing insights into variations in administrators' perspectives on instructional leadership and resource management, guiding the formulation of targeted policies for a more equitable educational environment.

Future researchers: This study could be used as a reference by future researchers covering the same topics or causes.

Scope and delimitation: The study focused on assessing the factors of how administrators exhibit instructional leadership and how these factors translate to administrators' allocation of teaching resources based on the perception of 218 teacher-respondents teaching in Qingdao University. It also looked into any potential differences in the assessment of the said variables if respondent profiles are to be considered, as well as the relationship between the two.

Theoretical framework: The Situational Leadership Model assumes that a leader's behavior must be commensurate with the level of maturity of his or her subordinates in order to achieve effective leadership. Four specific leadership styles are combined and formed according to the level of maturity of the subordinates. These are the directive leadership style (high task-low relationship), the selling leadership style (high task-high relationship), the participative leadership style (low task-high relationship), and the empowering leadership style (low task-low relationship). The two perspectives of the leadership model are defined in a combination of four leadership states. The first stage, the directive leadership model, is based on guidance and supported by support (high task, low relationship). It applies to situations where the leader is influenced by low levels of readiness. It is also known as the "informational" style because the leader gives detailed instructions on the why, when, where, and how to do the work.

The second stage, the teaching leadership model, means high teaching and high support (high task, high relationship), providing both teaching and support to the person. Suitable for situations where the leader is influencing low to medium levels of readiness. Since the leader still gives orders and instructions, this style is also known as "salesmanship." The third stage, the supportive leadership model, is characterized by a predominantly supportive, low-directed approach (high relationship, low task). It is suitable for situations where the leader is influencing a moderate to high level of readiness. The fourth stage, the empowering leadership model, is low direction and low support (low task, low relationship). It applies to situations where the leader has a high level of readiness to influence. The leader delegates the responsibility for making decisions and carrying out work.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter covers the methods and procedures used to collect the data needed to carry out this study.

Research locale: This research was carried out at Qingdao University (QU), which is located in Qingdao City, Shandong Province. It is a key comprehensive university in Shandong Province, a university built in collaboration between Shandong Province and Qingdao City and a high-level university in the area's "first-class" construction university, with a national cultural quality education base for college students and a Chinese language education base.

Sample and sampling technique: Purposive sampling was in this study. Targeted selection of respondents based on their characteristics is called purposive sampling (Bernard, 2012). Here, researchers select the information they need to know and then search for individuals who are able and willing to provide information due to their professional knowledge or experience (Lewis and Sheppart, 2009). The researcher of this study chose 218 teachers as respondents of the study using the Qualtrics calculator with 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error.

Data gathering procedure: Following approval of the research project, the researcher submitted the researcher-modified instrument for review and validation to at least three experts. Their suggestions and criticisms were incorporated into the device that was given to teachers. At the same time, the researcher obtained permission from the School Administrators of the chosen locale. For the secure administration of the questionnaires, each respondent was sent a link to the Questionnaire Star. They had at least one week to complete the online survey. The researcher then downloaded the findings from the platform, tallied, and coded them to analyze them with the SPSS and interpret the specific questions asked in this publication

Statistical analysis*:* The following statistical tools were used in this study to process the data collected for its purpose:

Weighted average: It is a concept similar to a mean. Rather than each data point contributing equally to the final standard, specific data points add greater 'weight.' A weighted average is equal to the arithmetic mean of all equal weights.

Standard deviation: It is a measurement that depicts the average deviation between all of the values in a collection of values and the mean value of the corresponding data. The variable measure is most typically used when interval data is obtained. This requirement applies to all other statistical measures used in this study.

t-test: It is a parametric test that examines the variance between the means of two sets of values.

Analysis of variance: The significance of the variations in the perception and evaluation of research participants on the topic of this study when they are categorized according to their separate profiles.

Pearson's product moment of correlation: This test measures the strength of the association between two variables and the relationship between them. This tool identifies a significant correlation between instructional leadership and educational resourcing.

Results and analysis

This chapter delves into results and analysis of findings.

Table 1. Assessment of Instructional Leadership of Administrators in terms of Personal Qualities and Competence

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
1.Administrators are forward-thinking in terms of education.	2.90	1.05	T3	Agree/Often
2.Administrators are easy to approach regarding concerns and are usually empathetic.	2.90	1.13	T3	Agree/Often
3.Administrators have experience in the industry which they can apply to leading in the academe.	2.73	1.07	6	Agree/Often
4.Administrators have graduate degree in educational leadership, school management or other similar programs.	2.96	1.07	*1*	Agree/Often
5.Administrators are aware of the modern trends in education.	2.76	1.09	5	Agree/Often
6.Administrators exhibit understanding of their faculty members.	2.83	1.12	4	Agree/Often
7.Administrators recognize policies but can adjust when certain situations demand.	2.91	1.12	2	Agree/Often
Composite	**2.86**	**1.09**	**-**	**Agree/Often**

Scale: 4.00-3.51=Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51=Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51=Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00=Strongly Disagree/Never

The assessment of instructional leadership among administrators, focusing on personal qualities and competence, reveals insightful perspectives from respondents. This result underscores the perceived importance of administrators' educational backgrounds in effectively leading academic institutions. Following closely, administrators' ability to recognize and adjust policies based on situational demands earned the second-highest rank, with a mean score of 2.91. This finding highlights the significance of adaptability in educational leadership, showcasing administrators' capacity to navigate and respond to dynamic situations within the academic environment. Murphy (2018) posits that instructional leadership encompasses various facets, including personalized education advocacy, promotion of innovative teaching and learning, and holistic development of both teachers and students. Principals are tasked with nurturing students' comprehensive growth, focusing on character development, overall quality enhancement, and instilling a lifelong learning ethos. The statistical assessment of instructional leadership in terms of personal qualities and competence presents an optimistic scenario. Administrators' forward-thinking approach and approachability contribute to an environment conducive to open communication and innovation. The recognition of policies coupled with the ability to adapt underscores the dynamic nature of educational leadership, emphasizing administrators' proficiency in navigating established norms and emerging challenges, especially in efficiently managing resources.

Table 2. Assessment of Instructional Leadership of Administrators in terms ofTeaching Philosophy and Values

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
1. Innovative teaching techniques are allowed and even encouraged.	2.82	1.03	5	Agree/Often
2. Research works are given incentives.	2.83	1.13	4	Agree/Often
3. Lesson plans and/or syllabi are required in carrying out classes.	2.88	1.01	2	Agree/Often
4. Faculty are encouraged and given a chance for further development such as in faculty exchange programs, trainings, seminars and similar programs.	2.90	1.10	*1*	Agree/Often
5. Faculty teaching using traditional teaching methods only are pushed to learn new strategies.	2.75	1.11	7	Agree/Often
6. Faculty are regularly reviewed for chances of improvement.	2.84	1.05	3	Agree/Often
7. Faculty comments are recognized.	2.81	1.03	6	Agree/Often
Composite	**2.83**	**1.07**		**Agree/Often**

Scale:4.00-3.51 = Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51 = Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51 = Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00 = Strongly Disagree/Never

Table 3. Assessment of Instructional Leadership of Administrators in terms ofTeaching Skills and Experience

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
1. Administrators degree/s is/are in line with their position.	2.86	1.01	1	Agree/Often
2. Administrators have teaching load or have had teaching experience before assuming their position.	2.83	0.98	2	Agree/Often
3. Administrators have published research and extensive training in the field.	2.76	1.06	6	Agree/Often
4. Administrators have teaching experience for at least 10 years.	2.78	1.10	5	Agree/Often
5. Administrators are trained and are aware of the modern techniques in teaching.	2.80	1.01	4	Agree/Often
6. Administrators have at least five years of teaching experience.	2.81	1.08	T3	Agree/Often
7. Administrators have graduate or post-graduate degrees.	2.81	1.00	T3	Agree/Often
Composite	**2.81**	**1.03**		**Agree/Often**

Scale:4.00-3.51 = Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51 = Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51 = Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00 = Strongly Disagree/Never

Table 4. Assessment of Instructional Leadership of Administrators in terms of Teaching Resources and Conditions

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
1. Resources are given equally to all faculty members regardless of their disciplines.	2.85	1.06	T3	Agree/Often
2. Equipment used for classes are all up-to-date.	2.83	0.99	4	Agree/Often
3. Equipment are all functioning and do not have issues when used.	2.73	1.08	6	Agree/Often
4. Learning materials are made accessible to teachers.	2.92	1.12	2	Agree/Often
5. Attendance to seminars, colloquia and similar events are encouraged and supported.	2.95	1.07	1	Agree/Often
6. In-house training opportunities are made available for teachers.	2.81	1.01	5	Agree/Often
7. Facilities are available for use and are well-maintained.	2.85	1.12	T3	Agree/Often
Composite	**2.85**	**1.07**		**Agree/Often**

Scale:4.00-3.51 = Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51 = Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51 = Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00 = Strongly Disagree/Never

Table 5. Assessment of Instructional Leadership of Administrators

Variable	Composite			Rank
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	
Personal Qualities and Competence	2.86	1.09	Agree/Often	1
Teaching Philosophy and Values	2.83	1.07	Agree/Often	3
Teaching Skills and Experience	2.81	1.03	Agree/Often	4
Teaching Resources and Conditions	2.85	1.07	Agree/Often	2
Overall	**2.84**	**1.07**	**Agree/Often**	**--**

Scale:4.00-3.51 = Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51 = Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51 = Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00 = Strongly Disagree/Never

Table 6. Assessment of the Administrator's' Efficient Resource Management in terms of Educational Objectives

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
1. Educational objectives are holistic, involving all aspects of education.	2.72	1.04	7	Agree/Often
2. Prioritization according to the school needs is imposed in the school's strategic plan.	2.71	1.09	6	Agree/Often
3. Flagship programs of the school is given priority.	2.78	1.06	4	Agree/Often
4. Recognition from academic accrediting bodies and the Ministry of Education is given a lot of attention.	2.85	1.05	1	Agree/Often
5. Strategic plan is referred to the country's general plan of action in education.	2.81	1.07	2	Agree/Often
6. Education objectives consider learning needs of students.	2.74	1.10	5	Agree/Often
7. Education objectives maximize the capabilities of teachers.	2.79	1.08	3	Agree/Often
Composite	**2.77**	**1.07**	**-**	**Agree/Often**

Scale:4.00-3.51 = Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51 = Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51 = Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00 = Strongly Disagree/Never

Table 8. Assessment of the Administrator's' Efficient Resource Managementin terms of Curriculum Development

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
1. Curricula are updated with the latest version.	2.89	1.08	1	Agree/Often
2. Teaching methods mentioned in curricula are at par with the modern demands.	2.79	1.02	T3	Agree/Often
3. Lessons inside curricula are properly arranged according to their delivery.	2.75	1.06	5	Agree/Often
4. Each curriculum comes with relative and accessible resources.	2.69	1.01	6	Agree/Often
5. Curriculum employs doable tasks and resource requirements.	2.79	1.15	T3	Agree/Often
6. Curricula are consulted to experts for verification and optimization.	2.78	1.12	4	Agree/Often
7. The curriculum utilizes the current technology to adapt with modern time.	2.87	1.04	2	Agree/Often
Composite	**2.79**	**1.07**		**Agree/Often**

Scale:4.00-3.51 = Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51 = Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51 = Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00 = Strongly Disagree/Never

Table 9. Assessment of the Administrators' Efficient Resource Management

Variable	Composite			Rank
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	
Educational Objectives	2.77	1.07	Agree/Often	2.5
Teaching and Learning Needs and Resources	2.77	1.07	Agree/Often	2.5
Curriculum Development	2.79	1.07	Agree/Often	1
Overall	**2.78**	**1.07**	**Agree/Often**	**--**

Scale:4.00-3.51 = Strongly Agree/Always; 3.50-2.51 = Agree/Often; 2.50-1.51 = Disagree/Sometimes; 1.50-1.00 = Strongly Disagree/Never

This interpretation highlights the intricate dimensions of instructional leadership, underscoring the pivotal role of administrators' personal attributes and competence in cultivating a responsive and effective educational environment. The assessment of instructional leadership among administrators in terms of teaching philosophy and values reveals several key insights. Administrators prioritize faculty development, with the highest mean (2.90) assigned to the indicator indicating encouragement and opportunities for further professional growth, including faculty exchange programs and training initiatives. This emphasis on continuous development aligns with contemporary educational principles that recognize the importance of ongoing learning for educators. Sergiovanni (1986) and (Handy, 1993) mentioned that values and traditions play a significant part in school culture and are the components that enhance each school's language, meanings, historical figures, and current activities. In the realm of efficient resource management, the assessment of instructional leadership among administrators indicates commendable efforts to create a dynamic and research-oriented academic environment. The prioritization of faculty development, recognition of research endeavors, and systematic reviews for improvement demonstrate a commitment to contemporary educational standards and efficient utilization of institutional resources. By fostering a culture of continuous improvement and scholarly engagement, administrators contribute to an environment that maximizes available resources. However, the recognition of the need to support faculty employing traditional teaching methods in embracing innovative strategies suggests an opportunity for further optimizing resource allocation. In terms of teaching skills and experience, the assessment of instructional leadership of administrators yielded a composite mean score of 2.81 with a 1.03 corresponding standard deviation. This means that teaching skills and experience of the administrators were often manifested as agreed by the respondents. The assessment of instructional leadership among administrators, focusing on teaching skills and experience, paints a portrait of commitment to educational qualifications and practical teaching expertise.

School administrators' supervisory traits, attitudes, and attributes grow through time and, as Ylimaki and Jacobson (2011) discovered, originate from society via the interplay of administrators' life knowledge and experience with their current position. In addition, they are more often developed through a combination through hands-on experience instruction, traditional and informal professional learning, mentorship or sponsorship from key persons, along with certain happenstance in the paths to management and being administrators. The emphasis on educational leaders having graduate or post-graduate degrees, substantial teaching experience, and awareness of modern teaching techniques reflects a strategic investment in human resources. This approach ensures that administrators possess the requisite knowledge and skills to effectively guide the academic community. However, there is room for improvement in optimizing research contributions and continuous training opportunities, which can be pivotal in enhancing administrators' efficacy and institutional development. In terms of teaching resources and conditions, the assessment of instructional leadership of administrators yielded a composite mean score of 2.85 with a 1.07 corresponding standard deviation.

This means that teaching resources and conditions of the administrators were often manifested as agreed by the respondents. The assessment of instructional leadership pertaining to teaching resources and conditions provides valuable insights into the administrators' commitment to creating an optimal learning environment. While the overall assessment is positive, the slightly lower mean for addressing equipment functionality (Mean = 2.73) suggests a potential area for improvement. Hallinger and Heck (2011) found that certain schools benefit from instructional practices while others struggle, and that administrators' methods of instructional leadership are associated to school progress in tests. According to Hallinger *et al*. (2016), instructional leadership may increase the management of instructional programs, the backing and oversight of employee growth from the right administrators, and a positive work environment.

Efficient resource management is a pivotal component of instructional leadership for principals, ensuring equitable distribution and effective utilization of resources to support teaching and learning. The assessment reveals positive perceptions among faculty members regarding resource management practices. Notably, there is a strong consensus that resources are allocated fairly across disciplines, emphasizing a commitment to equality. The encouragement and support for faculty attendance at seminars and similar events highlight a dedication to ongoing professional development, reinforcing the importance of staying abreast of current educational trends.

The positive perceptions among faculty members suggest that principals are successfully implementing resource allocation strategies to create a supportive and well-equipped learning environment. This reflects a commitment to fostering ongoing professional development and maintaining facilities for optimal educational experiences. Continued efforts to monitor and enhance resource management, particularly in areas identified for improvement, can further contribute to the overall efficiency of instructional leadership. The top-ranking indicator, with a mean score of 2.85, underscores administrators' heightened attention to gaining recognition from academic accrediting bodies and the Ministry of Education. This focus suggests a strategic emphasis on aligning the school with external standards and regulations, ensuring its status within the broader educational landscape. Following closely, the second-highest mean score of 2.81 reflects administrators' commitment to anchoring the school's strategic plan within the context of the country's general plan of action in education. This alignment signifies a dedication to national educational priorities and a synchronized approach to contribute to broader educational objectives. School success components such as teacher professional ability, policy and resource support, and student qualities are recognized as requiring strong leadership support from administrators (Jiang, Chen, and Lu, 2010).

However, there are differences in the opinions of teachers and principals, with teachers voicing worries regarding principals' attention to school curriculum implementation and classroom learning activities and resources (Ma, Wang, and Xie, 2008; Pang, 2001). Reflecting this is the commitment to anchoring the school's strategic plan within the national context demonstrates a collaborative mindset, seeking harmony with the country's general plan of action in education. This alignment not only enhances the school's integration into the broader educational landscape but also signals an understanding of the interconnectedness of local and national educational objectives. The emphasis on maximizing teachers' capabilities further accentuates the significance of human resources in achieving educational goals, suggesting that effective resource management involves investing in the professional development and support of teachers. The highest-ranked indicator, with a mean score of 2.94, highlights the emphasis on providing and updating equipment for more efficient and timely utilization. This underscores a commitment to ensuring that teaching resources, particularly technological and equipment-based, are continually optimized to support effective instruction. The second-ranked indicator, with a mean score of 2.81, emphasizes that resource management features regular maintenance and updating.

This focus on routine maintenance aligns with a proactive approach to sustaining the quality and functionality of existing resources, contributing to a stable and reliable educational infrastructure. Efficient resource management is crucial for sustaining a conducive learning environment, and the assessment of instructional leadership among administrators provides insights into areas that warrant attention and strategic improvement. The findings indicate positive perceptions regarding resource management, particularly in prioritizing the provision and updating of equipment for teaching. This reflects a commitment to leveraging technology and modern tools to enhance the teaching and learning experience. Moreover, the emphasis on regular maintenance aligns with a proactive approach to sustain existing resources effectively. However, the assessment also highlights areas for consideration. The lower mean score for the indicator related to facilities—well-maintained and constantly provided, updated, and upgraded—suggests a potential area for improvement. Ensuring timely and comprehensive updates to facilities can contribute to a more holistic and modern educational infrastructure. In terms of implications, administrators may benefit from strategically focusing on facility improvements and upgrades, aligning these efforts with the dynamic needs of the educational landscape.

The efficient management and development of curricula play a fundamental role in shaping the educational experience, and the assessment of instructional leadership among administrators sheds light on various aspects of curriculum management. Topping the ranking is the indicator emphasizing the importance of updated curricula, with a high mean score of 2.89. This suggests a proactive approach to keeping educational content current and relevant. The second-highest mean score is assigned to the indicator related to the utilization of current technology in curricula, emphasizing an awareness and integration of modern tools to enhance teaching methods and adapt to contemporary educational needs. As claimed by Shatzer *et al*. 2014, while the curriculum is effective in generating appearance satisfaction and encouraging students without producing stress, as well as instilling technical skills, there are opportunities for improvement such as promoting confidence and encouraging altruistic drives should be improved. The curriculum helps students' mental and emotional health by increasing well-being, confidence, and motivation, implying that improvements in specific areas might increase its advantages. The emphasis on utilizing current technology within curricula further underscores a commitment to adapting to modern educational methodologies. This implies a recognition of the transformative impact technology can have on teaching and learning experiences. However, the lower mean scores in certain indicators, such as the arrangement of lessons and consultation with experts, suggest areas for improvement. Principals and administrators might consider investing additional efforts in optimizing the organization and structure of lessons to facilitate effective delivery. The comprehensive assessment of administrators' efficient resource management, as perceived by respondents, reveals a generally positive outlook with an overall mean score of 2.78 and a standard deviation of 1.07. This mean score, falling within the "Agree/Often" interpretation, indicates a collective agreement among participants on the efficiency of resource management practices employed by administrators.

The top-ranking variable in this evaluation is Curriculum Development, showcasing a commitment to staying current and dynamic in educational content. The shared second rank between Educational Objectives and Teaching and Learning Needs and Resources suggests a parallel emphasis on these interconnected aspects of educational leadership. The assessment of administrators' efficient resource management reveals a collective acknowledgment of effective practices within educational institutions. The emphasis on Curriculum Development as the top-ranked variable underscores the pivotal role of dynamic and contemporary curricula in shaping educational practices. This indicates a need for institutions to prioritize ongoing updates to curricular content, aligning it with modern teaching methods and technological advancements.

REFERENCES

Alig-Mielcarek, J. M. (2003). A model of school success: Instructional leadership, academic press, and student achievement (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).

Babinski, L. M., Amendum, S. J., Knotek, S. E., Sánchez, M., & Malone, P. (2018). Improving young English learners' language and literacy skills through teacher professional development: A randomized controlled trial. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(1), 117–143.

Baker, B. D., & Cooper, B. S. (2005). Do principals with stronger academic backgrounds hire better teachers? Policy implications for improving high-poverty schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 41(3), 449–479. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X04269609.

Bao Shuimei, Chang Qiaoli. (2017), From government strategy to university action: Hong Kong's experience and enlightenment in building world-class disciplines [J]. *Higher Engineering Education Research*, (03): 95–99.

Bao Shuimei. (2020). Comprehensive Revitalization of Higher Education in the West: Dilemmas, Roots, and Breakthroughs [J]. *Chinese Higher Education Research*, (12): 41–47.

Basma, B., & Savage, R. (2018). Teacher professional development and student literacy growth: A systematic review and Meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30, 457–481.

Bellibaş, M. Ş., Polatcan, M., &Kılınç, A. Ç. (2020). Linking instructional leadership to teacher practices: The mediating effect of shared practice and agency in learning effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(6), 812–831.

Blase, J. J. and Blase, J. R. (1999) Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35 (3), 349–378.

Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(4), 34–64.

Botha, R. J. (2004). Excellence in leadership: Demands on the professional school principal. *South African Journal of Education*, 24(3), 239–243.

Bush, T. (2020). Instructional leadership in centralized contexts: Constrained by limited powers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 593–594.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(6), 553–571.

Cai Wenbo, Huang Jinsheng. (2019). The impact and heterogeneity of human capital agglomeration on regional high-quality development [J]]. *Heilongjiang Higher Education Research*, (08):79–84.

Chen Yuanxiu.(2021). Investigation and analysis of primary and secondary schools in areas – Take Butuo County as an example. Sichuan Normal University.

Chen, J., & Guo, W. (2020). Emotional intelligence can make a difference: The impact of principals' emotional intelligence on teaching strategy mediated by instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 82–105.

Chen, S. Y. (2010). The correlativity analysis of principal's curriculum leadership and the effectiveness of the promotion of teaching. Master's Thesis, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China.

Deng Guoqing. (2010). Analysis of factors affecting the fair allocation of physical education resources, *Reading and Writing Magazine*, Vol7 No.9,51–52.

Doğan, S., &Yurtseven, N. (2018). Professional learning as a predictor for instructional quality: A secondary analysis of TALIS. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 29, 64–90.

Dou, D., Devos, G., & Valcke, M. (2016). The relationships between school autonomy gap, principal leadership, teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(6), 959–977.

Fang Yu Fei.(2016). Research on Leadership Education for American College Students [M]. Shanghai People's Publishing House.

Feng, D. M. and Xu, J. F. (2005). Tendencies and responsive strategies for the construction of key teaching force in China. *Instruction and Management*, 10, 17–19.

Feng, D.M. *et al*. (2002). The development of China's reform in educational administration: 1985–2000.

Fernandez, K., Flores, S., Huang, E., Igwe, C., Mcdonald, L., Stroud, R. & Taylor, D. L. (2007). Principal performance in Texas: Tools for measuring effective school leadership. *College Station*, TX: Texas A&M University.

Gao Xiaoqing.(2019). Research on the policy tracking of China's education modernization 2035[M]. Changsha: Central South University Press.

Gao Yinghui, Wang Bin, Shi Hongtao, (2022).Promoting the reform of physical education teaching through improving teacher's teaching leadership. Chinese Journal of Education S1, Basic Education Reform and Development, 158–160.

Ghavifeekr, S., Radwan, O., & Velarde, J. M. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership roles and practices. *Malaysian Journal of Education* (0126 –6020), 44(2).

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. *Educational Research*, 42(9), 433–444.

Gu, Jing.(2020). Review of Women's Leadership Research[J].*Cooperative Economy and Technology*, (15):134-136.

Guo, J.Y.(2006). Quality characteristics and functions of backbone teachers in primary and secondary schools. *Modern Primary and Secondary Education*, 8, 71–73.

Gurr, D. (2015). A model of successful school leadership from the international successful school principalship project. Graduate School of Education, The University of Melbourne, 100 Leicester Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia.

Hafsat Aliyu Bada, TengkuFaekahTengkuAriffin, HasnizaNordin. (2020). Teachers' perception of principals' instructional leadership practices in Nigeria," *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 8, No. 10, pp. 4459–4469. doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.081013.

Hallinger, P. and Murphy J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal* 86(2): 217–247.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: lessons from 40 years of empirical research.*Journal of Educational Administration* 49 (2), 125–142.

———. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 47(2), 271–306. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

———. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* 46(1), 5–24.

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

Hallinger, P., & Mc Cary, C.E. (1990). Developing the strategic thinking of instructional leaders. *The Elementary School Journal*, 91 (2), 89–105.

Hallinger, P., Gümüş, S., &Belliba, M. S. (2020). "Are principals instructional leaders yet?": A science map of the knowledge base on instructional leadership, 1940–2018. *Scientometrics*, 122(3), 1629–1650.

Hallinger, Philip & Wang, Wen-Chung & Chen, Chia-Wen & Li, Dongyu (Dora). (2015). Assessing Instructional Leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. 10.1007/978-3-319-15533-3.

Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. R. (2011). Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95, 798–812.

Hill, H. C. (2009). Fixing teacher professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(6), 470–477.

Horng, E., & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi DeltaKappan*, 92(3), 66–69.

Hou, Y., Cui, Y., & Zhang, D. (2019). Impact of instructional leadership on high school student academic achievement in China. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20(4), 543–558.

Huang Liang, Zhao Decheng .(2017).The impact of principal leadership on student academic achievement—the moderating effect of teacher investment in teaching and school autonomy.*Educational Science*, 33 (3): 35-41

Huang, B. L. (2016). Practice and Reflection on the practice of workshop-based training for backbone teacher of primary and secondary schools. *Fujian Basic Education Studies*, 12, 34–36.

Issa, Y. A. (2012). Instructional factors influencing head teachers' instructional supervision practices in secondary schools in Mandera East District. Unpublished Project: University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.

Jacob, B. A., &Lefgren, L. (2004). The impact of teacher training on student achievement: Quasi-experimental evidence from school reform efforts in Chicago. *Journal of Human Resources*, 39(1), 50–79.

Jacob, R., Hill, H., & Corey, D. (2017). The impact of a professional development program on teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching, instruction, and student achievement. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 10(3), 379–407.

Johnson, B. (2010). Teacher collaboration: good for some, not so good for others. *Educational Studies*, 29(4), 337–350.

Kang Ning. (2019). China's higher education resources in the 40 years of reform and opening up allocation transformation and its development trend. *Higher Education Research*, (04):1–13.

Kaster, G. (2011). Principals' instructional leadership practices: teachers' perspectives DEd. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

Ke, Z., Yin, H. B., & Huang, S. H. (2019). Teacher participation in school-based professional development in China: does it matter for teacher efficacy and teaching strategies? Teaching and teacher education.*An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 25, 821–836.

Kieleko, D. M. (2015). Factors influencing principals' instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta sub-country, Kitui country, Kenya. Master's Thesis. University of Nairobi, 2015.

Kruger, M. L. (2008). School Leadership, sex and gender: welcome to difference. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(2), 155–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120701576266

Leithwood K. (2019) Characteristics of effective leadership networks: A replication and extension. *School Leadership & Management* 39(2): 175–197.

Leithwood, K., &Jantizi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research, 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177-199. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244769

Leithwood, K., &Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 529-561.

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

Leithwood, K., Patten, S., &Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 671–706.

Li Hui. (2022).Development and Application of Physical Education Resources in Universities, *Industrial Technology and Vocational Education*, Vol 20, No. 6: 119–124.

Li L., Hallinger P, Walker A (2016) Exploring the mediating effects of trust on principal leadership and teacher professional learning in Hong Kong primary schools. Educational Management Administration & Leadership 44(1): 20–42.

Li Yingxuan.(2021).Study on the mechanism and influencing factors of educational investment. Jilin University.

Li, C. M. (2000). Chuan-Bang-Dai: An effective way of training for young backbone teachers. *The Teaching of Thought and Political Study*, 10, 57–58.

Li, J. and Li, Z. (2003). On the training mode of school-based management. *Continuing Education,* 7, 60–61.

Li, W. H. (2005). Attempting to creatively initiate and to firmly promote the reform of accreditation of the professional titles of primary and secondary school teachers. *People's Education,* 21, 2–5.

Li, X. G. and Shi, X. P. (2002). Reform and development of teacher preparation pattern in China. *Journal of Guangzhou University* (Natural Science Edition), 1(5), 80–84.

Liang Lichan. Ma Haiyan. Zhang Xinyu. (2021).Analysis of the ten year changes and influencing factors of the cooperation between primary and secondary schools in China. *China Education News*.

Lin Guangchang, Zhao Yanli, (2023). The internal mechanism and action path of effective allocation of vocational education resources during the 14th five year plan period, *Journal of Jiujiang Vocational and Technical College*, 5–10

Liu Haimin.(2013), Introduction to the Principles of Modern Pedagogy [M]. Higher Education Press

Liu Hu, Yu Yue,JiangWansheng.(2020). Blockchain technology, differences in educational resources and high-quality economic development—based on an empirical analysis of the allocation of higher education resources in China. *Journal of Shaanxi Normal University* (Philosophy and Social Sciences), (01): 145–158.

Liu, J. P. and Liu, X. F. (2006). The implementation strategy for the democratic reviewing of school leaders by the staff congress. *Instruction and Management*, 1, 14–16.

Liu, S., &Hallinger, P. (2018). Principal instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher professional learning in China: Testing a mediated-effects model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(4), 501–528.

Liu, Y. X. (1999). Implementing the principal-term accountability by objectives and developing a new mechanism for promoting quality-oriented education. *Heilongjiang Education*, 2, 33–35.

Luan Siliang.(2022).Research on scenario-driven emergency resources allocation and distribution of the Freeway Network. Jilin University

Makgato, M. (2012). Identifying constructivist methodologies and pedagogic content knowledge in the teaching and learning of technology. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1398–1402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.832.

Marks, H. M., &Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370–397.

Msila, V. (2013). Instructional leadership: empowering teachers through critical reflection and journal writing. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 35(2), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2013.11893149

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In R. Lotto, & P. Thurston (Eds.), Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school (Vol. 1, Part b, pp. 163–200). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Musungu, L. &Nasongo, J. (2008). The head teacher's instructional role in academic attainment in secondary schools in Vihiga County. *Educational Research and Review*, Vol 3(10), 316–323.

Muyunda, G. (2022). Impact of Principal Instructional Leadership Practices on Students' Academic Performance in Zambia. Instructional Leadership Practices. Faculty of Education, Southwest University, PR. China: 24–36.

National People's Congress. (1995). Education law of People's Republic of China. http://english.gov.cn/archive/laws_regulations/.

Ozdemir, M. (2019). Principal leadership and students' achievement: Mediated pathways of professional community and teachers' instructional practices. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 16(1), 81–104. http://eng.kedi.re.kr

———. (2020). How to improve teachers' instructional practices: The role of professional learning activities, classroom observation and leadership content knowledge in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(5), 585–603.

Pan, H., Nyeu, F. Y., & Chen, J. S. (2015). Principal instructional leadership in Taiwan: Lessons from two decades of research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(4), 492–511.

Park, J. H., Lee, I. H., &Cooc, N. (2019). The role of school-level mechanisms: How principal support, professional learning communities, collective responsibility, and group-level teacher expectations affect student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(5), 742–780.

Peng Weibin, Cao Wenjian. (2020). The impact and heterogeneity of human capital agglomeration on regional high-quality development. *Quest*, (5): 180–189.

Qian H, Walker A, Yang X. (2017). Building and leading a learning culture among teachers: a case study of a Shanghai primary school. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 45(1): 101–122.

Qiao, X., Yu, S., & Zhang, L. (2018). A review of research on professional learning communities in mainland China (2006–2015): Key findings and emerging themes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(5), 713–728.

Qin, E. (2007). Focusing on process, paying attention to detail, and enhancing effectiveness: implementation and reflection on the principal training by serving temporary position. The In-service Education and Training of School Teachers, 6, 27–29.

Qu, T.H. and Cui, H.J. (2014). The evolution and characteristics of teacher education policy in China: an analysis. *Journal of Academy of Education Administration*, 12, 56-62.

Rashdi, N., & Khamis, M. K. (2017). Instructional Leadership perspective of private school's mission definition.

Research and Innovation for Student Learning. (2018). Principals as Instructional Leaders A Review of the Literature Research Unit.

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.

Scribner, S. M. P., Crow, G. M., López, G. R., &Murtadha, K. (2011). "Successful" principals: A contested notion for superintendents and principals. *Journal of School Leadership*, 21(3), 390–421.

Sebastian, J., Huang, H., &Allensworth, E. (2017). Examining integrated leadership systems in high schools: Connecting principal and teacher leadership to organizational processes and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 28, 463–488.

Sharma, S. (2012). Instructional leadership model through Asian principals' perspectives. In International conference

on education and management innovation.*İPEDR* (Vol. 30).

Shen, J. H. and Yin, B. Y. (2016). Backbone teacher training from the perspective of professional development needs. *Teacher's Journal*, 1, 75–80.

Shin, S. H., Slater, C. L., &Backhoff, E. (2013). Principal perceptions and student achievement in reading in Korea, Mexico, and the United States educational leadership, school autonomy, and use of test results. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(3), 489–527.

Şişman, M. (2016). Factors related to instructional leadership perception and effect of instructional leadership on organizational variables: A meta-analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 16, 1761–1787. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2016.5.0172

Siu, W (2008). Complexity theory and school reform. *NASSP Bulletin* 92(2): 154–164.

Sultan, S., Karuppannan, G. &Rumpod, J. (2022). instructional leadership practices among headmasters and the correlation with primary schools' achievement in Sabah, Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 15, No. 2; 2022.

Sun Jie. (2021), Three-dimensional model design of teacher leadership: construct formation, connotation characteristics and model construction. *Journal of Education.*

Sun, X. T. and Yang, C. D.(1999). Reflections on China's normal education model for the 21st century. *Journal of Linyi Teacher's College*, 21(5), 60–61.

Toprakçı, E., Beytekin, O. F., &Chipala, H. C. (2016). A Case Study of Instructional Leadership in Malawian Secondary Schools. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 17(3), 169–176. https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.17314606.

Wang, F. J. (2017). A study on current situation and deepening strategies for the reform of principal rank system. *Shandong Human Resources and Social Security*, 10, 34–36.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationships to self-efficacy and implementation of new teaching strategies. *Elementary School Journal*, 110(2), 228–245.

Vanblaere, B., & Devos, G. (2016). Relating school leadership to perceived professional learning community characteristics: A multilevel analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 57, 26–38.

Wang Pengcheng, Gong Xin. (2020).The impact of family cultural capital on preschool educational opportunities—an empirical study based on CFPS Data.*Preschool Education Research*, (12): 43–54.

Wang Xiaodong, Sun Hechuan. (2011). on An Empirical Study on the Elements of Principal Leadership in my country.*Meitan Higher Education*, Vol. 29 No. 1, 35-38

Wang Xueqing.(2020).Research on the school running Characteristics of American "Five sisters" Women's College. Guangxi Normal University.

Wang, F. and Cai, Y. H.(2005). Review and reflection on superfine teacher system and superfine teacher research in China. *Teacher Education Research*, 17(6), 41–46.

Wang, F. Q. and Yang, Y. (2016). Reviewing on the reform of the management system of primary and secondary school principals in China in the past 30 years. Educational Science Research, 4,27–32.

Wang, L. (2004). Carrying out the principal-term-accountability in Anhui province. *Xinhua Daily Telegraph*. 4.

Wang, X. Q. and Shen, L. N. (2017). An interpretation of the teacher qualification examination from the perspective of educational policy. *Journal of Hebei Normal University* (Educational Science Edition), 19(3), 94–99.

Weber, G. (1971). Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, D.C. Council for Basic Education.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., &Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 398–425.

Wong, J. L. N. (2012). How has recent curriculum reform in China influenced school-based teacher learning? An ethnographic study of two subject departments in Shanghai, China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40, 347–361.

Wong, J. L. N., &Tsui, A. (2007). How do teachers view the effects of school-based in-service learning activities? A case study in China. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 33, 457–470.

Wu GL, Bai XJ, Shen DL (2003) The study of influential factors of the high school teachers' teaching efficacy. *Journal of Tianjin Normal University* 4(4): 16–20.

Wu Yanhong.(2022).Research on the Formation and Development of Teaching Leadership of Middle School Principals—Taking Principal A as an Example, Hunan Institute of Science and Technology.

Xi Jieren. (2007), 20 years of Chinese leadership research. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.

Xia, Z. C., Yang, F., & Xu, Q. Y. (2018). Principals' teaching leadership and analysis of its affecting mechanism: Research of the correlation between principals' teaching leadership and the school's teaching quality. *Journal of Soochow University Education Science Edition*, 6, 112–120.

Xiarong, M & Marion, R. (2021). Exploring how instructional leadership affects teacher efficacy: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49: 1; 188–207. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219888742

Xie Chen.(2021).Research on Influencing Factors and Improvement of Female Leadership in Colleges and Universities. China University of Mining and Technology.

Yao Wenjia and Li Jianhua. (2023).Justice in the distribution of educational resources—based on the perspective of Rawls. Modern University Education: 13–18

Yu GL, Xin T, Shen JL (1995) Teacher's Sense of Teaching Efficacy: it's structure and influencing factors. *Acta PsychologicaSinica* 27(2): 159–166. In Chinese.

Yu Wen'an. (2022). Principal's Multiple Role Model and Its Ability Improvement [J], Chinese Journal of Education □

Yuan Dan. (2020). Individual research on teacher teaching based on school culture [M]. Chongqing: Southwest Normal University Press.

Zhang Peng.(2022).Research on the teaching leadership andits influencing factors of primary school physical education teachers in Guangzhou, Guangzhou Sport University.

Zhang Tingkai, NiuRuixue.(2021).From elements to standards—research on effective teaching a centennial overview.*Education History Research*, 3(04):164–172

Zhang, J. L. (2010, Feb., 02). The full implementation of principal-term-accountability in Fengtai District this year. Beijing Daily, 8.

Zhang, M. S. (1996). A study on the experience of honorary principals in Shanghai. Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House.

Zhang, M., & Kong, L. (2012). An exploration of reasons for Shanghai's success in the OECD Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 7(1), 124–162.

Zhang, P., & Hu, Y. (2019). The impact of principal's leadership on teacher collaboration in primary and secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Science Hunan Normal University*, 5, 15–24.

Zhang, T., Huang, Y. T., & Huang, L. (2020). Effects of school organizational conditions on teacher professional learning in China: The mediating role of teacher self-efficacy. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 66, 100893.

Zhang, X. X. (1998). The characteristics of contemporary primary and secondary school principals. Journal of Yunnan Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences), 2, 40-47.

Zhao Qian. (2018), Research on Principal's Teaching Leadership. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press

Zhou, B.(2012). Policy for teacher rank system: evolution, alienation and optimization. *Teacher Education Research*, 24(2), 1–5.

Zucker, L.G. (1986) The production of trust institutional sources of economic structure, 1840-1920. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 8: 53–111.

****