

Principal Visionary Leadership in Learning-Quality Improvement at SD Negeri Baros 1, Ketanggungan: A Qualitative Case Study

Melia Kurniawati ¹, Nurkolis ², Nur Khoiri ³

¹ Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia; meiliaoezank@gmail.com

² Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia; nurkolis@upgris.ac.id

³ Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia; nurkhoiri@upgris.ac.id

Received: 13/06/2026		Revised: 28/08/2026	Accepted: 31/10/2026
Abstract	<p>This qualitative case study examines how the principal's visionary leadership was enacted in relation to learning-quality improvement at SD Negeri Baros 1, Ketanggungan, Brebes. Data were drawn from semi-structured interviews, direct observations, and school documents and analyzed through data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing, supported by source and technique triangulation. The findings show that the school vision was formulated from an internal diagnosis and stakeholder deliberation, then translated into programs through repeated communication, teacher professional learning, role distribution, instructional experimentation, and academic supervision. Evaluation through classroom visits, semester and annual reviews, reflection, and follow-up helped maintain alignment between school priorities and instructional practice. The strongest evidence concerns changes in lesson planning, support for active learning, assessment follow-up, and a school culture of literacy, discipline, and collaboration; the study does not claim measured gains in student achievement. The study suggests that visionary leadership supported improvement when the vision functioned as a coordinating reference linking shared direction, teacher enactment, instructional support, and evidence-informed follow-up.</p>		
Keywords	Academic Supervision; Learning Quality; Principal Leadership; School Culture; Visionary Leadership		
Corresponding Author Melia Kurniawati Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia; meiliaoezank@gmail.com			

1. INTRODUCTION

Improving learning quality in elementary schools is not limited to academic achievement. Schools are also expected to provide learning experiences that help students think critically, communicate, collaborate, create, and adapt. These expectations make learning quality a shared responsibility that needs to be supported by sound planning, teacher development, and consistent school management. At the elementary level, the quality of learning experiences is particularly important because this is the stage at which students begin to develop foundational competencies and learning habits (Mardhiyah et al., 2021).

In this study, learning quality is understood primarily through the quality of classroom processes. Attention is directed not only to final learning outcomes but also to how teachers plan lessons, clarify objectives, select methods and media, build interaction, engage students, provide feedback, assess learning, and follow up on the results. This perspective makes it possible to view learning quality as a



connected set of processes that can be continuously improved through organizational support from the school (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

Principals play an important role in creating these conditions because leadership decisions shape school direction, opportunities for teacher learning, professional culture, and support for instruction. The influence of school leadership on student outcomes is generally indirect, operating through conditions that affect teachers' work and classroom practice. For this reason, research on school leadership needs to pay attention to how principals' decisions and actions are translated into everyday practice rather than focusing only on associations between leadership styles and student achievement (Wu & Shen, 2022).

Visionary leadership offers a relevant lens for examining this process. It emphasizes a leader's capacity to establish a clear future direction, communicate that direction to organizational members, and use it to guide priorities. In schools, a vision becomes meaningful when it informs programs, teacher development, resource use, and school culture. In this sense, vision is more than a formal statement; it becomes a shared reference for school-improvement work (Elkington et al., 2017).

Visionary leadership, however, needs to be distinguished from other educational leadership approaches. Instructional leadership focuses more directly on curriculum, teaching, supervision, and teacher professional learning, whereas transformational leadership places greater emphasis on organizational change through motivation, commitment, and shared values. In practice, these approaches may overlap. This study therefore treats visionary leadership primarily as the principal's work of establishing and sustaining a shared future direction, while supervision, teacher development, and instructional innovation are examined as practices that help realize that direction (Gümüş et al., 2018).

The value of a vision also depends on how it is translated into organizational practice. A well-formulated vision does not automatically lead to change when it is not collectively understood or aligned with school strategies. At SD Negeri Baros 1, the initial conditions of the study showed that the school vision was not yet used consistently as a reference for instruction, the use of active learning models and media varied across classrooms, professional development was not yet organized as a strong cycle, and supervision and reflection were uneven. These conditions highlight the importance of participation, communication, and alignment between vision and school programs if a shared direction is to guide practice (Ateş et al., 2020).

Previous studies have widely examined relationships between principal leadership, school climate, teacher performance, and student outcomes. Such findings are valuable, but they do not always explain in detail how a school vision moves from formulation to programs, teacher practice, supervision, evaluation, and follow-up within a particular school context. This process gap is the focus of the present study. By examining one case in depth, the study seeks to show how leadership direction is connected with teachers' work and instructional improvement while remaining attentive to the specific characteristics of the research setting (Dutta & Sahney, 2022).

The novelty of this study lies in explaining how vision functions as a connecting reference across different school-improvement activities. Rather than examining vision formulation alone, the study traces how the vision is translated into programs, communication, teacher empowerment, professional development, instructional innovation, supervision, reflection, and follow-up. Accordingly, this study analyzes the implementation of the principal's visionary leadership in improving learning quality at SD Negeri Baros 1, Ketanggungan District, Brebes Regency, with a focus on vision formulation, vision implementation, and vision evaluation and reinforcement.

2. METHODS

This study employed a qualitative case-study design to develop an in-depth understanding of visionary leadership within the natural setting of one school. The study was conducted at SD Negeri Baros 1, Ketanggungan District, Brebes Regency, in 2026. Participants were selected purposively on the basis of their involvement in and knowledge of school management and instructional processes. The main sources of data included the principal, teachers, educational staff, and other school members relevant to quality-improvement programs. This selection provided both a leadership perspective and the experiences of those involved in implementing school programs.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews, direct observation, and document analysis. The interviews explored vision formulation, strategic direction, vision communication, program development, instructional innovation, teacher empowerment, school culture, evaluation, and reflection. Observation was used to examine leadership and instructional practices directly, while the documents included the School Work Plan (RKS), School Activity and Budget Plan (RKAS), school work programs, academic-supervision programs, lesson plans or modules, teacher-development programs, supervision records, assessment documents, and school evaluation reports. The three techniques were used in a complementary manner so that the findings did not rely on interview accounts alone.

Data were analyzed interactively through data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The material was first organized around three main areas of visionary leadership: vision formulation, vision implementation, and vision evaluation and reinforcement. Evidence from interviews, observations, and documents was then compared to identify consistent patterns, differences in accounts, and relationships among themes. Trustworthiness was strengthened through source and technique triangulation so that interpretations were not based on a single type of evidence. This process is consistent with thematic-analysis principles that emphasize traceable analytical decisions and coherence between data, categories, and themes (Nowell et al., 2017).

Learning quality was examined through the three domains used in the research instruments: planning, instructional implementation, and learning evaluation. Planning included lesson plans or modules and clarity of objectives; implementation covered variation in methods, use of media, student engagement, classroom interaction, classroom management, and learning motivation; and evaluation included feedback, process and outcome assessment, reflection, competency attainment, and follow-up. These domains were then considered in relation to the stages of visionary leadership to explain how the school vision was translated into quality-improvement practices without assuming causal effects beyond the evidence available from the case study.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings

The findings are presented in four connected parts: vision formulation, vision implementation, evaluation and reinforcement, and changes in learning-quality practices. Interview, observation, and documentary evidence point to a recurring pattern in which the vision became visible through repeated communication, participation, professional support, supervision, and follow-up. The sections below trace how that pattern developed within the school.

Vision formulation: from needs diagnosis to shared direction

The principal described vision formulation as beginning with an internal review of academic achievement, instructional quality, student character, and the school environment. Teachers, educational staff, the school committee, and parent representatives were then involved in discussions about the school's current condition and future priorities. The principal characterized the process as 'participatory and gradual,' with the resulting vision emphasizing academic improvement, character,

literacy, numeracy, teacher competence, and a positive school culture (principal interview, 16 June 2026).

The teacher account gives the participatory process a more practical meaning. Teachers were involved in planning meetings and IHT forums and were given space to raise ideas, classroom needs, and implementation concerns. The teacher noted that this involvement created a stronger sense of responsibility for school programs because the priorities discussed at school level were connected with conditions encountered in the classroom (teacher interview, 13 June 2026). The RKS and RKAS then provided a formal bridge between the agreed direction and the programs to be implemented.

Table 1. Synthesis of Vision-Formulation Evidence

Aspect	Empirical evidence	Interpretation
Needs diagnosis	Internal review covered academic achievement, instructional quality, student character, and the school environment.	Future direction was connected to recognized school needs.
Participation	Teachers, educational staff, the school committee, and parent representatives were involved in planning forums.	Participation created shared understanding and practical input.
Strategic priorities	The vision emphasized achievement, character, literacy, numeracy, teacher competence, active learning, and positive culture.	The vision specified priorities relevant to learning rather than remaining generic.
Program translation	RKS and RKAS documented learning-quality programs, teacher development, and resource support.	Planning documents linked direction with implementation and resources.

Source: Research data, 2026

Table 1 shows that vision formulation at Baros 1 combined needs diagnosis, participation, strategic priorities, and program translation. The significance of this pattern lies in the movement from a formal statement toward an operational direction: school needs informed the discussion, stakeholders contributed practical considerations, and the resulting priorities were incorporated into planning and budgeting documents. This combination gave the vision a clearer place in the school's improvement work.

Vision Implementation: Repeated Communication, Empowerment, and Instructional Support

Implementation occurred through both formal and informal communication. The principal reported using beginning-of-year meetings, routine teacher meetings, IHT/workshops, school documents, displays in strategic spaces, supervision, and day-to-day conversations. A teacher similarly stated that the vision was repeatedly explained in meetings, morning briefings, classroom supervision, and direct conversations. The repetition mattered because it connected an abstract statement with specific work situations rather than treating socialization as a single ceremonial event.

A second pattern was the translation of the vision into programs and responsibilities. Annual planning emphasized learning quality, teacher competence, literacy and numeracy, character development, and instructional innovation. Responsibilities were distributed according to competence, and teachers were involved in planning, implementation, and evaluation. One teacher explained that teachers were involved in program planning, learning implementation, and school evaluation, while

IHT and teacher working groups provided opportunities for continued professional development (teacher interview, 12 June 2026).

Instructional experimentation was supported rather than prescribed as a single method. The principal encouraged teachers to move beyond conventional routines and to try active, creative, and student-centered approaches, including PBL and PjBL. The field records also mention learning media and opportunities for teachers to adapt instruction to classroom needs. Academic supervision was described as developmental rather than judgmental, which positioned supervision as a source of feedback for experimentation rather than only as compliance control.

Table 2. Synthesis of Vision-Implementation Evidence

Implementation pathway	Empirical evidence	Implication for practice
Repeated communication	Meetings, IHT/workshops, briefings, supervision, displays, and daily conversation.	The vision was repeatedly connected to concrete work situations.
Teacher empowerment	Responsibilities were allocated by competence; teachers participated in planning, implementation, and evaluation.	Teachers were positioned as actors in improvement, not only program recipients.
Professional learning	IHT, KKG, workshops, peer discussion, and academic supervision.	Teacher learning became an implementation resource.
Instructional experimentation	PBL, PjBL, varied methods, learning media, and room for teacher creativity.	The vision was associated with supported changes in instructional practice.
Positive routines	Discipline, literacy, cleanliness, cooperation, and role modelling.	Organizational routines reinforced the shared direction.

Source: Research data, 2026

Table 2 indicates that vision implementation was sustained through several connected practices: repeated communication, teacher empowerment, professional learning, instructional experimentation, and positive school routines. None of these practices worked in isolation. Their importance lay in keeping the school's direction present in everyday decisions while allowing teachers to exercise professional judgment in the classroom (Campbell et al., 2019).

Evaluation and Reinforcement: Turning Supervision into a Feedback Loop

Evaluation combined formal review and continuous reflection. The principal described semester and year-end meetings that examined program achievement, alignment with the vision, and implementation constraints. Academic supervision included classroom observation, review of learning devices, and consideration of student-learning evidence. Informal discussions with teachers and input from the school committee were also used to identify issues that might not wait for scheduled evaluation meetings.

The teacher account confirms that supervision and evaluation were experienced as part of improvement work. Classroom supervision was used to observe the learning process and the attainment of learning objectives, after which the results were discussed as material for reflection and program improvement (teacher interview, 12 June 2026). Documentary evidence also shows scheduled supervision, instruments for reviewing learning devices and classroom processes, and supervision

reports used as a basis for teacher development.

Table 3. Synthesis of Vision-Evaluation and Reinforcement Evidence

Evaluation process	Empirical evidence	Improvement function
Classroom monitoring	Class visits and direct observation of learning.	Provided evidence about implementation in practice.
Academic supervision	Scheduled supervision, review of learning devices and classroom process, developmental coaching.	Connected monitoring with professional support.
Formal review	Semester and year-end meetings considered achievement, constraints, and program alignment.	Created a structured forum for collective reflection.
Continuous reflection	Informal discussion with teachers and contextual stakeholder input.	Allowed issues to be identified outside formal review periods.
Follow-up	Program revision, teacher-competence development, instructional replanning, and remedial action.	Returned evaluation evidence to improvement decisions.

Source: Research data, 2026

Table 3 shows how evaluation fed information back into implementation. Classroom monitoring provided evidence about practice; academic supervision connected that evidence with professional support; review meetings created a space for collective reflection; and follow-up returned the results to program revision, teacher-development priorities, and instructional planning. Evaluation therefore formed part of an ongoing improvement cycle rather than a separate final activity.

Learning-Quality Changes Observed Across the Study Period

Learning quality was examined through the same operational dimensions used in the study instruments. The January diagnostic observation showed that the school vision had not yet been used consistently as a reference for classroom planning, active methods and technology-supported media varied across classes, professional development was not yet systematic, and supervision and reflection were still intermittent. Later 2026 records documented lesson modules aligned with learning outcomes and student characteristics, active-learning programs, IHT and KKG activities, scheduled supervision, varied assessment practices, and program follow-up.

The clearest changes appeared in the organization and support of instruction. Later evidence shows stronger alignment between school priorities and lesson planning, broader support for active learning, and more structured routines for supervision, reflection, and follow-up. Because the study did not use a standardized pre-post design or repeated quantitative measures of achievement, these changes are interpreted as documented improvements in instructional practice and support systems, not as estimates of a causal effect on student performance (Wu et al., 2020).

Table 4. Changes in Learning-Quality Practices Across the Study Period

Operational dimension	January 2026 diagnostic indication	Later 2026 documented evidence	Interpretation
Planning	The formal vision was not	RKS/RKAS priorities were	Later records indicate

Operational dimension	January 2026 diagnostic indication	Later 2026 documented evidence	Interpretation
	yet consistently used as a reference for classroom planning.	reflected in lesson modules/plans; objectives and follow-up planning were documented.	stronger alignment between school priorities and classroom planning.
Instructional process	Conventional practice remained visible; active models and technology-supported media were uneven.	Teachers were encouraged to use varied methods, PBL/PjBL, learning media, active interaction, and contextual adaptation.	The records show broader use of active approaches and stronger instructional support.
Evaluation/assessment	Supervision and instructional reflection had not yet become consistent routines.	Scheduled supervision, feedback, authentic assessment, reflection, remedial action, and strategy revision were documented.	The evidence indicates a more structured cycle of supervision, reflection, and follow-up.

Source: Research data, 2026

Table 4 summarizes the change pattern at the process level. The evidence points to stronger alignment in planning, broader support for active and contextual instruction, and a more structured cycle of assessment, supervision, reflection, and follow-up. These developments provide the empirical basis for discussing learning-quality improvement in this case, while the study remains focused on instructional processes rather than quantified gains in student achievement.

Vision as a Coordinating Mechanism in School Improvement

Across the three stages, one pattern became especially prominent: the vision gained practical meaning when it was repeatedly used as a reference for teacher roles, professional learning, instructional experimentation, supervision, and follow-up. At Baros 1, the distinctive feature was not simply the sequence of formulation, implementation, and evaluation, but the way the same strategic direction reappeared in planning meetings, teacher development, classroom support, and review activities. This recurring use of the vision helped connect formal school priorities with daily work (Sebastian et al., 2019).

Seen as a whole, the case formed a recurring sequence of shared direction, teacher enactment, instructional support, evidence and reflection, and subsequent adjustment. Within this sequence, supervision and teacher development-practices commonly discussed in instructional leadership-helped translate the school's future direction into support for teaching and learning. Visionary and instructional leadership therefore intersected in practice: the former maintained and coordinated a shared direction, while the latter supplied means for strengthening instruction (Liu & Hallinger, 2018).

Discussion

The main finding is that the vision at SD Negeri Baros 1 became meaningful when it was used as a shared reference across different school decisions and activities. The vision was not confined to planning documents; it could be seen in the way school programs were organized, teachers were involved, professional-development activities were directed, and supervision and evaluation were used to improve instruction. This pattern suggests that visionary leadership is not limited to formulating an image of the future. Its practical value appears when that direction helps maintain connections among planning, resource management, teacher development, and classroom practice. In this sense, the vision acted as a connecting reference that reduced the risk of improvement programs operating as separate

activities and kept them oriented toward common priorities. This way of working is consistent with the view that educational leadership and management need to maintain coherence among organizational purposes, structures, resources, and actions (Bush, 2020).

Teacher professional learning was one of the clearest links between the school vision and classroom practice. At Baros 1, in-house training, teacher working groups, workshops, peer discussion, and academic supervision were not treated simply as routine activities; they were connected with instructional needs identified as school priorities. This matters because a vision is unlikely to influence learning when teachers do not have opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills needed to enact it. In this case, professional learning gave teachers space to discuss instructional problems, try new approaches, and receive feedback after teaching. Teacher learning therefore became part of vision implementation rather than an additional activity outside the quality-improvement program. This finding supports research showing that professional development is more likely to influence practice when learning goals are clear, opportunities are organized purposefully, and principals provide continuing support (Braseth, 2021).

The importance of professional learning is also supported by research showing that the relationship between principal leadership and teacher learning is shaped by collective efficacy, trust, and the professional conditions created within the school. The Baros 1 findings add a process-oriented illustration: teacher participation, recognition, and shared work helped make the school's direction understandable and actionable in everyday practice (Karacabey et al., 2022).

Related evidence from centralized education systems places particular weight on teacher trust in explaining professional learning. This comparison is useful because it suggests that the principal's vision is unlikely to operate through a single direct pathway. At Baros 1, direction, trust-building practices, and professional opportunities appeared together, indicating that the practical effect of a vision depends on the organizational relationships through which it is enacted (Bellibaş & Gümüş, 2023).

Teacher collaboration in this study was more than a positive working relationship; it formed part of the process through which the vision was implemented. Teachers contributed to program planning, raised classroom needs, discussed practice through teacher working groups and in-house training, and participated in reflection on program implementation. Their involvement meant that school priorities were not simply delivered by the principal but were interpreted through teachers' professional experience. This helped the same school vision to be translated in ways that were more responsive to classroom needs. Collaboration also created opportunities for teachers to compare practices, share experience, and agree on follow-up while maintaining a common direction. Research on learning-centred leadership has shown that collaboration can form a pathway between leadership and changes in teacher practice. The Baros 1 case provides a process-level illustration of how such a pathway can operate within one elementary school (Kılıncı et al., 2022).

The recursive character of the case also resembles research that conceptualizes teacher collaboration for change as an iterative process of sharing, improving, and spreading practice. Rather than a linear implementation sequence, the Baros 1 evidence shows teachers receiving direction, experimenting, discussing, receiving supervision feedback, and revising practice. The similarity strengthens the interpretation of improvement as an organizational learning process rather than a one-off implementation event (Nguyen & Ng, 2020).

Teacher empowerment further strengthens this interpretation. Teachers were not only assigned responsibilities; they were invited to contribute ideas, participate in program decisions, and develop their practice. Research on teacher leadership similarly treats professional influence, decision making, and school improvement as important dimensions of teachers' roles beyond the individual classroom. In the Baros 1 setting, this participation operated within a shared strategic direction rather than replacing the principal's responsibility for maintaining coherence (Wenner & Campbell, 2017).

Professional interaction also depended on opportunities to share knowledge. The combination of IHT, KKG, supervision, and informal discussion created multiple spaces in which teachers could exchange experience and interpret school priorities. Studies of learning-centered leadership show that trust and knowledge-sharing behavior are important mechanisms linking principal leadership with teacher professional learning, which helps explain why repeated interaction mattered in this case (Talebizadeh et al., 2021).

The principal's own learning and capacity should not be overlooked. Implementing a vision that crosses planning, teacher development, supervision, and evaluation requires the leader to interpret organizational conditions and adjust leadership practice. Research on professional development for principals indicates that leadership learning is more effective when it is connected to the contextual arrangements that enable or constrain instructional leadership. This supports the practical implication that visionary leadership development should include opportunities for contextual reflection, not only vision-writing exercises (Liljenberg, 2021).

Organizational trust and pride provide another lens for understanding why repeated direction may become a behavioral norm. In the case, recognition, role modelling, and participation accompanied the communication of the vision. Research on visionary leadership has linked vision with organizational trust, pride, and citizenship behavior, suggesting that members are more likely to contribute beyond formal requirements when they believe the direction is credible and experience supportive relationships (Ismail et al., 2023).

The link between vision and innovation also depended on collaboration. Teachers were encouraged to try PBL, PjBL, and varied media while sharing practices and receiving supervision. Research in public organizations shows that visionary leadership can support team innovation through cohesion and collaboration. Although a school is a different organizational context, the mechanism is relevant because innovation in the case was embedded in collective routines rather than framed as individual creativity alone (van der Voet & Steijn, 2021).

The space for experimentation is also consistent with research connecting visionary leadership and employee creativity. The Baros 1 data do not measure creativity as an outcome, yet teachers were given discretion to try methods as long as they remained aligned with learning objectives. This suggests that a vision can provide boundaries that make experimentation legitimate: teachers know the direction but retain room to choose how to enact it in their classrooms (Zhou et al., 2018).

The emphasis on culture broadens the contribution beyond classroom technique. Discipline, literacy, cleanliness, cooperation, and role modelling were repeatedly connected to the school vision and embedded in routines. Research on visionary leadership in faith-based educational settings also shows that a future-oriented direction can shape institutional culture and holistic learner development. The Baros 1 case differs institutionally, but it likewise indicates that vision is enacted partly through cultural expectations that surround instruction (Fathih et al., 2021).

Academic supervision provides the clearest point of contact between visionary and instructional leadership. Conceptually, supervision is closely associated with instructional leadership because it deals directly with teaching, instructional planning, and teacher professional development. In the Baros 1 case, however, supervision was also used to keep classroom practice connected with the priorities agreed upon at the school level. This does not mean that visionary and instructional leadership are treated as the same construct. Rather, they appear to perform different but complementary functions: visionary leadership maintains a shared direction, while instructional practices help translate that direction into support that is closer to teachers' daily work. This interpretation is consistent with literature showing that successful school leadership usually involves combinations of practices that connect organizational direction with improvements in teaching and learning rather than relying on a single leadership label (Leithwood et al., 2020).

Evaluation and feedback were important because they kept the vision from becoming a fixed statement. The study found that supervision results, evaluation meetings, and reflection were used to adjust instructional strategies, revise lesson modules, plan remedial work, and improve school programs. Evaluation therefore did more than determine whether an activity had been completed; it informed what should happen next. This made the relationship between vision and practice dynamic: the school retained a common direction, but the means of pursuing it could be adjusted in response to evidence from implementation. At the teacher level, feedback helped identify aspects of instruction that needed to be maintained or improved; at the school level, evaluation results informed changes in programs and professional support. This process is consistent with the view that feedback is most useful when information about current performance is used to decide the next steps for improvement (Hattie, 2019).

The feedback cycle also corresponds with a management perspective on learning quality that links planning, implementation, supervision, assessment, and follow-up. The case evidence is valuable because it shows these functions being connected around a shared direction rather than treated as unrelated administrative tasks. This integration helps explain why the later records appeared more coherent than the January diagnostic picture, even though the study cannot quantify the magnitude of improvement (Gemnafle & Batlolona, 2021).

The Merdeka Curriculum provides an important local context for this coordination. School priorities were reflected in lesson modules and teacher-development activities, while teachers retained room to adapt methods to student needs. The pattern suggests that curricular flexibility can be supported by a shared school direction without requiring uniform classroom practice, which is consistent with the emphasis on teacher autonomy in elementary-school planning under the Merdeka Curriculum (Ardianti & Amalia, 2022).

Digital media remained a supporting, not dominant, change. The records mention technology-supported media, but the evidence is insufficient to claim digital transformation. Consistent with research on e-learning, media use is treated here as one form of instructional experimentation whose educational value depends on its integration into learning (Devia Kartika & Hezy Kurnia, 2022).

From a school-management perspective, the principal's work connected planning, people, resources, implementation, and evaluation. This supports the idea that leadership and management are not separate in everyday school practice: a vision needs administrative arrangements, professional support, and monitoring to become actionable. The case therefore offers a practical illustration of how management functions can support the realization of a future-oriented school direction (Mulyasa, 2021).

The teacher-empowerment findings also show that implementing a vision requires teachers to have room to take responsibility rather than simply receive directions. Their involvement in planning, the allocation of roles according to competence, and opportunities to contribute ideas created conditions in which teacher leadership could develop. This pattern is consistent with research showing that principals can foster teacher leadership through support, collaboration, and opportunities for teachers to contribute to school improvement (Adhikary, 2021).

Within the context of the Merdeka Curriculum, the finding on teacher professional space is particularly relevant. Teachers have greater flexibility to adapt instruction to student needs, but that flexibility still benefits from a clear school direction so that practices do not become fragmented. At Baros 1, the school vision and priorities provided a reference for program planning and instructional development, which is consistent with the emphasis of Merdeka Belajar on strengthening teachers' role as key actors in learning (Daga, 2021).

Distinguishing visionary, instructional, and transformational leadership is also important for interpreting the findings accurately. The data include practices that may overlap with several leadership approaches, but the study does not treat them as a single construct. Vision is examined as a shared

direction, while supervision and teacher development are considered practices that help realize that direction. This distinction is consistent with reviews showing that educational leadership models differ in their theoretical emphasis and the practices they prioritize (Daniëls et al., 2019).

School context also shapes how leadership is enacted. Baros 1 has its own needs, working culture, resources, and relationships with parents and the school committee, all of which influence how the vision is translated into programs. The findings are therefore better read as an in-depth explanation of one case than as a pattern that can be directly generalized. The importance of organizational context in understanding school leadership and school success has also been emphasized in contextual leadership research (González-Falcón et al., 2020).

The use of assessment information for follow-up strengthens the connection between learning evaluation and school improvement. In the study, assessment was not limited to final outcomes but also included feedback, reflection, remedial action, and adjustment of instructional strategies. This orientation is consistent with competency-assessment approaches that encourage schools to use information about literacy and numeracy achievement to improve learning processes rather than treating assessment only as a final score (Hanafi & Minsih, 2022).

Vision communication was also connected with the space provided for instructional innovation. At Baros 1, repeated communication through meetings, in-house training, supervision, and daily interaction helped teachers understand the direction of change while giving context to instructional experimentation. Clear communication of a vision can strengthen goal alignment and support innovation when organizational members understand how their work relates to the direction being pursued (Mascareño et al., 2020).

The technology-related findings need to be interpreted proportionately. The study identified the use of learning media and support for technology-based innovation, but the available evidence is not sufficient to describe a comprehensive digital transformation. Technology is therefore treated as one instructional resource whose value still depends on teacher competence and pedagogical use. Research in elementary schools likewise shows that teachers' digital competence is closely related to the effectiveness of digital learning media (Roudhoh et al., 2026).

The connection between principal leadership and teacher roles also indicates that organizational change did not operate only from the top down. The direction established by the principal acquired practical form when teachers participated in planning, program development, and classroom implementation. This pattern is consistent with research on integrated leadership systems showing that principal and teacher leadership may be connected through organizational processes that support school outcomes (Sebastian et al., 2017).

Teacher professional learning in this case further illustrates that leadership influence does not need to take the form of direct instruction. The principal created conditions through development forums, supervision, support, and opportunities to share practice, while teachers used those spaces to improve instruction. Such indirect mechanisms are consistent with cross-national findings showing that principal leadership can shape teacher professional learning through organizational conditions and teachers' professional experiences (Hallinger et al., 2019).

Taken together, the findings show that visionary leadership at SD Negeri Baros 1 operated through a connected set of practices. Vision formulation provided direction, participation built shared understanding, professional development helped teachers translate school priorities into instruction, and supervision and evaluation provided information for subsequent improvement. The vision can therefore be understood as an organizing reference used in everyday work rather than as a document consulted only on formal occasions. The contribution of the study lies in this process explanation: learning-quality improvement was not associated with a single action by the principal but with connections among clear direction, teacher involvement, support for instructional practice, and follow-

up based on evaluation.

The pattern also shows that consistency does not mean maintaining programs without adjustment. Rather, consistency lies in keeping the vision as a stable direction while strategies, teacher support, and follow-up are adapted to needs identified during implementation. For school management, this finding highlights the importance of connecting planning meetings, teacher-development activities, classroom supervision, program evaluation, and follow-up decisions. When these activities are linked, the vision is more likely to be present in everyday practice; when they operate separately, the vision can easily return to the status of a formal statement. Because the research was conducted in one school, this pattern is not proposed as a model that applies to every context. Instead, it offers an empirical explanation of how visionary leadership was enacted and given practical meaning within the organization studied.

4. CONCLUSION

At SD Negeri Baros 1, visionary leadership was evident not only in the formulation of a future direction but in the repeated use of that direction to organize participation, teacher learning, instructional support, and evaluation. Needs-based and participatory vision formulation created a shared point of reference; communication and teacher involvement carried it into programs and classroom work; and monitoring, academic supervision, reflection, and follow-up returned evidence to subsequent planning. The central finding is that the school vision functioned as a coordinating reference across these activities. For practice, this means that principals need to connect vision with programs and teacher development, teachers can use shared priorities as a basis for collaborative experimentation and reflection, and supervisors can position supervision as developmental feedback that strengthens the continuity of school improvement. In practical terms, principals need to ensure that the vision is translated into work agendas that teachers can recognize, while supervision and professional development should respond to instructional needs that actually emerge in classrooms. In this way, evaluation does not remain an administrative exercise but becomes part of an improvement cycle linking planning, implementation, and follow-up.

These findings need to be read within the boundaries of a single qualitative case. The study draws on interviews, observations, and documentary evidence collected during one research period and does not include repeated quantitative measures of student achievement. Its contribution is therefore an explanation of how strategic direction, teacher work, instructional support, and feedback were connected in this school. Further research across schools with different resources and social contexts, particularly studies combining qualitative evidence with longitudinal indicators of teaching quality and student learning, would help test the sustainability and wider relevance of this coordination process.

REFERENCES

- Adhikary, S. (2021). Exploring school principle's practices in developing teacher leaders in their school. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 4(1), 100189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2021.100189>
- Ardianti, Y., & Amalia, N. (2022). Kurikulum Merdeka: Pemaknaan Merdeka dalam Perencanaan Pembelajaran di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 6(3), 399–407. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jppp.v6i3.55749>
- Ateş, N. Y., Tarakci, M., Porck, J. P., van Knippenberg, D., & Groenen, P. J. F. (2020). The Dark Side of Visionary Leadership in Strategy Implementation: Strategic Alignment, Strategic Consensus, and Commitment. *Journal of Management*, 46(5), 637–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318811567>
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2023). The effect of learning-centred leadership and teacher trust on teacher professional learning: Evidence from a centralised education system. *Professional Development in Education*, 49(5), 925–937. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1879234>

- Braseth, E. A. (2021). Principals' Leadership of Mathematics Teachers' Professional Development. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 697231. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.697231>
- Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.).
- Campbell, P., Chaseling, M., Boyd, W., & Shipway, B. (2019). The effective instructional leader. *Professional Development in Education*, 45(2), 276–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1465448>
- Daga, A. T. (2021). Makna Merdeka Belajar dan Penguatan Peran Guru di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Educatio FKIP UNMA*, 7(3), 1075–1090. <https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v7i3.1279>
- Daniëls, E., Hondeghem, 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>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Devia Kartika, & Hezy Kurnia. (2022). Penerapan E-Learning Sebagai Media Pembelajaran Dalam Menghadapi Pandemi Covid 19. *J-COSCSIS : Journal of Computer Science Community Service*, 2(1), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.31849/jcoscis.v2i1.7773>
- Dutta, V., & Sahney, S. (2022). Relation of principal instructional leadership, school climate, teacher job performance and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(2), 148–166. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2021-0010>
- Elkington, R., van der S., M., Glick-Smith, L., J., & Breen, J. M. (2017). *Visionary Leadership in a Turbulent World* (R. Elkington, M. Van Der Steege, J. Glick-Smith, & J. M. Breen (eds.)). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/9781787142428>
- Fathih, M. A., Supriyatno, T., & Amin Nur, M. (2021). Visionary Leadership of The Head of Diniyah Madrasah in Improving The Quality Santri. *Nidhomul Haq : Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(3), 513–525. <https://doi.org/10.31538/ndh.v6i3.1527>
- Gemnafle, M., & Batlolona, J. R. (2021). Manajemen Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Pendidikan Profesi Guru Indonesia (JPPGI)*, 1(1), 28–42. <https://doi.org/10.30598/jppgivol1issue1page28-42>
- González-Falcón, I., García-Rodríguez, M. P., Gómez-Hurtado, I., & Carrasco-Macías, M. J. (2020). The importance of principal leadership and context for school success: Insights from “(in)visible school.” *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 248–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1612355>
- Gümüş, S., Bellibaş, M. Ş., Esen, M., & Gümüş, E. (2018). A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational research from 1980 to 2014. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216659296>
- Hallinger, P., Liu, S., & Piyaman, P. (2019). Does principal leadership make a difference in teacher professional learning? A comparative study China and Thailand. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 49(3), 341–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1407237>
- Hanafi, A. M., & Minsih, Nf. (2022). Asesmen Kompetensi Minimum Sebagai Transformasi Pendidikan di Sekolah Dasar. *Kwangsan: Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, 10(2), 204. <https://doi.org/10.31800/jtp.kw.v10n2.p204--220>
- Hattie, J. (2019). *Visible learning: Feedback*. Routledge.
- Ismail, H. N., Kertechian, K. S., & Blaique, L. (2023). Visionary leadership, organizational trust, organizational pride, and organizational citizenship behaviour: a sequential mediation model. *Human Resource Development International*, 26(3), 264–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2108993>
- Karacabey, M. F., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Adams, D. (2022). Principal leadership and teacher professional learning in Turkish schools: Examining the mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy and teacher trust. *Educational Studies*, 48(2), 253–272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2020.1749835>

- Kılınç, A. Ç., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Polatcan, M. (2022). Learning-centred leadership and change in teacher practice in Turkey: Exploring the mediating effects of collaboration. *Educational Studies*, 48(6), 790–808. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2020.1828833>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Liljenberg, M. (2021). A professional development practice to enhance principals' instructional leadership – enabling and constraining arrangements. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 6(4), 354–366. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCCC-12-2020-0102>
- Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Principal Instructional Leadership, Teacher Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Professional Learning in China: Testing a Mediated-Effects Model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(4), 501–528. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18769048>
- Mardiyah, R. H., Aldriani, S. N. F., Chitta, F., & Zulfikar, M. A. (2021). Pentingnya keterampilan belajar di abad 21 sebagai tuntutan dalam pengembangan sumber daya manusia. *Lectura: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.31849/lectura.v12i1.5813>
- Mascareño, J., Rietzschel, E., & Wisse, B. (2020). Envisioning innovation: Does visionary leadership engender team innovative performance through goal alignment? *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 29(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12341>
- Mulyasa, E. (2021). *Manajemen dan kepemimpinan kepala sekolah*.
- Nguyen, D., & Ng, D. (2020). Teacher collaboration for change: Sharing, improving, and spreading. *Professional Development in Education*, 46(4), 638–651. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1787206>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Roudhoh, Fachruddin, A., Hidayati, S., Astuti, R. N., & Murni, W. (2026). The Influence of Teachers' Resilience and Digital Competence on the Effectiveness of Digital Learning Media in Elementary Schools. *BASICA*, 5(2), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.37680/basicav5i2.9230>
- Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E., Wiedermann, W., Hochbein, C., & Cunningham, M. (2019). Principal leadership and school performance: An examination of instructional leadership and organizational management. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 18(4), 591–613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2018.1513151>
- Sebastian, J., Huang, H., & Allensworth, E. (2017). Examining integrated leadership systems in high schools: Connecting principal and teacher leadership to organizational processes and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 28(3), 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2017.1319392>
- Talebizadeh, S. M., Hosseingholizadeh, R., & Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2021). Analyzing the relationship between principals' learning-centered leadership and teacher professional learning: The mediation role of trust and knowledge sharing behavior. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 68, 100970. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100970>
- van der Voet, J., & Steijn, B. (2021). Team innovation through collaboration: how visionary leadership spurs innovation via team cohesion. *Public Management Review*, 23(9), 1275–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1743344>
- Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134–171. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316653478>
- Wu, H., Gao, X., & Shen, J. (2020). Principal leadership effects on student achievement: A multilevel analysis using Programme for International Student Assessment 2015 data. *Educational Studies*, 46(3), 316–336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2019.1584853>
- Wu, H., & Shen, J. (2022). The association between principal leadership and student achievement: A multivariate meta-meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 35, 100423.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100423>

Zhou, L., Zhao, S., Tian, F., Zhang, X., & Chen, S. (2018). Visionary leadership and employee creativity in China. *International Journal of Manpower*, 39(1), 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-04-2016-0092>

