INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN MUSIC EDUCATION AND ACADEMIC OUTCOMES AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN CHINA

[1]Zhou Dong and [1]Mantuhac Pamela B.

Abstract

This study explored the impact of instructional leadership on student outcomes in music education, with a focus on goal-setting, resource management, development skills, and leadership quality. The study also examined the relationship between leadership practices and academic outcomes such as classroom performance, subject motivation, and resource availability. A descriptive-comparative research design was employed, using a total enumeration sampling technique involving 400 student respondents from Taishan University. The findings revealed that students positively assessed their teachers' leadership across all areas, with no significant differences in perceptions based on demographic factors such as age, sex, grade level, or specialization. Moreover, a significant positive relationship was found between instructional leadership and academic outcomes, indicating that strong leadership practices contribute to improved student performance, motivation, and resource access.

Based on these findings, a comprehensive program is proposed to enhance instructional leadership, optimize resource management, and promote student engagement in music education. The program focuses on professional educator development and continuous monitoring of leadership's impact on academic success. This study highlights the importance of effective leadership in fostering a conducive learning environment and improving educational outcomes in university music programs.

1. Introduction

Leadership plays a crucial role in contemporary education, particularly in university music programs. This study sought to explore the definition of educational leadership, the unique characteristics and challenges faced in music education, and the critical importance of effective leadership in enhancing music education programs. Music education is essential for developing various student abilities, including creativity, expression, social skills, and cognitive functions (Huang & Zhang, 2020). Through structured music programs, students' intellectual growth, emotional development, and artistic appreciation can be significantly advanced (Li et al., 2018).

Educational leadership is instrumental in creating and maintaining a robust music education framework. Leaders in education are responsible for setting and communicating clear objectives, motivating and guiding teaching

---

[1] Graduate School, Emilio Aguinaldo College

teams and ensuring that the necessary resources are available (Wu & Liu, 2016). They play a key role in providing support, establishing partnerships, and fostering a positive learning environment that enhances the effectiveness of music education (Yang & Li, 2017). Furthermore, educational leaders must continuously monitor and evaluate teaching quality to ensure ongoing improvements in music education (Guo & Xu, 2017). The ongoing evaluation and adaptation are vital for maintaining high standards and achieving educational goals.

Comprehensive student development relies heavily on music education and effective educational leadership. Leaders in education not only set goals and provide resources but also actively support and enhance the implementation of music education programs (Tang & He, 2021). Their efforts in shaping the music education framework ensure that programs are effective and responsive to students' needs, ultimately fostering a more enriching and successful educational experience.

In university music education, effective leadership is pivotal in the comprehensive planning and execution of music teaching and the creation of an enriching learning environment (Chen & Wang, 2019). Leadership in this field involves the careful selection of teaching methods and content, setting clear educational goals, developing strategic plans, managing resources, and engaging with external stakeholders (Huang & Zhang, 2020). Educators' leadership is crucial in guiding and organizing music instruction, requiring a forward-thinking approach to adapting and refining educational practices based on societal and student needs (Tang & He, 2021).

The quality of music education is closely linked to the professional competence of educators. Effective educational leadership prioritizes the ongoing professional development of teachers by offering diverse training and growth opportunities (Guo & Xu, 2017). By advancing teachers' skills and fostering innovation, leadership not only improves teaching quality and supports the sustainable development of music education programs (Wu & Liu, 2016).

Educational leadership is crucial for advancing music education. This involves transforming educational administration and teaching policies to reflect current student needs and global standards (Yang & Li, 2017). Effective leadership in music education supports teachers' development and improves overall educational outcomes by fostering efficiency and benefiting educators and students (Huang & Zhang, 2020). Research on music teachers' educational leadership can reveal how leadership qualities and practices contribute to the growth of music education programs.

This study underscores the vital role of educational leadership in enhancing music education at the university level. In focusing on the development of leadership skills and practices, this study aimed to improve the quality of music education and support the ongoing professional growth of educators (Li et al., 2018). Understanding and cultivating the traits of successful leaders can provide valuable insights into effectively advancing music education and its impact on student development (Guo & Xu, 2017).

1.1. Background of the study

Educational leadership refers to the ability of leaders in the field of education to guide organizations to achieve predetermined goals through a series of behaviors and decisions. It encompasses multiple aspects such as forward thinking, effective communication, teamwork, and innovative thinking (Yin et al., 2022). It is also a new requirement for educational development in today's era and an essential comprehensive ability for educators (Chen & Zhang, 2021). It was founded on several core principles, including the establishment of a clear vision and mission, innovative thinking (Sousa & Tomlinson, 2019), and interdisciplinary and interdisciplinary collaboration (Huang & Zhang, 2020).

In the specific context of music education, educational leadership involves fostering an environment that nurtures creativity and artistic growth. Robinson and Wager (2020) highlighted that leaders in music education must support educators, develop curricula that reflect both classical and contemporary musical traditions, and create opportunities for student performance and engagement. This role requires a deep understanding of music

educators' and students' unique needs, as well as the ability to advocate for the importance of arts education within the broader educational landscape.

Students are the primary beneficiaries of music education, and their comprehensive development is the core goal of all educational programs. Educational leaders must pay attention to students' needs and growth by providing diverse learning resources and a conducive learning environment. Hence, the development of music education in universities is also heavily reliant on external support and resource integration. Educational leaders must actively coordinate relationships with external entities to secure additional resources and support.

Educational leadership in general higher education and music education shares some commonalities but also exhibits distinct differences. In general, in higher education, leadership focuses broadly on academic and operational management, strategic planning, and fostering an inclusive academic culture. Leaders in this context must navigate complex governance structures, promote interdisciplinary collaboration, and address diverse challenges such as technology integration, diversity, and equity (Kezar & Holcombe, 2017; Zhang & Huang, 2016).

Despite progress, further research is needed on the influence of cultural contexts, particularly in non-Western settings like China, and the role of technology in transforming music education leadership (Wang, 2017; Zhao & Li, 2019; Smith, 2020). Interdisciplinary approaches, evaluation systems, and professional development for educators are areas that require more practical studies to improve teaching quality (Wu & Xu, 2021; Chen & Li, 2020; Liu, 2021). Additionally, the impact of globalization on music education leadership, including international partnerships, needs further exploration to enhance global perspectives (Chen & Zhang, 2018).

More empirical research is necessary to bridge the gap between leadership theory and practice in music education, which may lead to better student outcomes, faculty performance, and program success (Smith, 2020). By addressing these areas, educational leadership can continue to evolve, benefiting students, educators, and institutions alike.

Current research often focuses on general educational settings or other disciplines, overlooking the unique aspects of music education. This omission indicates that there is a lack of specific insights into how instructional leadership can be optimized for music programs. Addressing this gap provides evidence-based recommendations for improving leadership practices and enhancing educational experiences in music education.

1.2. Statement of the problem

This study explored how leadership factors can help improve leadership practices and enhance the overall educational experience for all music educators. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

Is there a significant difference in the assessment of teachers' instructional leadership when respondents' profiles are considered?

Is there a significant difference in the assessment of academic outcomes when respondent profiles are considered?

Is there a significant relationship between the assessment of teacher instructional leadership in music education and academic outcomes?

Based on the research results, what intervention programs can be developed?

1.3. The significance of the study

This study examined the impact of music education on students. This study focused on students' perceptions within an academic institution regarding their respective leaders' transformational leadership styles. The study is significant as it enriches the understanding of the relationship between the transformational leadership of deans and the job satisfaction of teachers in the field of pedagogy. Specifically, it is beneficial to

Students. The study enhances students' educational experiences and outcomes through the development of the systems that govern their teachers, as well as the resources they use, hence, optimizing the learning opportunities offered to them.

*School administrators***.** School administrators can use the study's findings to refine their approaches to supporting music education programs. By understanding the specific impacts of leadership practices on educational outcomes and institutional culture, administrators can implement targeted strategies to strengthen leadership competencies and optimize resources for music education.

Policymakers. Policymakers can benefit from empirical evidence on how educational leadership influences music education in universities. This knowledge can guide the formulation of policies that promote effective leadership development initiatives, enhance educational standards, and support the integration of innovative practices into music departments.

*Education sector***.** Within the broader education sector, the study provides critical insights into the transformative power of educational leadership in music education. These insights can inform sector-wide efforts to nurture leadership talent, improve teaching and learning experiences, and elevate the overall quality of music education.

Music sector. Stakeholders in the music sector, including educators, performers, and industry professionals, can leverage the findings of this study to understand how leadership practices shape the development of musical talent and the advancement of music education. This understanding can support initiatives that enhance artistic growth, promote interdisciplinary collaborations, and prepare students for diverse careers in music.

Future researchers. This study provides a foundational understanding of how educational leadership practices influence music education. Future researchers can build upon these findings to explore specific aspects such as leadership styles, teaching methodologies, and student outcomes in greater depth.

1.4. Scope and delimitation

This study explored the impact of instructional leadership on music education learning among students at Taishan University (Tai'an City, Shandong Province, China. The research focused on 400 students, including those majoring in music studies and others enrolled in music-related courses across various disciplines. This study assessed how instructional leadership elements such as goal-setting, resource management, development skills, and leadership quality influence students' academic performance, motivation, and classroom participation in the context of music education.

Geographically, the study was confined to Taishan University, a prominent educational institution known for its strong emphasis on teacher education and comprehensive academic programs. The findings from this specific setting may not be directly applicable to other universities or regions, which could limit the study's broad applicability. Additionally, the research exclusively targeted students involved in music-related courses, intentionally excluding faculty, administrators, and students from other departments, thus narrowing the scope to those directly engaged in music education.

The study was conducted within a defined academic period and focused on current practices and outcomes, which may not reflect long-term trends or future changes in instructional leadership. This time-bound approach restricts analysis to this context and does not account for evolving educational dynamics. Moreover, the research primarily examined the role of instructional leadership, without delving into other factors such as curriculum design, teaching methodologies, or external socioeconomic conditions that might also influence student learning outcomes.

1.5. Theoretical framework

The study used the Transformational Leadership Theory, which offers a robust framework to examine how leadership influences various facets of music education. Transformational leadership, rooted in the work of James MacGregor Burns and further developed by Bernard Bass, emphasizes leaders' ability to inspire and motivate followers toward higher performance through a shared vision and values (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2018). This theory posits that effective leaders transform individuals' and organizations' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, which are particularly relevant in the dynamic and creative environment of music education. In educational

contexts, transformational leaders are associated with higher levels of teacher motivation, student engagement, academic achievement, and organizational commitment (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood et al., 2004). Research applying the Transformational Leadership Theory to music education can explore how the components of transformational leadership contribute to student engagement and learning outcomes. Studies can investigate how inspirational motivation enhances students' commitment to music studies, how intellectual stimulation fosters creativity and innovation in musical performances, how individualized consideration supports student well-being and academic success, and how idealized influence shapes the ethical and professional standards of future musicians and educators. Moreover, the application of Transformational Leadership Theory in music education research can examine its impact on faculty performance and professional development.

2. Methodology

The techniques and steps used to gather data required to complete this study are addressed in this chapter. The research design, sample and sampling strategy, research instrument, data collection process, and statistical data treatment are among the elements covered in this chapter. These elements all help this study achieve its objective.

2.1. Research locale

For the purposes of this study, Taishan University was selected as the research site. The university is a full-time undergraduate university approved by the Ministry of Education and offers a comprehensive range of academic courses. Taishan University is recognized as one of the 19 provincial teacher education bases in Shandong Province and is among the first universities in the province to admit state-funded normal students. The university employs 1,500 faculty members, of whom 1,100 are full-time faculty members, including 450 senior educators.

2.2. Sample and sampling technique

This study targeted students majoring in music at the university's music colleges as well as students from other colleges taking music courses. The distinction between these groups lies in their objectives: students in music colleges pursue professional development for future careers, while those taking music courses aim to enhance their comprehensive artistic literacy.

A total enumeration sampling technique was applied, involving the selection of 400 student respondents to participate in the survey. This method was chosen to ensure comprehensive data collection from the entire study population. The total enumeration guarantees that the participants represent the entire group of interest. Participants were selected based on their enrollment status at Taishan University, ensuring that the data collected was both detailed and inclusive for thorough analysis.

2.3. Data gathering procedure

The data gathering procedure for this study on the impact of educational leadership on music education in universities involved several systematic steps to ensure accuracy and reliability.

First, the researcher identified the specific population and developed a sampling frame. The selection criteria ensured a representative sample that could provide comprehensive insights into the research questions.

Next, a structured questionnaire was designed based on the study objectives. The questionnaire consisted of items related to the respondents' demographic profiles, assessments of educational leadership practices, and perceptions of their impact on music education. A four-point Likert scale was used to measure the degree of agreement or disagreement with various statements.

BePrior tohe full deployment of the questionnaire, a pilot test was conducted with a small group of respondents from the specific population. This preliminary test helped identify any ambiguities or issues with the questionnaire, which was then subsequently revised to improve its clarity and reliability.

With the refined questionnaire ready, the researcher sought and obtained permission from university administrators to conduct the research. Then, the main data collection phase began. Participants were contacted via email or in-person meetings, and the purpose of the study was explained. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring that they were fully aware of the study's aims, their role and their right to withdraw at any time.

The questionnaire was distributed to the selected respondents. Participants were given a specified time frame to complete and return the questionnaires. Follow-up reminders were sent to maximize the response rate and ensure comprehensive data collection. Upon receiving the completed questionnaires, the researcher meticulously checked for completeness and consistency. Incomplete or inconsistent responses were excluded from the analysis to maintain data integrity.

The collected data were then systematically entered into a statistical software for analysis. Descriptive statistics, comparative analysis, and correlation studies were conducted to address the research questions and test the hypotheses. The results were interpreted and discussed in the context of the existing literature on educational leadership and music education, providing insights and recommendations based on the findings. The data gathering procedure was conducted with strict adherence to ethical standards, ensuring the confidentiality and privacy of all participants throughout the study.

2.4. Statistical analysis

The data were statistically analyzed so that the researcher could rapidly study and comprehend the findings. Data had to be statistically processed in order to be used for the intended purposes. For accurate conclusions to be drawn, data layout is crucial. As a result, statistical analysis was performed using appropriate statistical techniques to assess the given data.

A statistical data description's primary objective is to caution researchers against making assumptions about the results that the data do not support. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to conduct the study objectives and subsequent statistical methods.

3. Results and analysis

The following section presents the findings of the study, analyzing the data collected from the respondents. The results are discussed in relation to the research objectives, focusing on the impact of instructional leadership on student outcomes in music education.

Table 1

Summary of Instructional Leadership in Music Education

Domain	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
Goal Setting	3.74	0.60	1	Highly Manifested
Resource Management	3.67	0.68	4	Highly Manifested
Development Skills	3.69	0.64	3	Highly Manifested
Leadership Quality	3.72	0.61	2	Highly Manifested
Instructional Leadership in Music Education	3.70	0.63	-	Highly Manifested

Scale: 3.51–4.00 Highly Manifested; 2.51–3.50 Manifested; 1.51–2.50 Slightly Manifested; 1.00–1.50 Not Manifested

Table 1 presents a summary of the assessed level of instructional leadership in music education, with each domain evaluated by its mean, standard deviation (SD), rank, and interpretation. All domains were interpreted as "Highly Manifested," indicating a strong perception of instructional leadership across different areas of music education. The highest-ranked domain is "Goal Setting," with a mean of 3.74 and an SD of 0.60. This suggests that setting clear, achievable goals is the most prominent aspect of instructional leadership among the teachers evaluated, with a focus on aligning these goals with both course objectives and students' needs.

Overall, the mean for instructional leadership in music education was 3.70, with an SD of 0.63, indicating that, across all domains, instructional leadership was consistently perceived as strong and highly manifested. The top three domains, in order, are goal setting, leadership quality, and development skills, with resource management ranking the lowest among the four domains, although it still receives high ratings from respondents.

The overall high mean score (M = 3.70) across leadership domains underscores the strong positive impact of leadership on music education's educational outcomes. Effective leadership, as noted in resource management (M = 3.67) and leadership quality (M = 3.72), aligns with the literature that stresses the importance of visionary and collaborative leadership in fostering an enriching learning environment (Kezar & Holcombe, 2017).

Table 2: *Differences in Instructional Leadership based on Age*

Domain	Categories	Mean	F-Value	Sig.	Interpretation/ Decision
Goal Setting	Less than 18 years old	3.72	0.95	0.73	Not significant/accept H0
	18-21 years old	3.69			
	22-25 years old	3.71			
	More than 25 years old	3.72			
Resource Management	Less than 18 years old	3.70	0.97	0.50	Not significant/accept H0
	18-21 years old	3.71			
	22-25 years old	3.72			
	More than 25 years old	3.71			
Development Skills	Less than 18 years old	3.69	1.16	0.41	Not significant/accept H0
	18-21 years old	3.71			
	22-25 years old	3.69			
	More than 25 years old	3.70			
Leadership Quality	Less than 18 years old	3.69	1.01	0.26	Not significant/accept H0
	18-21 years old	3.71			
	22-25 years old	3.69			
	More than 25 years old	3.71			
Instructional Leadership	Less than 18 years old	3.72	1.19	0.24	Not significant/accept H0
	18-21 years old	3.71			
	22-25 years old	3.69			
	More than 25 years old	3.70			

Level of significance = 0.05.

Table 2 outlines the differences in instructional leadership based on the age of respondents across four domains: Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, and Leadership Quality. The mean values for each age category, F-value, significance level (Sig.), and the corresponding interpretation/decision are presented for each domain. Across all domains, the findings indicate no significant differences in instructional leadership based on age, as all significance values (Sig.) are greater than 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H0).

In summary, across all domains—Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, Leadership Quality, and overall Instructional Leadership—there was no significant difference in the assessment of instructional leadership based on the age of the respondents. This suggests that instructional leadership is perceived uniformly across age groups. No significant differences were observed in instructional leadership based on age (Sig. > 0.05) suggest that leadership approaches in music education are effective across various age groups. This reflects the inclusivity of modern leadership strategies that accommodate diverse student needs and backgrounds (Yin et al., 2022).

Table 3: *Differences in Instructional Leadership based on Sex*

Domain	Categories	Mean	t-value	Sig	Interpretation/Decision
Goal Setting	Male	3.69	–0.50	0.66	Not significant/ Accept H0
	Female	3.70			
Resource Management	Male	3.71	–0.72	0.73	Not significant/ Accept H0
	Female	3.72			
Development Skills	Male	3.71	0.85	0.57	Not significant/ Accept H0
	Female	3.69			
Leadership Quality	Male	3.70	-0.51	0.77	Not significant/ Accept H0
	Female	3.71			
Instructional Leadership	Male	3.72	0.40	0.51	Not significant/ Accept H0
	Female	3.71			

Level of significance = 0.05.

Table 3 presents the differences in instructional leadership based on the sex of the respondents across four domains: Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, and Leadership Quality. The table provides the mean scores for both male and female respondents, the t-value, significance level (Sig.), and the corresponding interpretation or decision. Across all domains, the results indicate no significant differences in instructional leadership based on sex, as all significance values are greater than 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H0).

In summary, across all domains—Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, Leadership Quality, and overall Instructional Leadership—there were no significant differences between male and female respondents in their assessment of instructional leadership. This suggests that instructional leadership is perceived similarly by both sexes. Similar findings with no significant differences in leadership based on sex (Sig. > 0.05) highlight the gender-neutral impact of leadership in music education. Educational leadership should embrace gender equity, ensuring that both male and female students benefit equally from leadership efforts (Yang & Li, 2022).

Table 4: *Differences in Instructional Leadership based on Grade Level*

Domain	Categories	Mean	F-Value	Sig.	Interpretation/ Decision
Goal Setting	1st year	3.70	0.53	0.66	Not significant/accept H0
	2nd year	3.70			
	3rd year	3.72			
	4th year	3.72			
Resource Management	1st year	3.70	1.21	0.19	Not significant/accept H0
	2nd year	3.70			
	3rd year	3.72			
	4th year	3.72			
Development Skills	1st year	3.72	0.57	0.87	Not significant/accept H0
	2nd year	3.71			
	3rd year	3.69			
	4th year	3.70			
Leadership Quality	1st year	3.72	1.38	0.17	Not significant/accept H0
	2nd year	3.71			
	3rd year	3.69			
	4th year	3.72			
Instructional Leadership	1st year	3.71	0.73	0.53	Not significant/accept H0
	2nd year	3.72			
	3rd year	3.71			
	4th year	3.70			

Level of significance = 0.05.

Table 4 examines the differences in instructional leadership based on the grade level of the respondents across four domains: Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, and Leadership Quality. The mean scores for each grade level (1st to 4th year), F-value, significance level (Sig.), and the corresponding interpretation or decision are presented. Across all domains, no significant differences were found based on grade level, as all significance values were greater than 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H0).

In summary, no significant differences in instructional leadership were observed across all domains—Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, Leadership Quality, and overall Instructional Leadership—based on the grade level of the respondents. This indicates that students consistently perceive instructional leadership. Non-significant differences in leadership based on grade level (Sig. > 0.05) indicate that leadership strategies are perceived consistently across different student cohorts. Leaders must adapt to the developmental needs of all students, regardless of their year-level (Chen & Zhang, 2019).

Table 5: *Differences in Instructional Leadership based on Specialization*

Domain	Categories	Mean	F-Value	Sig.	Interpretation/ Decision
Goal Setting	Percussion	3.72	0.95	0.81	Not significant/accept H0
	Woodwind	3.72			
	Brass	3.71			
	Strings	3.71			
Resource Management	Percussion	3.71	0.64	0.65	Not significant/accept H0
	Woodwind	3.71			
	Brass	3.72			
	Strings	3.69			
Development Skills	Percussion	3.70	1.11	0.10	Not significant/accept H0
	Woodwind	3.69			
	Brass	3.70			
	Strings	3.70			
Leadership Quality	Percussion	3.70	0.91	0.55	Not significant/accept H0
	Woodwind	3.70			
	Brass	3.71			
	Strings	3.71			
Instructional Leadership	Percussion	3.71	0.48	0.66	Not significant/accept H0
	Woodwind	3.70			
	Brass	3.71			
	Strings	3.71			

Level of significance = 0.05.

Table 5 examines the differences in instructional leadership based on the specialization of the respondents across four domains: Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, and Leadership Quality. The table provides the mean scores for each specialization (Percussion, Woodwind, Brass, and Strings), F-value, significance level (Sig.), and the corresponding interpretation or decision. Across all domains, no significant differences were found based on specialization because all significance values were greater than 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H0).

In summary, across all domains—Goal Setting, Resource Management, Development Skills, Leadership Quality, and overall Instructional Leadership—no significant differences were observed based on the specialization of the respondents. This indicates that instructional leadership is consistently perceived across different specializations in music education. The absence of significant differences across specializations (Sig. > 0.05) suggests that instructional leadership is equally effective across different music disciplines. This aligns with the notion that leadership must accommodate interdisciplinary collaboration in education (Sousa & Tomlinson, 2019).

Table 6: *Summary of Academic Outcomes*

Domain	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation
Classroom Performance	3.72	0.61	1	Highly Evident
Subject Motivation	3.71	0.61	3	Highly Evident
Resource Availability	3.70	0.63	4	Highly Evident
Academic Outcomes	3.71	0.62	-	Highly Evident

Scale: 3.51–4.00, highly evident; 2.51–3.50, evident; 1.51–2.50, slightly evident; 1.00–1.50, not evident

Table 6 provides a summary of academic outcomes across three domains: Classroom Performance, Subject Motivation, and Resource Availability. Each domain was evaluated based on its mean, standard deviation (SD), and rank, with the overall interpretation being "Highly Evident" for all domains. The summary also includes the overall academic outcomes derived from the three domains.

Overall, the mean for academic outcomes was 3.71, with an SD of 0.62, indicating a high level of consistency in students' perceptions of the positive impact of instructional leadership on their academic performance, motivation, and access to resources. The top-ranked domain highlights the critical role of instructional leadership in classroom performance, whereas resource availability, though essential, ranks slightly lower in contributing to academic outcomes.

The overall academic outcomes (M = 3.71) were highly influenced by leadership in music education, as demonstrated by the high scores in classroom performance, motivation, and resource availability. Effective leadership drives student success through strategic resource management, goal setting, and student engagement (Chen & Zhang, 2019).

Table 7

Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Academic Outcomes

Variables		Goal-Setting	Resource Management	Development Skills	Leadership Quality	Instructional Leadership
Classroom Performance	Pearson *r*	0.81	0.80	0.83	0.79	0.85
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subject Motivation	Pearson *r*	0.82	0.80	0.79	0.83	0.79
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Resource Availability	Pearson *r*	0.84	0.81	0.82	0.82	0.81
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Academic Outcomes	Pearson *r*	0.79	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.80
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Level of significance = 0.05.

Table 7 presents the significant relationships between instructional leadership dimensions—goal-setting, resource management, development skills, and leadership quality—and various academic outcomes, including classroom performance, subject motivation, resource availability, and overall academic outcomes.

In summary, Table 7 highlights the critical role of instructional leadership in influencing academic outcomes, confirming that strong leadership practices in goal setting, resource management, and development skills significantly improve student performance, motivation, and resource availability. All relationships were statistically significant, emphasizing the importance of effective leadership in fostering a positive educational environment.

Based on the data, all academic outcomes—Classroom Performance, Subject Motivation, Resource Availability, and overall Academic Outcomes—are significantly and positively correlated with instructional leadership. This highlights the critical role that instructional leadership plays in fostering better academic results. The strongest relationship was found between instructional leadership and classroom performance (r = 0.85, p = 0.00), supporting the idea that effective leadership significantly enhances students' academic achievements in music education (Chen & Zhang, 2019).

The strong positive correlation with subject motivation (r = 0.79, p = 0.00) reflects how leaders who set clear goals and foster engagement can drive student interest and enthusiasm (Guo & Xu, 2020). The significant relationship between leadership and resource availability (r = 0.81, p = 0.00) further emphasizes the leader's role in ensuring that adequate resources are provided, enhancing the overall learning environment (Bryson, 2018). the significant, strong, positive correlation between instructional leadership and academic outcomes (r = 0.80, p = 0.00) underscores the central role of leadership in shaping educational success, which aligns with the broader

literature emphasizing strategic planning, resource management, and effective communication as essential components of educational leadership (Zhang et al., 2022; Sousa & Tomlinson, 2019).

REFERENCES

Adams, M. C., & Miskell, R. C. (2016). Teacher trust in district administration: A promising line of inquiry. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(4), 675–706.

Asmus, E. P. (1999). Music assessment concepts. *Music Educators Journal, 86*(2), 19–24.

Atlas, A. W. (1998). *Renaissance Music: Music in Western Europe, 1400–1600*. W.W. Norton and Company.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (3rd Ed.). The Free Press.

Bastian, C. K., & Henry, T. G. (2015). The apprentice: Pathways to principalship and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 51*(4), 600–639.

Bryson, J. M. (2018). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement*. John Wiley & Sons.

Burnard, P., and Haddon, E. (2015). *Activating diverse musical creativities: Teaching and learning in higher music education*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Campbell, P. S., & Scott-Kassner, C. (2013). *Music in Childhood: From Preschool through the Elementary Grades*. Schirmer.

Cannata, M., Rubin, M., Goldring, E., et al. (2017). Using teacher effectiveness data for information-rich hiring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*(2), 180–222.

Cell, C. P. (1974). Charismatic heads of state: The social context. *Behavior Science Research, 9*(2), 255–305.

Chen, J., & Li, H. (2020). Evaluation mechanisms in music education: Strategies and impacts. *Journal of Music Education*.

Chen, M., & Zhang, L. (2021). Innovative approaches to educational leadership: Theory and practice. *Educational Leadership Journal*, 30(2), 78–92. doi: 10.1016/j.edu.2021.05.004.

Chen, M., Xu, Y., & Zhang, L. (2020). Innovative teaching methods in music education: addressing global trends. *Journal of Music Education Research*, 12(3), 45–59. doi:10.1080/00207454.2020.1764237

Chen, X., & Wang, Y. (2020). Leadership in music education: insights and innovations. *Journal of Music Education, 45*(3), 214–226.

Chen, X., & Zhang, L. (2018). Global perspectives in music education: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Music Education*.

Chen, Y., & Zhang, L. (2019). Resource management in music education. *International Journal of Music Education, 37*(4), 379–395.

Cosner, S. (2009). Building organizational capacity through trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(2).

Davis, J. H. (2020). *Fundamentals of higher education leadership*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(2), 22–46.

De Groot, K., Kiker, D. S., & Cross, T. C. (2000). A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 17*(4), 356–371.

Ellis, C., Skidmore, T. S., & Combs, P. J. (2017). The hiring process matters the role of person-job and person-organization fit in teacher satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*(3), 448–474.

Fautley, M., & Murphy, R. (2015). *Assessment in music education*. Oxford University Press.

Fuller, E., Young, M., & Baker, D. B. (2011). Do principal preparation programs influence student achievement through mediating of teacher-team qualifications by the principal? An exploratory analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(1), 173–216.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why is can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.

Guo, X. (2017). Analysis of the reform of physical education teaching in colleges and universities under the idea of lifelong physical education. *Journal of Chifeng College* (Natural Science Edition), 08, 134–135.

Guo, X., & Xu, Q. (2020). The role of leadership in enhancing music education quality: An empirical study. *Journal of Music Education Research*, 14(1), 33–47. doi:10.1080/00207454.2020.1756104.

Hiley, D. (1993). *Western Plainchant: A Handbook*. Oxford University Press.

Ho, W. C. (2014). *Globalization, National Education Policies, and Reforms: Insights into China and Taiwan*. Springer.

Ho, W. C. (2017). *Music education in China: Policy, administration, and delivery since 1949*. Routledge.

Huang, H., & Zhang, L. (2020). Transforming music education through leadership: An overview. International Journal of Music Education, 38(4), 560–572. doi:10.1177/0255761420924518.

Huang, H., & Zhang, L. (2020). Transforming music education through effective leadership: insights and practices. *International Journal of Music Education,* 38(4), 560-572. doi:10.1177/0255761420924518.

Ishimaru, A. (2013). From heroes to organizers: Principals and education in urban school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(1), 3–51.

Johnson, L., & Pak, Y. (2018). Leadership for democracy in challenging times: Historical case studies in the United States and Canada. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 54*(3), 396–426.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2008). *The art of teaching music*. Indiana University Press.

Kanungo, R. N., & Conger, J. A. (1992). Charisma: Exploring new dimensions of leadership behavior. *Psychology and Developing Societies, 4*(1), 21–38.

Kennedy, M. M. (2019). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research, 89*(4), 547–588.

Kezar, A., & Holcombe, E. (2017). *Shared leadership in higher education: Lessons learned from research and practice*. American Council on Education.

Klar, W. H., and Brewer, A. C. (2013). Successful leadership in high-needs schools: An examination of core leadership practices in challenging contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(5), 768–808.

Kowalski, T. (2009). Evidence-based practices in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(3), 351–374.

Koyama, J. (2014). Principals as Bricoleurs: Making sense and making do in an era of accountability. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 50*(2), 279–304.

Lamont, A., & Maton, K. (2008). *Exploring musical learning*. Oxford University Press.

Leong, S. (2012). *Musicianship in the 21st century: Issues, trends & possibilities*. Australian Music Center.

Li, F., & Xu, Z. (2022). Innovations in music education leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Education, 20*(1), 45–62.

Li, J., & Wang, H. (2020). Educational leadership and its impact on music education: A comprehensive study. *Music Education Research*, 22(3), 299–313. doi:10.1080/14613808.2020.1802553.

Li, J., Wang, H., & Zhou, M. (2018). The impact of leadership on music education: A comprehensive study. *Music Education Research*, 20(1), 25–39. doi:10.1080/14613808.2018.1489682.

Liang, J. G., & Peters-Hawkins. (2017). "I am more than what I look alike": Asian- American women in public school administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*(1), 40–69.

Liu, J., & Huo, Q. (2021). Strategic thinking in music education leadership. *Educational Leadership Journal, 30*(2), 159–175.

Liu, Y. (2009). *The history of Chinese music education*. Shanghai Music Publishing House.

Liu, Y. (2021). Professional development for music educators: Best practices and strategies. *Music Education Research*.

Mackey, J. H. (2017). ESSA in the Indian Country: Problematizing self-determination through the relationships between federal, state, and tribal governments. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*(5), 782–808.

Mark, M. L. (2002). *History of American music education*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Min Sun, Y., and Yongmei Ni. (2016). Work environments and labor markets: Explaining the principal turnover gap between charter and traditional public schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(1), 144–183.

Mitani, H. (2018). Principals' working conditions, job stress, and turnover behaviors under NCLB accountability pressure. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 54*(5), 822–862.

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage Publications.

O'Neill, S. A. (2017). *Motivation in music: Theories and applications*. Routledge.

Parker, M. (2012). *Understanding the context of music education*. Oxford University Press.

Pennington, P. (2005). The leadership pie: Grab your piece before it's gone! *Journal of Leadership Education, 4*(1), 75.

Robinson, K., & Wager, E. (2020). *The arts in schools: Principles, practices, and provision*. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Romero, S. L., and Mitchell, E. D. (2018). Toward understanding trust: A response to Adams and Miskell. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 54*(1), 152-170.

Schmidt, P. K. (2005). *Reconceptualizing music education*. Rowman and Littlefield Education.

Science, technology, engineering, and math education for future leadership. (*Gasworld: Incorporating CryoGas International*).

Scientometric Methods for Identifying Scientific Leaders: New Mathematical Models. (*Automatic Documentation and Mathematical Linguistics*).

Shaw, R. D. (2018). *Leadership in higher education: Practices that make a difference*. Routledge.

Smith, A. (2020). Educational informatisation in music education: Integrating technology for enhanced learning outcomes. *Educational Leadership Journal*.

Sousa, D.A. and Tomlinson, C. A. (2019). Differentiation and the brain: how neuroscience supports the learner-friendly classroom. ASCD. ISBN: 978-1416627223.

Swanwick, K. (1999). *Teaching music musically*. Routledge.

Tang, Y., & He, X. (2021). The effect of the sport education model in physical education on student learning attitude: A systematic review. BMC Public Health 21, 1061. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10748-6.

Wang, C. (2013). A study of the problems and countermeasures of music education in Chinese colleges and universities. *Journal of Music Education*.

Wang, Q. (2017). Leadership in higher education in China: Cultural contexts and practices. *Asia Pacific Education Review*.

Watkins, C., & Goetz, M. (2021). *Beyond the classroom: Engaging the community in music education*. Oxford University Press.

Webster, P. R., & Richardson, C. P. (2020). *New directions in music education*. Oxford University Press.

Wu, J., & Xu, Z. (2021). Interdisciplinary collaborations in music education: Leadership strategies and benefits. *Arts Education Policy Review*.

Yang, B. (2019). *Music during the Age of Confucianism: The Chinese Song Dynasty (960–1279) and its Musical Legacy*. University of Illinois Press.

Yang, J. (2018). Modern developments in Chinese music education. *Journal of Music and Arts, 56*(1), 33-47.

Yang, S., & Li, T. (2017). Educational leadership in music: Practices and outcomes. *Journal of Music and Education*, 29(2), 102–114. doi:10.1080/0141182X.2017.1315629.

Yang, S., & Li, T. (2022). Innovative leadership in music education: Theoretical and practical perspectives. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 18(2), 120–135. doi:10.1080/10408344.2022.2155548.

Yang, Y., & Li, X. (2018). Student-centered approaches in music education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 29*(4), 221–238.

Yin, Z., Zhang, X., & Liu, F. (2022). Leadership in music education: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Music Education Research*, 16(4), 50-65. doi:10.1080/00207454.2022.1959826.

Yip, H. K. (2007). Reforming music education in China. *Education Journal*.

Zhang, H., & Huang, Q. (2016). Comparative analysis of educational leadership. *Educational Research Review, 11*(2), 123–145.

Zhang, L. (2019). The evolution of music education in higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 15(2), 201–214. doi:10.1007/s10755-019-09423-2.

Zhang, L., Li, M., & Zhou, W. (2022). The role of educational leadership in enhancing music education outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 45(1), 78-92. doi:10.1007/s10755-022-09840-2.

Zhang, Y. (2015). Music education during the Song dynasty. *Chinese Culture Journal, 13*(3), pp. 67–89.

Zhao, Y., & Li, C. (2019). Challenges and opportunities in educational leadership in China. *Chinese Education & Society*.

Zhou, M., and Tang, S. (2020). Teacher training and professional development in music education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(3), pp. 201–217.