

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19891905

REPOSITIONING INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP FOR DIGITAL ASSESSMENT REFORM: TRANSFORMING LESOTHO'S ACCOUNTING CURRICULUM

Lineo Mphatsoane-Sesoane^{1*}, Nonjabulo Fortunate Madonda², Nomthandazo Moureen
Bhekiswayo³, and Loyiso Currell Jita⁴

^{1,2,3,4}*The Office of the Dean and SANRAL Chair in Science, Mathematics and Technology Education,
University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, Republic of South Africa*

¹*Sesoane.L@ufs.ac.za, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1892-7851>*

²*nonjabulo.madonda@nwu.ac.za, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4191-1612>*

³*BhekiswayoNM@ufs.ac.za, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5794-936X>*

⁴*jitalc@ufs.ac.za, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6871-6820>*

Received: 15/02/2026

Accepted: 18/03/2026

Corresponding Author: Lineo Mphatsoane-Sesoane
(Sesoane.L@ufs.ac.za)

ABSTRACT

This study examines how instructional leadership can drive meaningful reform in assessment practices within digital learning environments. Despite the increasing use of digital tools in education, many schools' assessment methods remain rigid, standardised, and detached from 21st-century learning expectations. This study is guided by Instructional leadership theory. A qualitative approach, utilising semi-structured interviews and document analysis, was employed to collect data from Accounting teachers and school principals. The findings show that hierarchical leadership paradigms continue to prevail, with leaders often positioned as change agents while teachers are marginalised in decision-making. Policy documents prioritised compliance over creativity, favouring summative evaluation over formative assessment, and emphasising learner-centred digital tools. However, the study also identified schools where principals fostered collaborative professional cultures, enabling teachers to take the initiative in redesigning assessment tasks to align with digital pedagogy. These cases demonstrate how distributed instructional leadership can have a profoundly positive impact, where authority and accountability are shared to jointly develop assessment practices that align with curriculum objectives and local classroom realities. According to the study, redefining assessment in the digital age requires distributed leadership. This study contributes to educational leadership and policy discourses by providing a context-sensitive, critically informed model for distributed instructional leadership.

KEYWORDS: Instructional Leadership, Digital Assessment, Reform, Transformation, Accounting Curriculum.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

There have been substantial changes in instructional leadership over the last forty years. The effective schools movement of the 1980s was first characterized by the principal's role in directing instruction, coordinating curricula delivery, and upholding academic standards (Hallinger, 2005). However, leadership models expanded to include distributed and collaborative approaches as educational priorities changed and classroom difficulties grew more complex (Bush & Glover, 2016; Gélinas-Proulx & Shields, 2022). In the digital age, instructional leadership includes integrating technology and ensuring that assessment procedures represent 21st-century skills (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Fullan, 2021; Kareem et al., 2023).

Digital assessment is essential to this transformation, requiring leaders to balance implementing new technology and maintaining pedagogical integrity, equity, and inclusivity (Abedi, 2024; Redecker & Punie, 2017). The COVID-19 pandemic intensified this need, accelerating the use of digital tools while exposing systemic weaknesses in infrastructure, teacher readiness, and leadership capacity (Patrinos et al., 2020; Schleicher, 2020). This shift in resource-constrained contexts such as Lesotho revealed a persistent misalignment between emerging digital pedagogies and rigid, summative assessment models (Khumalo, 2025).

This study is framed within this broader evolution. Initially titled "Instructional Leadership for Digital Transformation in Lesotho's Curriculum," the research began with a general focus on technology integration. However, preliminary findings revealed that the most pressing challenges were concentrated in assessment practices, leading to a refined focus: "Instructional Leadership and Digital Assessment Reform in Secondary Education." Further engagement with the literature and the Lesotho context highlighted the need for a subject-specific lens, particularly in Accounting education, where assessment demands are distinct and often under-addressed (Sesoane et al., 2025). The final title, "Repositioning Instructional Leadership for Digital Assessment Reform: Transforming Lesotho's Accounting Curriculum," reflects a shift from hierarchical oversight to distributed, teacher-empowering leadership practices.

Although this study centers on Lesotho's Accounting curriculum, its findings contribute to broader scholarly debates on digital assessment in resource-constrained contexts across sub-Saharan Africa and beyond. Similar challenges have been documented in South Africa (Wade & Mestry, 2021),

Zimbabwe (Stephen et al., 2023), and Botswana (Ntumi & Bulala, 2025), illustrating the dual role of leadership practices in either facilitating or hindering digital reform. Locating the Lesotho case within these comparative contexts highlights that leadership models for digital assessment reform are not merely a national concern but part of a wider regional and international discourse.

Comparative studies reinforce this urgency. In South Africa, Wade and Mestry (2021) emphasized the role of continuous professional development in sustaining digital assessment innovation. Stephen et al. (2023) advocated for leadership-driven professional learning communities to close digital competence gaps in Zimbabwe. In Botswana, Ntumi and Bulala (2025) linked collaborative assessment design to successful integration, while in the United States, Penuel (2021) highlighted the importance of aligning policy with practice. Within Lesotho, Makumane and Mpungose (2022) found that ICT policies were often undermined by insufficient leadership training for digital pedagogy.

Despite these insights, a research gap persists. Instructional leadership in many schools remains hierarchical and compliance-driven, limiting teacher agency and privileging summative over formative approaches (Leithwood et al., 2020; Mincu, 2022). Lesotho's secondary school Accounting curriculum has led to assessment practices that fail to leverage the pedagogical affordances of digital tools or to respond to the competencies demanded by the contemporary economy. Addressing this requires reimagining leadership as a shared, context-sensitive process that enables inclusive, formative, and technology-enhanced assessment (Carrington et al., 2024).

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How can instructional leadership enhance digital assessment practices in Lesotho schools?
2. Why is instructional leadership crucial for overcoming technological challenges in Lesotho schools?
3. How can instructional leadership foster sustainable, inclusive, learner-centred digital assessment practices in Lesotho schools?

In pursuing these questions, the study aims to develop a distributed instructional leadership model that can drive digital assessment reform in resource-constrained contexts. The paper proceeds as follows: Literature review, theoretical framework, methodology, discussion of the findings, and finally, conclusions and recommendations for policy and

practice.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. *Instructional Leadership as a Driver of Digital Assessment Innovation*

The digital transformation of accounting education has shifted the profession from routine bookkeeping tasks to roles requiring advanced analytical and decision-making skills (Herath & Herath, 2024; Rawashdeh & Idris, 2025). This change has compelled educational institutions to reform curriculum by integrating digital tools, data analytics, and emerging technologies such as AI and blockchain, thereby equipping students with both technological fluency and higher-order thinking skills (Andriani & Wahyudi, 2025; Singh et al., 2025). However, research shows that digital assessment reform is often undermined when leadership fails to provide vision, coordination, and support (Langa et al., 2025). Instructional leadership has therefore been identified as pivotal in enhancing digital assessment practices by cultivating professional learning communities, setting shared goals, and empowering teachers to design assessments that reflect digital pedagogical approaches (Mai, 2023). Distributed and participatory leadership models are particularly effective, as they decentralize authority and promote collaborative innovation, enabling assessments to better align with 21st-century learning demands (Suhaimi et al., 2025).

2.2. *Instructional Leadership in Navigating Technological Barriers*

Despite the promise of digital transformation, institutions face persistent technological challenges, including inadequate infrastructure, uneven access to resources, and limited faculty readiness (Singh et al., 2025). In many contexts, students and educators lack the digital literacy and confidence necessary to effectively adopt technology in assessment. Instructional leadership is critical in addressing these challenges, as leaders play a central role in ensuring resource allocation, modelling digital practices, and promoting ongoing professional development (Wang et al., 2025). Research further demonstrates that leadership which actively invests in capacity building through mentorship, structured training, and coaching strengthens educators' digital self-efficacy and confidence in implementing innovative assessment practices (Tomma, 2024). Conversely, hierarchical and compliance-driven leadership approaches reinforce barriers by limiting teacher agency and innovation (Hashim, 2020). Leadership

that is adaptive, supportive, and responsive to contextual realities is therefore essential in overcoming technological obstacles in resource-constrained environments such as Lesotho.

2.3. *Towards Sustainable and Inclusive Digital Assessment Practices*

Instructional leadership also plays a decisive role in ensuring that digital assessment reform is innovative, inclusive and sustainable. Equity-focused leadership practices are necessary to prevent digital transformation from reinforcing existing socio-economic disparities (Suhaimi et al., 2025). Leaders prioritizing inclusivity help ensure students from diverse backgrounds benefit equally from digital learning and assessment opportunities (Mpfu, 2024). Beyond resource provision, effective instructional leadership fosters collaborative school cultures, encourages reflective practices, and embeds ethical considerations in digital adoption, aligning assessment with broader goals of social justice and learner empowerment (Langa et al., 2025). International perspectives emphasise that sustainable reform necessitates leadership responsive to local realities, striking a balance between policy directives and the practical needs of schools and learners (Goh, 2025). Through such practices, instructional leadership fosters assessment models that are technologically robust, inclusive, and learner-centred.

While global scholarship positions digital assessment as an opportunity to advance formative, feedback-driven learning, the literature remains conflicted regarding the importance of formative versus summative purposes in digital spaces. Redecker and Punie (2017) conceptualise digital assessment as data-driven and accountable, aligning with summative logics, whereas Abedi (2024) advocate formative feedback as a democratic and learner-empowering imperative. This global debate is not merely definitional; it reflects ideological tensions over whether assessment should measure past performance or scaffold future learning. The absence of synthesis in policy frameworks means that both logics coexist uneasily, producing what is known as a "dual accountability paradox," in which systems demand innovation while structurally inhibiting it (Jorgensen, 2012).

The reviewed literature demonstrates that instructional leadership is central to enhancing digital assessment practices, overcoming systemic technological challenges, and ensuring sustainable and equitable reforms. However, most existing studies have been conducted in contexts outside

Lesotho, with limited exploration of how instructional leadership can be repositioned to address the specific challenges of digital assessment reform in the country's secondary school Accounting curriculum. This study addresses this gap by examining how leadership can move beyond hierarchical, compliance-driven approaches toward distributed, collaborative models that enable inclusive, learner-centred digital assessment practices in Lesotho schools.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is underpinned by Instructional leadership theory as it highlights the crucial role of school leaders in influencing teaching, learning, and assessment. Unlike administrative leadership, which emphasizes management and compliance, instructional leadership focuses on shaping the instructional programme, supporting teachers, and improving learner outcomes (Mestry, 2017). Hallinger and Murphy (1985) conceptualized the model around three central functions: defining the school's mission, managing the instructional programme, and fostering a favourable learning climate. Later work expanded the theory to emphasise collaboration and distributed approaches, recognising the complexity of modern education systems and the necessity of shared responsibility among principals, teachers, and other stakeholders (Leithwood et al., 2020).

A key assumption of Instructional Leadership Theory is that effective leadership directly shapes student achievement by influencing classroom practices and assessment approaches. Instructional leaders provide vision, cultivate professional development, and ensure alignment between curriculum goals and the means of assessment. Contemporary applications of the theory highlight its adaptability in guiding digital transformation in schools. Basjan (2024) argues that leaders are pivotal in ensuring technology adoption does not compromise pedagogy but enhances inclusivity, creativity, and learner-centred practices. This positions instructional leadership as a framework through which assessment reform can be understood as both a pedagogical and leadership imperative.

The relevance of this theory to the present study lies in its ability to critique and reframe leadership practices within Lesotho's secondary school Accounting curriculum. Evidence shows that many schools operate under hierarchical, compliance-driven leadership structures that privilege rigid summative assessments while sidelining teachers in reform processes (Lethole, 2020). Instructional

Leadership Theory offers a lens for examining how such practices constrain innovation and teacher agency, while providing direction for fostering inclusive and collaborative approaches to digital assessment reform. By repositioning leadership, the study highlights models that empower teachers and support context-sensitive transformation. Instructional Leaders, therefore, operate within a contested environment where formative aspirations and summative imperatives coexist; their decisions determine which logic becomes pedagogically dominant.

Therefore, this theory is appropriate for the study as it addresses the central challenge of modernizing assessment practices sustainably and equitably. Instructional leadership provides practical pathways for leaders to create shared visions, enhance teacher capacity building, and foster professional cultures that support digital assessment innovation (Carrington et al., 2024). This theory was chosen because it speaks directly to the study's problem: the need to shift leadership away from compliance and towards practices that reposition assessment to reflect 21st-century competencies, technological realities, and the lived experiences of learners in Lesotho.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative case study design within the interpretivist paradigm, which recognizes the socially constructed nature of educational experiences and privileges participants' perspectives in understanding curriculum and leadership practices (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Data were collected from a purposive sample of secondary schools in Lesotho, focusing on three principals, three heads of department, and three Accounting teachers, as these participants are directly responsible for shaping and enacting assessment reforms in the Accounting curriculum (Palinkas et al., 2015).

Multiple data generation methods were utilized to ensure depth and credibility. Semi-structured interviews captured participants' perceptions and experiences of instructional leadership and digital assessment (Kallio et al., 2016). Classroom observations provided insights into how assessment practices unfolded in real teaching contexts. Document analysis further strengthened the study through triangulation. In total, nine documents were analysed, comprising three national policy documents (the ICT in Education Policy, the National Curriculum and Assessment Policy, and the Secondary Accounting Syllabus), three school-level

documents (assessment policies, school improvement plans, and ICT implementation plans), and three classroom-based assessment artefacts (digital test samples, assessment records, and teacher-prepared digital tasks). These documents were selected for their relevance to understanding structural, policy, and practical dimensions of digital assessment reform within the Accounting curriculum (Bowen, 2009).

Thematic analysis guided data interpretation, allowing the researcher to identify patterns, develop themes, and critically engage them with Instructional Leadership Theory to generate contextually grounded insights (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Credibility was enhanced through triangulation across data sources, member checking with participants, and detailed reflexive engagement with the researcher's positionality (Lincoln & Guba, 1994). Ethical clearance was secured, and participants' confidentiality was maintained through the use of pseudonyms, ensuring the study adhered to the principles of trustworthiness, integrity, and respect.

5. Findings and Discussion

This section presents and critically engages with the study's key findings, organised around three emergent themes that directly address the research questions. Drawing on semi-structured interviews, lesson observations, and document analysis, the findings reveal how instructional leadership practices shape digital assessment reform in Lesotho's secondary school Accounting curriculum. The analysis is framed by Instructional Leadership Theory, which emphasizes the role of school leaders in shaping teaching, learning, and assessment. The triangulation of data sources strengthens the credibility of the findings and highlights the tensions between policy, practice, and leadership.

5.1. Lack of Resources and Infrastructure

A persistent challenge across all schools was the lack of digital infrastructure to implement practical digital assessment. Interviews revealed that teachers and heads of department struggled with limited access to devices and unreliable Internet.

T1 noted:

We do not have enough computers for learners, and sometimes even teachers share devices.

While HOD2 added:

The Internet is unreliable, and it affects how we assess students online.

P3 echoed these concerns, stating:

Digital tools are there, but they are not enough.

Lesson observations confirmed these constraints.

The teacher attempted to conduct a digital quiz in one school but had to revert to paper due to connectivity issues. Learners shared a single device, and the teacher lacked technical support. Document analysis of school improvement plans and ICT policies revealed unclear commitments to digital integration and no concrete budgeting or timelines for infrastructure development.

These findings align with Khumalo (2025), who argues that digital transformation depends on infrastructural readiness. However, other scholars alert that resource provision alone does not guarantee transformation; Hashim (2020) and Mincu (2022) emphasise that leadership cultures and teacher agency are equally crucial. This tension suggests that while infrastructural gaps are real, leadership responses determine whether schools stagnate or innovate within restrictions.

Instructional Leadership Theory emphasizes the leader's role in aligning instructional goals with resource provision (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The failure to address infrastructural gaps reflects a disconnect between leadership vision and classroom realities. Rather than treating resource provision as an administrative task, instructional leaders must collaborate with teachers to identify needs and advocate for context-sensitive solutions. Distributed leadership can empower schools to creatively navigate resource constraints and co-construct assessment strategies that are feasible and inclusive.

5.2. Marginalization of Teachers in Decision-Making

The study found that teachers were frequently excluded from decisions about digital assessment design and implementation.

T2 remarked:

We are told what to do; we do not participate in the design of assessments.

HOD1 stated:

Principals make decisions without consulting us.

T3 added:

There is no room for creativity; we follow instructions.

These statements reflect a top-down leadership culture that prioritizes compliance over collaboration. While Leithwood *et al.* (2020) and Harris *et al.* (2017) emphasize shared leadership as a catalyst for reform, some scholars argue that centralised decision-making may be essential during the initial stages of digital transition to uphold coherence (Suhaimi *et al.*, 2025). The contrast emphasizes that exclusionary practices observed in Lesotho schools may be partially explained by

leaders' efforts to manage uncertainty, though such strategies eventually limit sustainability.

Classroom observations revealed that teachers often implemented externally prescribed assessments, with little adaptation to learner needs or digital possibilities. In one observed lesson, the teacher used a rigid multiple-choice test downloaded from a district portal, despite learners struggling with basic digital navigation. Document analysis of curriculum guides and assessment policies strongly emphasized standardization and accountability, with limited space for teacher innovation or formative assessment.

These findings align with those of Leithwood et al. (2020) and Mincu (2022), who critique hierarchical leadership for suppressing teacher agency. Harris et al. (2017) argue that empowering teachers as co-leaders is essential for sustainable reform. Instructional Leadership Theory supports shared responsibility and collaborative decision-making. The marginalization of teachers in this study reflects a broader failure to embrace these principles. Principals must reposition themselves as facilitators of teacher agency, creating professional cultures that value experimentation, dialogue, and contextual adaptation.

5.3. Policy Emphasis on Summative Over Formative Assessment

The dominance of summative assessment in policy and practice emerged as a significant barrier to digital assessment reform.

HOD3 observed:

We are expected to produce marks, not feedback.

While P2 noted:

Formative assessment is not being recognized in official reports.

T1 added:

Digital tools are used for tests, not for learning support.

These statements point to a systemic privileging of summative assessment, driven by policy mandates and accountability pressures. The privileging of summative assessment echoes with global reviews (Abedi, 2024; Carrington et al., 2024), yet Redecker & Punie (2017) argue that digital tools can reinforce accountability and comparability when aligned with summative frameworks. This indicates a broader debate: whether digital assessments should primarily serve learning (formative) or accountability (summative). The Lesotho findings show the possibilities of policy overemphasis on the latter, but also uphold that the global tension remains unresolved.

Lesson observations revealed that assessments were primarily used for grading rather than learning. Learners completed a timed digital test in one class, but no feedback was provided, and the teacher moved on to the next topic. Document analysis of national assessment policies and school-based records confirmed this trend: assessment was framed as a tool for reporting and ranking, not for formative engagement or learner development.

This emphasis undermines the pedagogical potential of digital tools, which are best used to support ongoing learning and feedback. Scholars such as Abedi (2024) and Carrington et al. (2024) advocate for formative assessment as central to inclusive and adaptive learning. Instructional leaders must challenge policy constraints and promote assessment models prioritizing learning over ranking. According to Instructional Leadership Theory, effective leaders align assessment practices with curriculum goals and learner needs. The findings suggest that many school leaders in Lesotho have yet to embrace this role. Instead of enforcing rigid policies, instructional leaders must interpret and adapt them to support pedagogically sound practices; this includes advocating for formative assessment and equipping teachers with the independence and training to implement it effectively.

The findings reveal a complex interplay between infrastructural limitations, leadership practices, and policy constraints that collectively shape the landscape of digital assessment in Lesotho's secondary school Accounting curriculum. While some schools have begun experimenting with collaborative approaches, the dominant model remains hierarchical and compliance-driven. Lesson observations and document analysis reinforce the interview data, highlighting systemic barriers to innovation and inclusion. Repositioning instructional leadership to be more distributed, inclusive, and context-sensitive is essential for overcoming these challenges. School leaders can drive meaningful and sustainable digital assessment reform by involving teachers as co-leaders, addressing infrastructural gaps, and advocating for formative assessment.

The Lesotho case crystallises a broader theoretical struggle rather than merely reflecting local policy limitations. While participants interpret digital tools through summative accountability frameworks, instructional leadership theory suggests that leaders should act as boundary spanners, negotiating policy's evaluative demands with classroom-level learning needs. However, current leadership

practices magnify summative logics, effectively suppressing formative possibilities inherent in digital platforms. Thus, the failure is not technological, but epistemological: digital assessment is being used to automate inherited practices rather than transform them.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This study critically examined the role of instructional leadership in shaping digital assessment reform within Lesotho's secondary school Accounting curriculum. The findings reveal that instructional leadership has a decisive influence on how digital assessment practices are conceptualised and enacted in schools. Leaders who actively engage with teachers, provide strategic guidance, and articulate clear assessment expectations are better positioned to steer digital transformation that improves pedagogical practice. In environments where leadership practices were collaborative and dialogic, teachers demonstrated greater confidence in integrating digital tools and designing assessments aligned with contemporary Accounting competencies.

The study further established that the technological challenges facing schools, such as insufficient digital infrastructure, limited access to devices, and inadequate support systems, are not solely material concerns. Rather, they are deeply leadership-dependent. Schools with leaders who mobilised resources creatively, sought partnerships, and promoted professional development were able to mitigate infrastructural constraints more effectively than those operating under rigid, compliance-driven leadership. These findings position instructional leadership not as a peripheral influence, but as a central mechanism for enabling or constraining digital assessment reform.

Moreover, sustainable and inclusive digital assessment practices were observed, where instructional leaders support a shift from assessment as an instrument of summative reporting toward practices that emphasized feedback, learner engagement, and digital participation. When leaders encouraged collaborative cultures and recognised teachers as co-designers of assessment processes, digital tools became vehicles for learner-centred assessment rather than instruments of accountability alone. This repositioning of assessment practices highlights the importance of leadership in creating environments where formative, digital, and learner-driven approaches can thrive.

The findings suggest that digital assessment reform is not merely a technological endeavour but a

leadership transformation. Hierarchical leadership models continue to reinforce policy-driven summative priorities and marginalise teacher agency, thereby limiting the pedagogical affordances of digital tools. Conversely, distributed, participatory, and context-responsive leadership practices create space for teachers to innovate, adapt assessment tasks, and respond to learners' lived realities.

Although situated in Lesotho, these insights extend beyond national boundaries and contribute to global debates on how leadership mediates the tensions between traditional assessment paradigms and the possibilities introduced by digital technologies. The study demonstrates that leadership operates at the intersection of policy, pedagogy, and infrastructure, and that meaningful reform depends on leaders who can negotiate these domains with vision and sensitivity. In this way, instructional leadership emerges as a pivotal lever for shifting digital assessment from a compliance activity to a transformative educational practice that supports equitable, future-oriented learning.

7. Recommendations

In light of the study's findings, several recommendations are proposed to support meaningful and sustainable digital assessment reform within Lesotho's secondary school Accounting curriculum. These recommendations emphasise that leadership practices, rather than technological resources alone, ultimately determine the feasibility, direction, and pedagogical value of digital assessment initiatives.

7.1. Reframe Instructional Leadership Toward Distributed and Participatory Practice

There is an urgent need to shift leadership models from compliance-driven management toward distributed and facilitative instructional leadership. Principals should be supported through targeted professional development to adopt participatory leadership styles that position teachers as co-designers of assessment. Such leadership fosters collaborative school cultures, enhances teacher agency, and enables context-responsive innovation in digital assessment reform.

7.2. Strengthen Digital Capacity Through Sustained, Context-Sensitive Professional Learning

Teacher confidence in digital assessment increases when professional development is integrated into school routines, rather than delivered through

isolated workshops. Schools should institutionalize professional learning communities (PLCs) where teachers collaboratively develop digital assessment tools, reflect on their practice, and address context-specific challenges. Leadership plays a central role in ensuring that such communities are sustained, inclusive, and aligned with school improvement goals.

7.3. Align Infrastructure Investment With Instructional Priorities

Although digital infrastructure remains uneven across schools, its impact largely depends on how leaders interpret and integrate it into their teaching and learning practices. The Ministry of Education and school governing bodies should invest in devices, connectivity, and technical support, while ensuring that these resources directly serve instructional and assessment goals. Infrastructure investment must therefore be accompanied by leadership initiatives that meaningfully integrate technology into teaching and learning rather than symbolically signalling digital advancement.

7.4. Rebalance Assessment Policy to Promote Formative Feedback and Learner Agency

Current assessment policies continue to prioritise standardisation and summative reporting, limiting the transformative potential of digital assessment. National and school-level policies should explicitly support formative, feedback-oriented assessment

practices that enhance learner engagement and digital participation. Leaders must mediate policy flexibly, enabling schools to adapt assessment strategies to local needs and to foster learner agency, digital literacy, and higher-order competencies central to Accounting education in the 21st century.

7.5. Align Curriculum and Assessment With 21st-Century Competencies

Digital assessment reform in Accounting education must move beyond procedural tasks and memorisation. Curriculum and assessment should evolve to develop and evaluate competencies such as critical thinking, ethical reasoning, problem-solving, and digital fluency. Instructional leaders must ensure that assessment practices align with these broader curricular goals and prepare learners for the contemporary economic and technological demands.

7.6. Integrate Ethical and Inclusive Principles Into Digital Assessment Design

Digital transformation risks deepening existing inequalities if issues of access and equity are not addressed through leadership. Leaders must ensure that digital assessment strategies accommodate the diverse needs of learners and do not disadvantage those with limited access to devices or connectivity. Ethical and inclusive principles should be integral to leadership practices and assessment design, rather than treated as optional considerations.

Funding: The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

- Abedi, E. A. (2024). Tensions between technology integration practices of teachers and ICT in education policy expectations: Implications for change in teacher knowledge, beliefs, and teaching practices. *Journal of Computers in Education*, 11(4), 1215-1234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-023-00296-6>
- Basjan, S. H. (2024). A comparative study of principals' roles in the implementation of information and communication technologies (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Free State.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/qj0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2016). School leadership and management in South Africa: Findings from a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(2), 211-231. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2014-0101>
- Carrington, S., Park, E., McKay, L., Saggars, B., Harper-Hill, K., & Somerwil, T. (2024). Evidence of transformative leadership for inclusive practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 141, Art.104466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104466>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Schachner, A., & Edgerton, A. K. (2020). *Restarting and reinventing school: Learning in*

- the time of COVID and beyond. Learning Policy Institute.
- Fullan, M. (2021). The right drivers for whole system success (CSE Leading Education Series, No. 1). Centre for Strategic Education.
- Gélinas-Proulx, A., & Shields, C. M. (2022). Leading for equity and social justice: Systemic transformation in Canadian education. University of Toronto Press.
- Goh, K. M. (2025). Assessing digital leadership of middle leaders in Malaysian schools. *Journal of Research, Innovation, and Strategies for Education (RISE)*, 2(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.70148/rise.v2i2.21>
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Harris, A., Jones, M., & Huffman, J. (2017). Teachers leading educational reform: The power of professional learning communities. Routledge.
- Hashim, A. K. (2020). Coaching and districtwide improvement: Exploring the systemic leadership practices of instructional coaches. *Teachers College Record*, 122(10), 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812012201005>
- Jorgensen, M. B. (2012). The diverging logics of integration policy making at national and city level. *International Migration Review*, 46(1), 244-278.
- Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(12), 2954-2965. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031>
- Kareem, J., Patrick, H. A., Prabakaran, N., Tania, V., Kumar, P., & Mukherjee, U. (2023). Transformational educational leaders inspire school educators' commitment. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Art.1171513. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1171513>
- Khumalo, M. A. (2025). Enhancing digital literacy for learners in inclusive primary and secondary education in Lesotho. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 6(2), 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2025.6.2.2102>
- Langa, C., Lazar, A., & Tudor, L. (2025). Transforming educational leadership in Romanian pre-university education: Adapting to contemporary challenges and digital transformation. *Journal of Educational Studies and Practices*, 5(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.51865/jesp.2025.1.04>
- 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>
- Lethole, L. G. (2020). A sustainable teacher leadership implementation plan for Lesotho high schools (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Free State.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Sage Publications.
- Makumane, M. A., & Mpungose, C. B. (2022). Secondary school learners' experiences with educational technologies in Lesotho. *Journal of Educational Technology in Developing Contexts*, 6(1), 45-60. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jetdc.v6i1.4>
- Mestry, R. (2017). Principals' perspectives and experiences of their instructional leadership functions to enhance learner achievement in public schools. *Journal of Education (University of KwaZulu-Natal)*, (69), 257-280.
- Mincu, M. (2022). Why is school leadership key to transforming education? Structural and cultural assumptions for quality education in diverse contexts. *Prospects*, 52(3), 231-242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-022-09625-6>
- Mpofu, F. S. (2024). Hidden curriculum in accounting education in the digital era: The evolution, role, controversies, challenges and implications. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2402123>
- Ntumi, S., & Bulala, T. (2025). Enhancing assessment strategies, challenges, innovations, and integrity in the modern educational landscape: A comparative study of Ghana and Botswana. *Research Square Preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5532346/v1>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research.

- Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 42(5), 533-544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Patrinos, H. A., Shmis, T., & Nikolaev, D. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on global education systems and learning. World Bank. <https://coilink.org/20.500.12592/gbn6f6>
- Penuel, W. R. (2021). Reimagining American education: Possible futures for equitable educational assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 103(4), 54-57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00317217211070391>
- Rawashdeh, A., & Idris, M. (2025). Synchronized curriculum adaptation: A strategy for enhancing skill development in accounting education. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 18(2), 269-288. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-01-2024-0001>
- Redecker, C., & Punie, Y. (2017). European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/159770>
- Schleicher, A. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on education: Insights from Education at a Glance 2020. OECD Publishing.
- Sesoane, L. M., Tshelane, M., & Jita, L. C. (2025). Rethinking instructional leadership: Deconstructing teacher marginalization to foster sustainable accounting education practices. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(7), 343-360. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.7.17>
- Singh, B., Sunil, S., & Agnihotri, A. (2025). Adapting accounting education to the digital age: Technology's role in shaping future professionals. *International Journal of Economics, Management and Applied Social Sciences*, 7(1), 129-135. [https://doi.org/10.62823/ijemmasss/7.1\(ii\).7339](https://doi.org/10.62823/ijemmasss/7.1(ii).7339)
- Stephen, H. O., Chigora, T. B., Hove, B., & Ignatius, S. (2023). Professional learning communities (PLCs) for the Zimbabwean design and technology high school contexts: Ensuring quality teaching through effective professional development. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(6), 1462-1468. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2023.7723>
- Suhaimi, S., Ghani, M. F. A., & Radzi, N. M. (2025). Does student-centred leadership integrate with collaborative, distributive, and instructional leadership? A recent systematic review (2021-2025). *International Research-Based Education Journal*, 7(2), 238-272. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um043v7i22025p238-272>
- Tomma, M. M. A. A. (2024). Strategies, requirements, and challenges of transformation of accounting courses to digital teaching via electronic applications: Insights from KKV accounting faculty. *E-Learning and Digital Media*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530241279971>
- Wade, J., & Mestry, R. (2021). The perceptions and experiences of school management teams and teachers regarding continuing professional development of teachers in digital literacy amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Alternation*, 28(1), 338-365. <https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2021/v28n1a13>
- Wang, M., He, S., Li, Y., & Lin, M. (2025). How to motivate engineering education faculty for instructional innovation. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP)*, 15(5), 42. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v15i5.55945>
- Andriani, P. D., & Wahyudi, I. (2025, May). Digital revolution in accounting education: Bridging the academia-industry gap in the era of technological disruption. *International Student Conference on Business, Education, Economics, Accounting, and Management (ISC-BEAM)*, 3(1), 2449-2463. <https://doi.org/10.21009/ISC-BEAM.013.178>
- Herath, S. K., & Herath, L. M. (2024). Industry 4.0's effect on the accounting profession: A review of literature. *Asian Journal of Economics and Business*, 5(2), 34-44. <https://doi.org/10.47509/AJEB.2024.v05i02.04>