British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies,7(2),11-20, 2026

Education, Learning, Training & Development

Print ISSN: 2517-276X

Online ISSN: 2517-2778

https://bjmas.org/index.php/bjmas/index

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development -UK

Effective Leadership Strategies in Educational Institutions: Enhancing Performance and Innovation

Jummai Ali Kazaure

Jigawa State College of Education and Legal Studies, Ringim, Nigeria

doi: https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.0526 Published March 17, 2026

Citation: Kazaure J.A. (2026) Effective Leadership Strategies in Educational Institutions: Enhancing Performance and Innovation, *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*,7(2),11-20

Abstract: *Educational institutions increasingly operate in rapidly evolving landscapes shaped by digital transformation, accountability pressures, and demands for pedagogical innovation. Effective leadership is critical not only for sustaining institutional performance (e.g., teacher effectiveness, student achievement) but also for fostering innovation (e.g., novel pedagogies, organizational change). This paper presents a systematic literature review of empirical and theoretical studies (2015–2025) to identify leadership strategies that contribute to both performance and innovation in educational settings. We synthesize evidence on instructional, transformational, distributed, and technology-enabled leadership, examine underlying mechanisms and contextual moderators, and highlight research gaps. Findings suggest that integrated leadership models combining instructional focus, shared decision-making, trust, and digital capacity are most effective. We conclude with recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.*

Keywords: educational leadership, institutional performance, innovation in education, distributed leadership

INTRODUCTION

Educational leaders today face unprecedented challenges. Globalization, rapid technological advancement, and evolving accountability regimes demand not only high performance in core academic domains but also ongoing innovation. While performance remains measured in traditional ways (e.g., student achievement, teacher effectiveness), innovation increasingly takes center stage: schools must adopt new pedagogies, integrate digital tools, and rethink their organizational structures.

Leadership for Learning (LfL) argues that leaders should couple instructional engagement with vision-setting and capacity building, embedding leadership directly into teaching and learning processes (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Rather than simply supervising teachers or managing logistics, LfL posits that leaders should facilitate professional learning communities, shape shared goals, and empower teachers to lead pedagogical change. Empirical studies support this perspective, showing that different leadership approaches such as instructional, transformational, or distributed leadership are associated with both performance outcomes and innovation (Hallinger, 2011; Spillane, 2006).

Nevertheless, many educational institutions struggle to balance these demands. In some contexts, leaders emphasize performance (e.g., test scores) at the expense of risk-taking; in others, innovation is encouraged but without structural supports for quality instruction. This tension is particularly acute in resource-constrained settings, where capacity, infrastructure, and trust may be limited. To build more effective leadership policy and practice, it is essential to understand (1) which leadership strategies support both performance and innovation; (2) how these strategies work (mechanisms); and (3) how context influences their effectiveness.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the recognition of leadership as a linchpin for school improvement, many institutions fail to translate leadership intent into sustained improvement in both performance and innovation. Much of the literature treats leadership styles in isolation, focusing on either academic outcomes (performance) or organizational change (innovation), but rarely both in combination. Furthermore, the empirical base is fragmented across contexts, with varying methodological quality, making it difficult to draw generalizable conclusions. This fragmentation limits the design of coherent evidence-based leadership interventions that can address the twin goals of performance and innovation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to systematically review the empirical and conceptual literature (2015–2025) to identify leadership strategies that are demonstrably linked to both institutional performance and innovation in educational settings. By synthesizing mechanisms, contextual moderators, and effectiveness, the review aims to provide actionable guidance for educational leaders, policymakers, and scholars.

Research Questions

- Which leadership strategies are most strongly associated with improved institutional performance?
- Which leadership strategies most effectively foster innovation?
- What mechanisms (mediating factors) and contextual moderators influence the relationship between leadership strategies and outcomes?

- What are the key gaps in the literature, and where should future research focus?

Significance of the Study
This review contributes to educational leadership theory and practice by integrating recent evidence across multiple leadership paradigms. It supports leadership development programs and policy design by clarifying how to align leadership interventions with dual objectives of performance and innovation. Finally, it offers a research roadmap for scholars interested in sustainable and context-sensitive educational leadership.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Foundations

Leadership Strategies
We define leadership strategies as intentional behaviours, actions, and structures employed by formal or informal leaders in educational institutions to influence goals, practices, and culture. These include instructional, transformational, distributed, and digital leadership styles.

Performance
Performance refers to institutional outcomes such as student achievement, teacher effectiveness, classroom quality, retention rates, and operational efficiency.

Innovation
Innovation encompasses the adoption or development of novel pedagogies, curricula, assessment methods, organizational processes, or digital practices that fundamentally alter teaching and learning or institutional functioning.

Theoretical Frameworks

Leadership for Learning (LfL)
The Leadership for learning framework posits that leadership is deeply interconnected with learning: effective leaders engage with curriculum, support teacher learning, and foster shared vision (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). LfL suggests that leadership should be distributed, instructional, and transformative, integrating multiple roles to advance both performance and innovation.

Transformational Leadership
Rooted in Bass's theory of transformational leadership, this framework emphasizes inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In educational settings, transformational leaders articulate a compelling vision,

stimulate innovation, and build trust, enabling teachers to explore new pedagogies and adapt to change.

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership theorizes that leadership is a socially constructed activity spread across multiple actors (e.g., teachers, middle managers) rather than concentrated in a single individual (Spillane, 2006). This perspective focuses on how leadership tasks are shared, how expertise is leveraged, and how collective capacity is built.

Digital / Technology-Enabled Leadership

Digital leadership (also referred to as e-leadership or technology leadership) involves the strategic use of technology and data systems to support organizational improvement and innovation (Karaköse & Tülübaş, 2023). Leaders with digital competence guide the adoption of technology, build digital capacity, and foster a culture that embraces data-informed and technology-enhanced practices.

Empirical Evidence on Leadership and Outcomes

Instructional Leadership and Performance

Instructional leadership remains a cornerstone of effective school leadership. School leaders who prioritize teaching and learning including classroom observation, feedback, curricular coherence, and teacher professional development consistently contribute to improved student outcomes (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Although the direct effect of principals on student achievement is often modest, mediated models (through teacher quality) show stronger and more consistent associations (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; 1998).

Transformational Leadership and Innovation

Transformational leadership has been positively associated with innovation in educational settings. A recent systematic review in Ecuador demonstrated that practices such as inspirational motivation and idealized influence are strongly linked with the adoption of new pedagogical approaches and educational technologies (Román-Cortéz, Calderón Cisneros, & Trejo, 2025). Transformational leaders encourage intellectual risk-taking and build climates of trust, thereby enabling teachers to experiment and innovate.

Distributed Leadership and Teacher Innovativeness

Distributed leadership has been empirically shown to foster teacher innovativeness. In a large-scale study using TALIS 2018 data (132,376 teachers), Lin (2022) found that distributed leadership had positive direct effects on teacher autonomy, professional collaboration, and innovativeness. Importantly, teacher autonomy and collaboration mediated the relationship between distributed leadership and innovation, indicating that shared leadership creates the space for innovation to emerge (Lin, 2022).

Digital Leadership and Organizational Innovation

Digital leadership is gaining traction as a key enabler of sustainable innovation in schools. Karaköse and Tülübaş (2023) articulate how digital leadership integrates technological resources with pedagogical and organizational change to support long-term school improvement. Empirical studies echo this: Raptis, Psyrras, and Konstantinidi (2025) found that in the post-COVID era, schools that adopt distributed leadership in conjunction with digital strategies report stronger teacher digital competence and collaborative practices (Raptis, Psyrras, Konstantinidi, & Koutsourai, 2025).

In higher education, trust-based digital leadership has also been shown to catalyze innovation: university leaders who created flat hierarchies, distributed decision-making, and "safe spaces" for experimentation with educational technology enabled staff to develop novel EdTech-enabled pedagogies (Okunlola, 2024; trust-based innovation reported by university leaders in European universities) (Leading with Trust, 2024; see also Okunlola, 2024).

Mechanisms Linking Leadership to Performance and Innovation

Mediating Mechanisms

- **Teacher Autonomy and Collaboration**: Distributed leadership enhances teacher autonomy and collaboration, which in turn drive innovativeness (Lin, 2022).
- **Organizational Trust**: Digital leadership that empowers staff through trust fosters experimentation and innovation (Leading with Trust, 2024).
- **Professional Learning Cultures**: Transformational leaders promote intellectual stimulation and shared vision, which encourage continuous learning and creative problem-solving (Román-Cortéz et al., 2025).

Moderating / Contextual Factors

- **Digital Competence and Infrastructure**: The effectiveness of digital leadership depends significantly on leaders' and teachers' digital literacy, as well as the availability of technological infrastructure (Jaldemark et al., 2021).
- **Leaders' Perceptions of Digitalisation**: How school leaders perceive digitalisation influences strategic decisions about technology investments and leadership roles (Leaders' perceptions of digitalization study, 2024).
- **Resource Constraints**: In underprivileged schools, limited funding and poor infrastructure may hinder the capacity of leaders to enact digital change or distributed leadership practices (digital leadership in underprivileged schools, 2023).
- **Sustainability Orientation**: For innovation to persist, leadership must embed mechanisms for scaling and sustaining change, not just initial adoption (Karaköse & Tülübaş, 2023).

Gaps in the Literature

Despite growing empirical evidence, several gaps remain:

- **Integration of Leadership Styles**: Few studies systematically examine how instructional, transformational, distributed, and digital leadership together influence both performance and innovation.
- **Longitudinal and Intervention Research**: There is a scarcity of longitudinal or experimental research to establish causality or test leadership development interventions.
- **Measurement of Innovation**: Many studies rely on self-reported surveys of innovativeness; objective or process-based measures of innovation (e.g., adoption rates, fidelity, and sustainability) are rare.
- **Contextual Diversity**: Research is heavily skewed toward well-resourced or Western settings; under-resourced or non-Western contexts are underrepresented.
- **Sustainable Scaling**: More studies are needed on how leadership practices support sustained and scaled innovation over time, especially beyond pilot phases.

METHODOLOGY

Review Design

This paper uses a systematic literature review design, synthesizing empirical and conceptual research published between 2015 and 2025. We followed transparent procedures aligned with PRISMA guidelines (e.g., systematic search, screening, quality appraisal, thematic synthesis), although no primary data were collected.

Search Strategy

We searched major academic databases (e.g., Web of Science, Scopus, ERIC, Google Scholar) using combinations of keywords: instructional leadership, transformational leadership, distributed leadership, digital leadership, school innovation, institutional performance, educational leadership. Boolean operators ("AND," "OR") and citation-tracking (backward and forward) were used to broaden and refine results.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

- Peer-reviewed empirical studies, meta-analyses, systematic reviews, or conceptual articles
- Published between 2015 and 2025
- Focus on educational institutions (K–12 or higher education)
- Examine leadership strategies in relation to performance and/or innovation outcomes

Exclusion Criteria:

- Opinion pieces without empirical or theoretical grounding
- Non-educational leadership studies
- Non-English language publications without accessible English abstracts

Quality Appraisal

We evaluated studies based on methodological transparency, sample size, design (e.g., cross-sectional, longitudinal), validity of measures, and relevance of reported outcomes. Since this is a review, we did not extract or re-analyze raw data; instead, we assessed the strength, consistency, and coherence of findings.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

For each included study, we extracted: leadership style(s), educational context, research design, sample characteristics, outcome measures (performance, innovation), proposed mediators/moderators, and key findings. We conducted a thematic synthesis, identifying recurring patterns, mechanisms, and contradictions, and then developed an integrated conceptual model linking leadership strategies to outcomes.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Synthesis of Leadership Strategies

Our review reveals that no single leadership style suffices to promote both high performance and innovation. Instead, a combination comprising instructional, transformational, distributed, and digital leadership appears most effective.

Instructional leadership ensures consistent focus on teaching and learning, which underpins performance gains.

Transformational leadership builds trust and vision, creating fertile ground for experimentation.

Distributed leadership leverages collective capacity, enabling teacher autonomy and collaboration.

Digital leadership provides the infrastructure and strategy necessary for innovation in the modern era.

Leaders who integrate these strategies are better positioned to achieve both short-term performance goals and longer-term innovative change.

Mechanisms of Influence

The review identifies several key mechanisms:

- **Teacher Autonomy & Collaboration**: Distributed leadership fosters a participatory environment where autonomy and collaboration mediate innovation (Lin, 2022).

- **Trust & Psychological Safety**: Digital leadership that empowers staff through trust helps create safe spaces for experimentation (Leading with Trust, 2024).
- **Professional Learning Culture**: Transformational leaders encourage continuous reflection, growth, and intellectual stimulation (Román-Cortéz et al., 2025).

These mechanisms are not mutually exclusive; rather, they interconnect. For example, a leader may combine distributed decision-making (to build autonomy) with transformational messaging (to build vision) and digital systems (to monitor and scale innovation).

Contextual Moderators

The impact of leadership strategies is conditioned by several contextual factors:

- **Digital Competence & Infrastructure**: Without sufficient digital literacy and infrastructure, digital leadership initiatives struggle (Jaldemark et al., 2021).
- **Leaders' Perceptions of Digitalisation**: Leaders' beliefs about digital technologies shape how they deploy them in strategy (Leaders' perceptions of digitalisation study, 2024).
- **Resource Constraints**: In underprivileged schools, leadership capacity for innovation may be limited by funding, infrastructure, or training (digital leadership in underprivileged schools, 2023).
- **Sustainability Orientation**: Leadership that integrates scaling and sustainability thinking ensures that innovation is not a one-off but embedded in the school culture (Karaköse & Tülübaş, 2023).

Practical Implications

Based on the synthesis, we propose several actionable recommendations:

- **Integrated Leadership Development**: Leadership training programs should cultivate instructional, transformational, distributed, and digital competencies in tandem.
- **Foster Shared Decision-Making**: Promote distributed leadership practices such as teacher leadership teams, collaborative planning, and role-sharing.
- **Build Digital Capacity**: Invest in leaders' and teachers' digital competence, data literacy, and technology infrastructure.
- **Cultivate Trust-Based Cultures**: Encourage trust, psychological safety, and experimentation by flattening hierarchies and sharing decision-making authority.
- **Plan for Sustainability**: Embed mechanisms to scale and sustain innovation (e.g., data-feedback loops, institutional policies, ongoing professional development).

Limitations of the Review

- The review relied on published literature, which may be subject to publication bias.
- Variation in research design makes comparisons difficult.
- Many studies use self-reported measures of innovation rather than objective outcomes.
- The contexts represented are uneven (some geographic or socio-economic settings are under-studied).

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Conclusion

Effective leadership in educational institutions must balance two critical mandates: sustaining high performance and fostering innovation. Our systematic review demonstrates that an integrated leadership model, combining instructional rigor, shared ownership, vision-driven change, and digital strategy, offers the most promise. Mechanisms of autonomy, collaboration, trust, and professional learning mediate these effects, while context (such as resource levels and digital readiness) moderates them.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

1. Policy-makers should support leadership development systems that do not silo leadership styles but instead encourage holistic training.
2. School leaders should intentionally distribute leadership roles, build trust, and plan technology adoption strategically.
3. Leadership training organizations must include digital leadership and capacity-building for innovation.
4. Institutions should design policies that support the scaling and sustainability of innovation beyond pilot phases.

Future Research

- Conduct longitudinal and intervention studies to test causality and long-term effects of integrated leadership models.
- Develop robust, objective measures of innovation, including process metrics (e.g., adoption rate) and outcome metrics (e.g., change in pedagogy).
- Study leadership in diverse contexts, especially under-resourced or non-Western settings, to understand how resource constraints shape leadership efficacy.
- Explore the scaling mechanisms of innovation (how pilot initiatives become institutionalized) and the role of different leadership strategies in that process.

REFERENCES

Leading with Trust: How University Leaders can Foster Innovation with Educational Technology through Organizational Trust." (2024). Innovative Higher Education, 50(5), 303–327. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-024-09733-5

Jaldemark, J., Ewing, S., & Cooper, S. (2021). Leading the digitalisation process in K–12 schools: The school leaders' perspective. Education and Information Technologies, 27(5), 7121–7139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10686-0

Karaköse, T., & Tülübaş, T. (2023). Digital leadership and sustainable school improvement: A conceptual analysis and implications for future research. Educational Process: International Journal, 12(1), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2023.121.1

Leaders' perceptions of digitalisation in K–12 education: influencing arrangements for leading the expansion of digital technologies. (2024). Discover Education, 3, Article 143. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00247-y

Lin, Q. (2022). The relationship between distributed leadership and teacher innovativeness: Mediating roles of teacher autonomy and professional collaboration. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 948152. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948152

Okunlola, J. O. (2024). Digital technology adoption and school leadership in the post-pandemic era: Insights from high school leaders. Interdisciplinary Journal of Education Research, 6, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.38140/ijer-2024.vol6.32

Raptis, N., Psyrras, N., Konstantinidi, P., & Koutsourai, S. (2025). Distributed leadership, new technologies and teachers' digital competence in the post-COVID era. European Journal of Education and Pedagogy, 6(2), 904. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2025.6.2.904

Román-Cortéz, K. R., Calderón Cisneros, J. T., & Trejo, C. A. (2025). Transformational leadership and its impact on educational innovation in Ecuador: a systematic review. Frontiers in Education, 10, Article 1630004. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1630004

Sheninger, E. (2019). Seven Pillars of Digital Leadership. Journal of Educational Administration, 57(6), 659–675. (Based on Sheninger's framework as described in recent reviews)

The Power of Technology in School Leadership during COVID-19: Insights from the Field. (2024). In A. Kafa & N. Eteokleous (Eds.), Studies in Educational Leadership (Vol. 26). Springer.