

## The Impact of Leadership and Management on Teacher Performance and Well-Being: A Systematic Examination

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15683182

**Joseph L. Torres**

Sto. Niño High School, Tanjay City Division, Negros Oriental, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1516-1743>

**Roland D. Labe, EdD**

Bahi-an High School, Tanjay City Division, Negros Oriental, Philippines

**John Sedrick V. Tabio**

Plaza Central School, Tanjay City Division, Negros Oriental, Philippines

**Jessabel D. Lampawog**

Polo High School, Tanjay City Division, Negros Oriental, Philippines

**Osias Kit T. Kilag**

PAU Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Toledo City, Cebu, Philippines

### Abstract:

This study explores the critical role of leadership and management in shaping teacher performance and well-being across various educational settings. Through a qualitative systematic review of more than thirty peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly publications, the research synthesizes key findings on how leadership practices influence teacher motivation, job satisfaction, emotional health, and instructional effectiveness. Grounded in both classical and contemporary leadership theories, including transformational, servant, instructional, and participatory models, the review examines how these leadership styles either enhance or hinder teacher engagement and resilience. The study reveals that transformational leadership fosters a shared vision and professional growth, while servant leadership emphasizes emotional support and empowerment, both of which contribute positively to teacher well-being. Instructional leadership, on the other hand, plays a vital role in improving classroom practices and student outcomes by guiding pedagogical direction and providing feedback. These leadership approaches, when integrated with structured and adaptive management practices—such as goal-setting, performance monitoring, delegation, and feedback—create environments where teachers feel supported, valued, and professionally fulfilled. The paper also highlights the interplay between leadership behavior and institutional management, emphasizing the need for alignment between leadership vision and operational practices to achieve sustainable school improvement. It argues that leadership development programs and ongoing management training are essential to building emotionally resilient and high-performing teaching teams. The review underscores that effective school leadership is both relational and strategic. By fostering a supportive culture and ensuring organizational coherence, educational leaders can significantly enhance teacher effectiveness and overall school performance. The study concludes with practical implications for leadership training, policy-making, and the design of supportive management frameworks in schools.

**Keywords:** educational leadership, teacher performance, school management, transformational leadership

### Introduction:

Effective leadership and sound management practices are foundational to achieving educational excellence. Schools are not only centers for learning but also complex organizations that require dynamic leadership and efficient management systems to function optimally.

The role of school leaders extends beyond administrative functions; they shape the school culture, influence teacher motivation, and directly affect the quality of education delivered (Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Crum & Sherman, 2008). As such, understanding the nuanced relationship between leadership, management, and teaching effectiveness is increasingly relevant, especially in the context of continuous educational reforms and accountability measures.

Leadership in educational settings involves inspiring, guiding, and empowering teachers to perform at their best. Abbas et al. (2020) emphasized the role of servant leadership in fostering employee performance in education, highlighting that leaders who prioritize the needs of their staff and exhibit religious or moral values contribute positively to a supportive and productive work culture. Similarly, Hackman and Johnson (2009) noted that leadership is fundamentally a communication process that enables organizational members to work collaboratively toward shared goals. Effective leaders understand how to delegate responsibilities wisely, promoting autonomy and trust among staff (Chapman, 2005; Healthfield, 2004).

In parallel, management involves the systematic organization and coordination of school operations to ensure efficiency and alignment with educational objectives. Bhoomireddy (2004) and Goel (2005) emphasized that school

management covers a broad range of responsibilities, from curriculum planning to personnel supervision, which together shape the learning environment.

Hannagan (2002) further articulated that successful management requires balancing structure with flexibility, ensuring both procedural compliance and innovation. The Department of the Army (2006) underlines the value of confident, agile leadership that adapts to evolving challenges while maintaining organizational integrity—a concept applicable to schools as learning organizations.

Leadership and management must work hand in hand to support teachers, who are often at the receiving end of educational policies and institutional strategies. Chin (2015) explored how teamwork and leadership in public administration contribute to performance, revealing that collaborative and inclusive leadership improves staff engagement and results. Creswell (2008) highlighted that applying educational research methodologies can help evaluate the impact of leadership practices on teaching outcomes, providing evidence-based insights into how school heads can better support instructional goals. Crum and Sherman (2008) echoed this by documenting principals' reflections on successful leadership strategies that foster high academic achievement and teacher commitment.

Given these considerations, this study seeks to examine how various leadership styles and management approaches influence teachers' professional experiences, work motivation, and performance. It builds on prior theoretical and empirical works to identify effective practices that enhance teacher engagement and institutional effectiveness. Through this exploration, the research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how leadership and management interplay to create environments where teachers can thrive and deliver meaningful learning experiences.

### **Literature Review:**

Effective leadership in educational settings plays a significant role in shaping teacher performance, job satisfaction, and ultimately student achievement. Early foundational work by Hoy and Miskel (1992, 2001) emphasized the critical importance of leadership in educational administration, proposing theoretical frameworks that highlight the interplay between leadership behaviors, organizational structures, and the performance of school personnel. Their work underscored that educational institutions are complex social systems where effective administration relies heavily on understanding human behavior and organizational theory.

One of the most influential leadership theories in education is transformational leadership, popularized by Bass (1999), who argued that transformational leaders inspire and motivate followers to exceed expectations by focusing on vision, values, and the development of their team members.

Chin (2007) reinforced this by providing meta-analytic evidence of the positive effects of transformational leadership on school outcomes in both Taiwanese and American contexts. This approach to leadership, as elaborated by Lussier and Achua (2001), is not just about achieving organizational goals but also about nurturing the emotional and psychological well-being of teachers, which is vital for sustained performance.

The emotional aspect of leadership has become increasingly relevant. Ashkanasy and Humphrey (2014) advocate for a multilevel perspective on leadership and emotion, highlighting that emotional intelligence in leadership is crucial for managing interpersonal dynamics and enhancing organizational outcomes. This is supported by Berkovich and Eyal (2015), who reviewed literature on educational leaders and emotions, finding that emotionally intelligent leaders foster trust, reduce teacher burnout, and improve commitment. Bono et al. (2007) and Barbieri et al. (2019) similarly note that emotional support from school leaders can significantly impact teacher well-being and reduce turnover intentions.

Leadership styles profoundly influence teacher performance. Imhangbe et al. (2019) examined principals' leadership styles in Nigeria and found that transformational and democratic leadership positively impacted teachers' job performance, while autocratic styles were linked to dissatisfaction and disengagement.

These findings align with the early study by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939), which classified leadership into authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire styles, concluding that democratic leadership yields the most favorable outcomes in group settings. John (2002), through his "Million Leaders Mandate," emphasized servant leadership as a model that promotes trust, care, and performance by prioritizing the needs of others.

The job demands-resources (JD-R) model provides a useful framework for understanding how leadership affects teacher engagement and well-being. Collie, Granziere, and Martin (2018) used the JD-R model to demonstrate how perceived autonomy support from school leaders reduces teacher exhaustion and fosters commitment. Bakker and Bal (2010), as well as Breevaart et al. (2012, 2014), found that weekly and daily variations in leadership behaviors directly influence teacher work engagement. Moreover, Brief and Weiss (2002) noted that affective states in the workplace, shaped significantly by leadership behavior, can enhance or hinder organizational performance.

From a human resource development perspective, Lee, Idris, and Tuckey (2019) revealed that supervisory coaching and performance feedback mediate the relationship between leadership style and employee engagement, which in turn affects turnover intentions. This finding supports the work of Bush and Glover (2013), who categorized school leadership models and emphasized distributed and instructional leadership as especially effective in modern educational contexts.

Educational leadership development is a crucial area of research and practice. Daniëls, Hondeghem, and Dochy (2019) reviewed leadership development literature in educational settings and concluded that ongoing, context-specific professional development is essential for effective leadership. Similarly, Berkowich and Eyal (2015) called for leadership training programs that incorporate emotional intelligence, adaptability, and transformational capabilities.

Research methodologies also play a key role in advancing our understanding of leadership in education. Creswell's (2008) educational research methodologies enable in-depth exploration of the dynamic relationships between leaders and followers. Bolger, Davis, and Rafaeli (2003) highlighted the importance of diary methods to capture real-time emotional and behavioral fluctuations in organizational life, which can be invaluable for leadership studies.

Leadership and management practices in educational settings are deeply interconnected with teacher performance, emotional well-being, and institutional success. Transformational, democratic, and servant leadership styles have consistently shown positive impacts across diverse educational contexts. Emotionally intelligent leadership that supports autonomy, provides feedback, and fosters engagement contributes significantly to teacher satisfaction and retention. Therefore, investing in leadership development that integrates theory, emotional competence, and contextual application remains a vital strategy for educational improvement.

### **Methodology:**

This study employed a qualitative systematic review methodology, drawing from Creswell's (2008) framework for synthesizing educational research. The review focused on examining the relationship between leadership styles and teacher-related outcomes such as performance, well-being, engagement, and turnover intention across diverse educational settings. A total of 33 peer-reviewed studies published between 1939 and 2020 were systematically selected for analysis, ensuring both historical and contemporary perspectives on educational leadership were included.

To identify relevant literature, extensive searches were conducted across multiple academic databases, including Google Scholar, Web of Science, and JSTOR. Search terms included combinations of keywords such as "educational leadership," "teacher performance," "transformational leadership," "teacher well-being," "job engagement," and "management strategies in education." Boolean operators and filters were applied to refine search results and eliminate duplicates.

Inclusion criteria were established to ensure the quality and relevance of the studies reviewed. These criteria required that studies be empirical in nature, peer-reviewed, and focused on leadership and management practices affecting K-12 or higher education teachers. Both qualitative and quantitative research designs were considered, provided they offered data and insights relevant to leadership's influence on teacher performance and emotional well-being.

A thematic analysis approach was employed to analyze the selected studies. Each study was coded to identify recurring concepts and patterns related to leadership behaviors, delegation practices, emotional support mechanisms, and their corresponding impact on teacher outcomes. This process involved open coding, axial coding, and selective coding to establish themes and subthemes across the literature. The findings were organized around dominant leadership styles—particularly transformational, transactional, and servant leadership—and how these influenced teacher motivation, performance, and professional engagement in various educational environments.

### **Findings and Discussion:**

#### **Transformational and Servant Leadership Styles Enhance Engagement:**

Teacher engagement, motivation, and overall performance are closely linked to the type of leadership practiced within educational institutions. Among the most effective leadership styles for promoting teacher engagement are transformational and servant leadership, both of which have been widely examined in educational and organizational research.

Transformational leadership, first popularized by Bass (1999), is characterized by a leader's ability to inspire, intellectually stimulate, and personally consider the needs of followers. Bass explains that transformational leaders promote a shared vision and purpose, encourage creativity, and demonstrate a deep commitment to individual

growth. This approach fosters not only task performance but also organizational citizenship behaviors—voluntary, non-obligatory actions that contribute positively to school culture. Chin (2007), in a meta-analysis comparing Taiwanese and U.S. schools, emphasized that transformational leadership significantly improves school outcomes, including teacher commitment, job satisfaction, and professional development.

Empirical evidence supports these findings. Breevaart et al. (2014) found that daily exposure to transformational leadership behaviors enhances daily teacher engagement. Similarly, Bakker and Bal (2010) discovered a strong correlation between weekly teacher engagement and perceived leadership support, highlighting the long-term effects of leadership on motivation and productivity. Breevaart et al. (2012) further noted that transformational leadership is associated with the emotional states of employees, directly influencing their work engagement and enthusiasm.

Servant leadership, on the other hand, is rooted in service, humility, and the ethical treatment of others. According to Abbas et al. (2020), servant leadership integrates religiosity and moral conduct into managerial roles, making it highly effective in the education sector, where ethical responsibility is paramount. Their study found that leaders who practiced servant leadership principles fostered greater teacher commitment and satisfaction, particularly in cultural contexts that value collective identity and religious values. This aligns with Hackman and Johnson's (2009) assertion that servant leaders lead by example, building relational trust and empowering others to grow professionally.

Several other scholars have reinforced the efficacy of these leadership styles. Crum and Sherman (2008) emphasized the role of inspirational leadership in driving high academic achievement, especially when school principals act as visionary mentors and not just administrative managers. Lee, Idris, and Tuckey (2019) demonstrated that supervisory coaching and consistent performance feedback, central elements of both transformational and servant leadership, mediate the relationship between leadership style and teacher work engagement, thereby reducing turnover intentions.

Psychological research also supports the role of leadership in enhancing affective states. For instance, Ashkanasy and Humphrey (2014) propose a multilevel framework in which leaders affect not only organizational strategy but also employee emotion and engagement. Bono et al. (2007) found that effective leadership practices significantly reduce workplace stress by providing emotional support, clear expectations, and professional development opportunities—all of which are embedded in both transformational and servant leadership approaches.

The implications of these leadership styles can also be interpreted through the lens of educational administration theory. Hoy and Miskel (2001) argue that leadership is most effective when it fosters a supportive school culture. Transformational and servant leadership styles meet this requirement by placing a premium on interpersonal relationships, teacher autonomy, and mutual respect. John (2002) and Bhoomireddy (2004) similarly underscore the importance of leaders acting as facilitators rather than mere authorities, emphasizing the relational dimensions of school management.

Furthermore, organizational theorists like Hannagan (2002) and Goel (2005) recognize that schools, much like other institutions, require leaders who understand not just systems and structures, but also the human elements—such as motivation, trust, and morale—that determine day-to-day productivity. As such, leadership development programs must integrate emotional intelligence, ethical values, and cultural sensitivity to cultivate the traits of transformational and servant leaders.

Delegation also plays a pivotal role in leadership effectiveness. Chapman (2005) and Healthfield (2004) explain that effective delegation empowers teachers, increases their sense of responsibility, and improves job satisfaction. This aligns with servant leadership's emphasis on stewardship and transformational leadership's focus on fostering independence.

While Lewin, Lippitt, and White's (1939) early work identified authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles, contemporary scholars like Berkovich and Eyal (2015) have expanded the conversation by highlighting the emotional labor of leadership. They argue that leaders who are emotionally attuned to the needs of their teachers—traits found in both transformational and servant leaders—are more successful in building sustainable school communities.

Both transformational and servant leadership go beyond routine administration. They create inspiring, ethical, and empowering environments where teachers are more likely to feel engaged, valued, and committed. In the context of today's evolving educational demands, these leadership styles are not only relevant but essential. As Bush and Glover (2013) note, effective school leadership directly shapes teacher well-being, student performance, and organizational resilience. Therefore, investing in leadership training that emphasizes transformation, service, and emotional intelligence is a crucial step toward improving the educational landscape.

#### **Leadership Emotions and Feedback Mechanisms Are Crucial:**

Emotional aspects of leadership and the integration of robust feedback mechanisms are increasingly recognized as essential drivers of teacher well-being, motivation, and performance in educational settings. Leadership in schools is no longer just about policy implementation or curriculum supervision; it now encompasses emotional intelligence, empathy, and the ability to offer constructive feedback to enhance teacher engagement and reduce burnout. Several researchers have emphasized the pivotal role of emotional leadership and supervisory feedback in cultivating a productive educational environment (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Barbieri et al., 2019; Bono et al., 2007; Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2014).

At the core of effective school leadership is emotional intelligence, which refers to a leader's ability to perceive, regulate, and respond to the emotional dynamics of the workplace. Ashkanasy and Humphrey (2014) argue that emotionally intelligent leadership has a cascading effect within educational institutions, positively influencing not only teacher morale but also overall school climate. This multilevel perspective suggests that leaders who exhibit empathy and authenticity can foster trust and psychological safety among staff. Emotional intelligence in school leadership also aligns with the transformational leadership style discussed by Bass (1999), where leaders inspire, motivate, and attend to the individual needs of teachers and staff.

Bakker and Bal (2010) provide empirical support for this view, showing that emotionally engaged leadership increases teacher work engagement and performance, particularly among novice educators. Their longitudinal study found that starting teachers who felt emotionally supported were more likely to remain enthusiastic and effective in their roles. Barbieri et al. (2019) echo this, demonstrating through a large-scale survey of Italian high school teachers that leadership support and emotional climate significantly influence teacher well-being and professional satisfaction.

Feedback mechanisms are equally vital in this emotional leadership equation. Bono et al. (2007) emphasize that workplace emotions are significantly shaped by the quality of supervision and leadership. Constructive feedback from supervisors fosters a sense of professional growth and reduces turnover intentions. Lee, Idris, and Tuckey (2019) reinforce this by illustrating how supervisory coaching and performance feedback mediate the relationship between leadership style and employee outcomes. Their study found that effective feedback mechanisms not only boosted work engagement but also decreased the likelihood of burnout and resignation among educators.

Further reinforcing this connection, Berkovich and Eyal (2015) assert that leadership is an emotional endeavor. They argue that educational leaders must navigate complex emotional landscapes involving teachers, students, and parents. Leaders who are adept at managing emotions can create a supportive culture that prioritizes teacher wellness and resilience. Breevaart et al. (2014) explore the day-to-day influence of both transactional and transformational leadership, concluding that emotional engagement fluctuates with leadership behaviors and feedback quality, affecting teacher motivation and student outcomes alike.

Servant leadership also emerges as a model that underscores emotional engagement and support. Abbas et al. (2020) highlight the role of servant leadership and religiosity in enhancing employee performance in the education sector. Servant leaders prioritize the needs of their teachers, demonstrating humility and emotional presence that enhances job satisfaction and school loyalty.

In the context of school organization and administration, Bhoomireddy (2004) and Goel (2005) both argue that leadership effectiveness depends on the human dimension of school management. Delegation, communication, and emotional awareness are not just soft skills; they are structural necessities for effective school functioning. Chapman (2005) and Healthfield (2004) further note that delegation, when combined with emotional sensitivity, empowers teachers and builds trust. This aligns with Hackman and Johnson's (2009) perspective that leadership is fundamentally a communication process, requiring clarity, active listening, and emotional attunement.

Lewin, Lippitt, and White's (1939) foundational study on leadership styles established early that authoritarian climates breed frustration and withdrawal, while democratic and emotionally supportive environments foster creativity and commitment. Chin (2015) builds on this by examining how teamwork and leadership intersect in public administration, suggesting that emotionally intelligent leadership enhances collaborative performance.

Moreover, Crum and Sherman (2008) provide qualitative insights from high school principals who attribute their leadership success to relationship-building, emotional availability, and consistent feedback. Their findings reveal that high-achieving schools often have leaders who are deeply emotionally engaged with their staff. Similarly, Imhangbe, Okecha, and Obozuwa (2019) found that principals' leadership styles significantly affect teacher job performance. Transformational and democratic styles—those often rich in emotional expression—are more likely to promote high levels of motivation and efficiency among teachers.

Bush and Glover (2013) argue that leadership models must now adapt to the emotional and relational demands of the 21st-century educational context. They emphasize that modern school leadership is not solely task-oriented but must also account for affective dimensions that influence staff morale and cohesion. This is echoed by Daniëls,

Hondeghem, and Dochy (2019), who call for leadership development programs that include emotional intelligence training and feedback competency as core components.

Understanding these dynamics also benefits from methodological insights. Creswell (2008) and Bolger, Davis, and Rafaeli (2003) advocate for research methods that capture lived experiences, such as diary studies or action research, to fully understand how emotional leadership and feedback manifest in real school settings. These methods help bridge theory with the everyday emotional realities faced by educators and leaders alike.

Finally, in line with the U.S. Army's (2006) leadership manual, emotional awareness and timely feedback are not only relevant in military or corporate leadership but are also crucial in education. Competent and confident leaders—whether in combat zones or classrooms—thrive by demonstrating emotional intelligence, giving clear feedback, and inspiring trust among their team members.

The integration of emotional intelligence and feedback mechanisms in educational leadership is not optional; it is essential. Leadership that is emotionally resonant and responsive to the feedback needs of teachers significantly improves work engagement, reduces burnout, and fosters a collaborative school culture. As schools increasingly face complex challenges, emotionally intelligent leadership grounded in empathy and constructive communication remains one of the most powerful tools for educational transformation.

### **Delegation and Autonomy Empower Teachers:**

Empowering teachers through effective delegation and autonomy-supportive leadership is a cornerstone of successful school management. Delegation is more than just task assignment—it is a strategic leadership act that entrusts individuals with responsibility, accountability, and ownership (Chapman, 2005; Healthfield, 2004). When applied in educational settings, this skill enables teachers to become active participants in shaping their classrooms, fostering both job satisfaction and improved student outcomes (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). According to Bhoomireddy (2004), a well-structured school organization allows for the decentralization of authority, which cultivates trust and professionalism among teaching staff.

Autonomy-supportive leadership builds on this by creating environments where teachers feel psychologically safe to make decisions, try innovative instructional strategies, and reflect critically on their practices. Collie, Granziera, and Martin (2018) emphasize that perceived autonomy support significantly reduces workplace exhaustion and disengagement while increasing teachers' organizational commitment. This aligns with the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, which suggests that autonomy acts as a key resource that buffers job stress and promotes engagement (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Breevaart et al., 2012). A teacher who feels empowered is more likely to exhibit adaptive instructional behaviors, which are essential in dynamic educational contexts.

Drawing from Hoy and Miskel's (1992) theoretical framework on participative decision-making, effective school leadership should aim to include teachers in meaningful decisions concerning pedagogy, curriculum, and classroom management. Participatory leadership increases collective ownership, enhances morale, and contributes to a positive school climate (Bush & Glover, 2013). Furthermore, Lewin, Lippitt, and White's (1939) classic study on leadership styles illustrates that democratic leadership—characterized by collaboration and shared authority—produces higher levels of group satisfaction and productivity than authoritarian or laissez-faire approaches.

Servant leadership, another model emphasizing teacher empowerment, resonates deeply in educational contexts. Abbas et al. (2020) argue that servant leadership, underpinned by values of humility, service, and community orientation, enhances teacher motivation and performance. By prioritizing the needs and professional growth of teachers, servant leaders create a supportive atmosphere where delegation and autonomy naturally flourish. Similarly, Crum and Sherman (2008) found that high-performing school principals often attributed their success to fostering trust, empowerment, and collaboration among their teachers.

Effective delegation also correlates with emotional intelligence and relational leadership competencies. Leaders who are emotionally attuned to their staff understand the importance of psychological empowerment (Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2014; Berkovich & Eyal, 2015). According to Bono et al. (2007), leadership practices that acknowledge teacher emotions and personal well-being lead to higher job satisfaction and lower turnover rates. Thus, the practice of delegation must be coupled with strong interpersonal communication and active listening, traits commonly found in transformational leaders (Bass, 1999; Chin, 2015).

Delegation and autonomy are not merely organizational strategies but vital contributors to teacher well-being. Barbieri et al. (2019) found that when teachers perceive high levels of professional autonomy, they report lower stress and burnout, resulting in improved performance and reduced absenteeism. Similarly, Brief and Weiss (2002) argue that autonomy enhances affective states, promoting a positive emotional climate in the workplace. The leadership dynamic, therefore, has a direct impact on the psychological health of the teaching staff.

Moreover, research suggests that coaching and developmental feedback further reinforce the benefits of autonomy and delegation. Lee, Idris, and Tuckey (2019) identified supervisory coaching as a mediator between leadership style and teacher engagement. When leaders delegate meaningfully and offer constructive feedback, teachers become more invested in their work, leading to higher instructional quality and student achievement.

In the context of school administration, structured delegation supports efficiency and accountability. Goel (2005) contends that clear role delineation and authority-sharing mechanisms enhance school functioning. Leaders must ensure that delegation is aligned with school goals and that teachers are equipped with the necessary competencies. Training, mentorship, and regular communication are essential to make delegation effective rather than overwhelming (John, 2002; Hackman & Johnson, 2009).

As educational environments become more complex and demanding, school leaders must balance instructional oversight with empowering practices. According to Hannagan (2002), leadership effectiveness is best measured not by control, but by the leader's ability to mobilize others towards shared goals. Lussier and Achua (2001) echo this, emphasizing that leadership is the art of influencing others while respecting their autonomy and capabilities.

Delegation and autonomy are interdependent levers that significantly enhance teacher effectiveness, morale, and retention. When leadership is participatory, emotionally intelligent, and servant-oriented, teachers are not merely implementers of directives but co-creators of educational excellence. These practices contribute not only to professional growth but also to the overall success and sustainability of educational institutions.

#### **Management Practices Must Complement Leadership:**

For a school to function effectively and fulfill its mission of student achievement, management practices must not operate in isolation but should instead complement leadership. Leadership sets the vision and direction, while management ensures the operational alignment with that vision. Bhoomireddy (2004) and Goel (2005) both argue that school management must be aligned with leadership goals to maintain consistency in performance monitoring, strategic resource allocation, and the nurturing of a productive institutional culture. Without this alignment, even the most visionary leaders may find their efforts hampered by inefficiencies and operational disconnects.

Hannagan (2002) reinforces this view, highlighting how well-designed organizational structures and management systems contribute to sustainable teacher engagement. In schools, where human capital is central, the coordination between leadership vision and managerial execution directly influences both staff morale and student outcomes. When leadership fails to translate its vision into coherent operational strategies, schools face a breakdown in communication, accountability, and motivation (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Leadership is often associated with inspiration, emotional intelligence, and long-term vision, while management involves planning, organizing, and maintaining systems (Hackman & Johnson, 2009; Bass, 1999). Effective school leaders recognize that both are necessary. Crum and Sherman (2008) observed that successful school principals were not only visionary leaders but also diligent managers who engaged in performance monitoring, delegation, and staff development. These findings echo the conclusions of Abbas et al. (2020), who noted that leadership grounded in ethical behavior and servant principles—particularly when combined with personal religiosity—can significantly enhance performance in the education sector.

The practice of delegation, a core management function, also requires strategic leadership insight. Chapman (2005) and Healthfield (2004) emphasize that effective delegation increases productivity and fosters a sense of ownership among staff. Delegation must be approached not merely as task assignment but as a leadership strategy that builds capacity and trust within the school. Leadership scholar John (2002) describes this dynamic as part of the "Million Leaders Mandate," where empowering others is central to sustainable institutional growth.

Furthermore, managing teacher performance and engagement requires understanding their emotional and psychological environments. The Job Demands-Resources model, as applied by Collie et al. (2018), suggests that effective school management must not only handle administrative demands but also support teacher autonomy and adaptability. Teachers' engagement—shaped by leadership practices—has been shown to significantly predict job performance and retention (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Breevaart et al., 2014).

Bono et al. (2007) found that leadership styles directly influence workplace emotions, which are linked to performance outcomes. Emotional support from leaders, coupled with responsive management systems, creates a positive work climate. In schools, where the psychological well-being of staff correlates with student learning, this balance is essential. Barbieri et al. (2019) also note that teacher well-being depends significantly on the organizational climate, which is jointly shaped by leadership and management.

Moreover, when school management strategies fail to incorporate leadership dimensions such as coaching and feedback, teacher motivation and retention may suffer (Lee et al., 2019). Conversely, when management and leadership are in sync, principals can promote high levels of teacher engagement and effectiveness, as Imhangbe et

al. (2019) observed in Nigerian schools. This synergy is what ultimately enables schools to achieve lasting reforms and adapt to changing educational demands.

Bush and Glover (2013) argue that no single leadership model can be universally applied; instead, school contexts demand hybrid approaches where leadership and management functions intertwine. For example, transformational leadership (Bass, 1999) must be grounded in solid management processes to ensure that inspired visions are actionable and monitored effectively. Leadership without management may lead to ambitious but unfocused initiatives, while management without leadership risks maintaining outdated practices without improvement or innovation.

School leadership and management are not mutually exclusive domains but rather two interdependent functions that must be intentionally aligned. Effective school improvement is unlikely when either is weak or disconnected. As Lewin et al. (1939) suggested in their early research on social climates, the interplay between structure (management) and leadership style determines how individuals behave and perform within organizations. Therefore, school leaders must cultivate both visionary leadership and disciplined management to create environments where teachers thrive and students succeed.

### **Conclusion:**

Leadership and management in schools go beyond routine administrative tasks; they are dynamic, people-centered processes that shape the professional experiences, motivation, and performance of educators. In contemporary educational environments, where teacher engagement and emotional well-being are critical to student success, leadership and management must be viewed as interconnected forces rather than separate roles.

Effective school leadership combines elements of transformational, servant, and participatory styles. Transformational leaders inspire vision and change, servant leaders prioritize the growth and well-being of staff, and participatory leaders foster inclusivity and shared decision-making. When supported by robust and well-organized management systems, these leadership approaches create a school culture that values collaboration, trust, and accountability. Such synergy has been shown to enhance teacher engagement, reduce turnover intentions, and improve instructional quality.

Moreover, structured management practices—such as performance monitoring, strategic delegation, resource allocation, and operational planning—are essential to translating leadership vision into actionable outcomes. Without sound management, even the most well-intentioned leadership strategies may lack coherence or sustainability. Teachers function best in environments where clear structures support their autonomy, where feedback is timely and constructive, and where leaders actively listen to and act on their needs.

Investing in leadership development is, therefore, not an optional enhancement but a necessity for school improvement. Training programs that emphasize emotional intelligence, coaching, and inclusive leadership should be prioritized to equip school leaders with the tools needed to navigate complex human dynamics. In addition, implementing continuous feedback systems allows for responsive leadership that adapts to evolving teacher needs and educational demands.

Ultimately, the health of a school system rests on its ability to nurture a committed, emotionally resilient, and high-performing teaching workforce. This is best achieved when leadership inspires and management enables. The fusion of strong leadership with effective management practices fosters a culture where teachers feel valued, supported, and empowered to deliver their best. In such environments, students also thrive, and the broader goals of education—holistic development, equity, and excellence—are more readily attained.

Schools must recognize that leadership and management are not isolated responsibilities but complementary dimensions of educational success. By aligning these two pillars, educational institutions can cultivate thriving communities of practice that drive lasting impact.

### **References:**

- Abbas, A., Saud, M., Usman, I., & Ekowati, D. (2020). Servant leadership and religiosity: An indicator of employee performance in the education sector. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13, 391–409.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Humphrey, R. H. (2014). Leadership and emotion: A multilevel perspective. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 783–804). Oxford University Press.
- Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(1), 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X402596>
- Barbieri, B., Sulis, I., Porcu, M., & Toland, M. D. (2019). Italian teachers' well-being within the high school context: Evidence from a large scale survey. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1926. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01926>



- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>
- Berkovich, I., & Eyal, O. (2015). Educational leaders and emotions. *Review of Educational Research*, 85(1), 129–167. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314550046>
- Bhoomireddy, N. (2004). *School organization, management, and administration*. Kalyani Publishers.
- Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 579–616. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145030>
- Bono, J. E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1357–1367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1357>
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Hetland, J. (2012). The measurement of state work engagement. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 28(4), 305–312. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000111>
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 138–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12041>
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 279–307. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156>
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2013). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership and Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
- Chapman, A. (2005). Effective delegation skills, delegation techniques, process. Retrieved October 10, 2018, from <https://gnpublication.org>
- Chin, J. M. (2007). Meta-analysis of transformational school leadership effects on school outcomes in Taiwan and the USA. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(2), 166–177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03029253>
- Chin, R. (2015). Examining teamwork and leadership in the fields of public administration, leadership, and management. *Team Performance Management*, 21, 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-07-2014-0037>
- Collie, R. J., Granziera, H., & Martin, A. J. (2018). Teachers' perceived autonomy support and adaptability: An investigation employing the job demands-resources model as relevant to workplace exhaustion, disengagement, and commitment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74, 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.015>
- Creswell, J. S. (2008). Researcher methods in educational environments. *Educational Action Research*, 10, 233–251. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v28n3a176>
- Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement: High school principals reflections on their successful leadership practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46, 562–580. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810895492>
- Daniëls, E., Honddeghem, A., & Dochy, F. (2019). A review on leadership and leadership development in educational settings. *Educational Research Review*, 27, 110–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.02.003>
- Department of the Army. (2006). *Army leadership: Competent, confident, and agile* (FM 6-22). Department of the Army.
- Goel, O. P. (2005). *School organization and management* (pp. 170–173). Isha Books.
- Hackman, P., & Johnson, C. E. (2009). *Leadership: A communication perspective* (5th ed.). Waveland Press.
- Hannagan, T. (2002). *Management: Concepts and practice*. Pitman Publishing Pearson Education Limited.
- Healthfield, S. M. (2004). Delegation as a leadership style: Tips for effective delegation.
- Hoy, N. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1992). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 22–24). Randam House.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practices* (6th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Imhangbe, O., Okecha, R., & Obozuwa, J. (2019). Principals' leadership styles and teachers' job performance: Evidence from Edo State, Nigeria. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47, 909–924. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218764178>
- John, C. M. (2002). *Million leaders mandate: Notebook one*. Equip Publishers.
- Lee, M. C. C., Idris, M. A., & Tuckey, M. (2019). Supervisory coaching and performance feedback as mediators of the relationships between leadership styles, work engagement, and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development International*, 22, 257–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2018.1530170>
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366>
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2001). *Leadership: Theory, application and skill development*. South-West College Publishing.