

Perceptions and Practices of Heads of Schools' Instructional Leadership in Public Secondary Schools in Biharamulo District, Tanzania

Logatus Logation
Daphina L. Mabagala
Winifrida Malingumu
wimnyamka@yahoo.co.uk
The Open University of Tanzania

ABSTRACT

The study aimed at examining the perceptions and practices of heads of schools' instructional leadership in public secondary schools in Biharamulo district, Tanzania. A concurrent triangulation design using a sample of 75 was used. Data were collected using questionnaires for teachers, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) for heads of schools and interviews for district secondary education officers. The quantitative data from questionnaires was analyzed using descriptive statistics while the qualitative data from interviews and FGDs were analyzed through thematic techniques. The study found that heads of schools perceived instructional leadership in terms of showing right direction about the teaching and learning process, ensuring the presence of teaching and learning resources and enhancing teachers' teaching capacity. The study also found that heads of schools practiced instructional leadership in terms of supervising preparation of schemes of work and lesson plans, providing teaching and learning resources, promoting programme development, and in some occasions visiting teachers in classrooms. Furthermore, the study revealed that heads of schools' instructional leadership is affected by lack of financial support, lack of training, teachers' negligence, and heavy workload. Finally, the study recommends regular in-service trainings to be organized for heads of schools and more research to be carried out to examine the extent to which heads of schools employ instructional leadership practices.

Keywords: *Heads of schools, Instructional leadership, Perceptions, Practices, Tanzania*

INTRODUCTION

While considering quality education being pivotal, the importance of instructional leadership is considered a major ring to run the change and

educational development (Musaazi, 1988). A greater number of scholars agree that instructional leadership is the key to creating an effective teaching and learning environment (Pustejovsky, Spillane, Heaton & Lewis, 2009; Hallinger & Walker, 2014). That means schools are seen as drivers in the process to change the existing educational productivity to a more desired one. Indeed such change depends mainly on the ability of instructional leaders to analyze existing conditions and plan practical strategies in order to attain future desired goals (Ubben & Larry, 1997). The instructional leadership is defined as an educational leadership that focuses on the core responsibility of the teaching and learning process (Hallinger & Walker, 2014).

In the United States of America, Doss and Tosh (2019) carried out a qualitative study to establish teacher perceptions of principals and principal self-perceptions toward school leadership. Findings indicated that principals as immediate instructional leaders perceived the instructional leadership role to include framing and communicating school goals and mission, creating shared expectations of high performance, clarifying roles and objectives, and promoting professional development. However, teachers rated principals lower on important leadership practices than when principals rated themselves. The observed mismatch in perceptions creates an information gap which this paper sought to address. Sisman (2016) conducted a study in Turkey on the factors related to instructional leadership perception and effect of instructional leadership on organizational variables using a meta-analysis research methodology. The study revealed that heads of schools were familiar with the concept of instructional leadership.

Onuma (2016) studied the principals' performance of supervision of instructions in secondary schools in Nigeria. The descriptive survey design was used. Only questionnaires used to collect data from a sample of 605 teachers that obtained through a stratified proportionate sampling. The study revealed that heads of schools' instructional leadership practices were classroom visits and observation, instructional aids, instructional programmes as well as monitoring student achievement. However, apart from a lot of generalizations, the study lacks supplements from qualitative elements. Enueme and Egwunyenga (2008) conducted a survey to examine the extent to which heads of schools assist teachers in their classroom instruction and promote professional growth of their teachers. The study findings revealed that Nigerian teachers experienced

high level of instructional leadership as well as classroom instruction assistance by heads of schools. However, Ekyaw (2014) found that heads of schools as immediate instructional leaders in Ethiopia are hindered by challenges such as being overburdened with other tasks, teaching the same credit like other teachers, negligence of teachers to accept recommendations, lack of financial allowances, questionable teacher-supervisor relationship, lack of adequate training and support as well as poor teachers' perceptions toward instructional leadership.

In Tanzanian context, researches by Nguni (2005), Ngirwa (2006), and the World Bank (2010) in the area of instructional leadership indicated that very little attention has been devoted to instructional leadership practices in secondary schools. Manaseh (2016) contends that heads of schools in Tanzania were not familiar with the concept of instructional leadership. This finding contradicts with Sisman (2016) who found that heads of schools were familiar with the concept of instructional leadership. The mismatch of the findings between Manaseh (2016) and Sisman (2016) makes this study necessary. However, Manaseh's (2016) study was too qualitative to allow generalizations. The study hardly revealed reasons for lack of understanding of instructional leadership. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2015) requires all heads of secondary schools to be holders of bachelor degrees assuming that they have adequate skills to run instructional practices. Conversely, Lwaitama and Galabawa (2008) reveal that these heads of schools have inadequate supervisory skills for not being trained in professional disciplines. Commenting on inadequate instructional leadership in secondary schools, Sumra and Rajani (2006) point out that in Tanzania teachers teach using rote techniques- requiring students to copy or take notes on the board, and seldom interact with students in classrooms. This is supported by school inspectors' report in Kagera region (2015) which shows that most teachers failed to prepare pedagogical documents and others prepared lesson plans when school quality assessors were visiting.

Several studies were conducted in other regions in the past to tackle similar issue of instructional leadership (Dhinat, 2015; Manaseh, 2016; Sumra & Rajani, 2006). However, the findings of those studies cannot be generalized to Kagera Region due to social, economic, cultural and political differences between this region and the other regions. In addition, the findings in the cited studies are not generalizable to all regions in Tanzania; including Kagera Region. It should be noted that

very little if not none, is known regarding perceptions and practices of heads of schools' instructional leadership in Kagera Region, particularly in Biharamulo district. Therefore, this study aims to examine perceptions and practices of heads of schools' instructional leadership in public secondary schools in Biharamulo district. Specific objectives of the study were to:

- i) Examine secondary school heads' perceptions toward instructional leadership roles in Biharamulo district.
- ii) Identify different instructional leadership practices employed by heads of secondary schools in Biharamulo district.
- iii) Find out challenges facing secondary school heads' instructional leadership in Biharamulo district.

Findings from this study would contribute to the body of knowledge in the field of educational management and leadership. This study may also provide greater insight for the newly appointed heads of schools and the heads of schools aspiring to become school heads in the future. Furthermore, the findings may create awareness to decision makers, policy makers, and the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) to organize trainings in instructional leadership and management which support capacity building among school heads. In addition, the results of this study might provide further insights on the perceptions of instructional leadership roles, the practices being employed, and the challenges affecting the development of school heads' instructional leadership in districts and local state agencies.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a concurrent triangulation research design and a mixed methods approach. The target population for the study was 651 respondents consisting of 18 heads of schools, 3 District Secondary Education Officers (DSEOs) and 630 teachers. Systematic random sampling was used to select teacher respondents - every tenth teacher in the alphabetic list of teachers in each school was selected to take part in the study. Responses of teachers complemented the responses from heads of schools. The idea of involving teachers aimed at eliminating possible subjectivity emanating from responses of the heads of schools. The purposive sampling was used to identify DSEOs and heads of schools to take part in the study. School heads were purposively selected based on their administrative and instructional roles. DSEOs were selected due to their involvement in secondary schools' activities. Ethical issues were

observed as authors managed to solicit research clearance from relevant authorities in Biharamulo District. Biharamulo District was selected for the study following reports that teachers in the district were weak and did not prepare well before teaching. (School inspectors' report, 2015). Table 1 presents the sample size of the study.

Table 1 shows that the study involved a sample of 75 respondents. The sample comprised 2 DSEOs, 10 heads of schools, and 63 teachers. The study used questionnaires, interviews, and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) as main tools of data collection. Questionnaires were administered to sixty-three (63) teachers and comprised items which demanded the respondents to rate expressions using likert scales. Ten (10) heads of schools were subjected to Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) whereas two (2) DSEOs were interviewed. School heads and DSEOs were selected because they were expected to have more significant insights regarding administrative and instructional roles at school level. Both quantitative data and qualitative data were concurrently collected. Quantitative data from questionnaires were analysed using descriptive statistics (percentages, frequencies), while qualitative data from the FGDs and interviews were analysed through thematic techniques. Three major themes – perceptions of instructional leadership role, school heads' instructional leadership practices, and challenges that hinder instructional leadership, guided qualitative data collection. Sub-themes which emanated from main themes were integrated with quantitative findings during interpretation stage.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Heads of Schools' Perceptions toward Instructional Leadership

The first specific objective of this study was to explore the perceptions of heads of secondary schools towards instructional leadership roles in Biharamulo District. Teachers were requested to indicate what they knew regarding the role of heads of schools' instructional leadership. Teachers' responses supplemented in-depth information from heads of schools and DSEOs. Questionnaires with a three-point Likert scale were used to collect quantitative data. Individual teachers were required to respond to a series of statements in the questionnaire by indicating whether they agreed (A), were neutral (N) or disagreed (D) as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Teachers' Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Role (N=63)

Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Role	Level of Agreement		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Showing right direction about the teaching and learning process	57(90.5%)	2(3.2%)	4(6.3%)
Ensuring the provision of teaching and learning resources	53(74.2%)	2(3.2%)	8(12.6%)
Improving teacher capacity to enhance the teaching and learning process	55(87.3%)	1(1.6%)	7(11.1%)

Field data, 2020

Table 2 indicates that the majority 57 (90.5%) of teachers agreed that the role of heads of schools' instructional leadership is all about showing the right direction about the teaching and learning. This perception places heads of schools in a position of ensuring that the teaching and learning process takes place. This finding concurs with the findings from the study conducted by Doss and Tosh (2019) who point out that heads of schools have a role of creating shared expectations of high performance. Information from FGD with heads of schools indicates that heads of schools devised ample strategies to ensure the improvement of instructional process and student academic achievement. During FGD one head of school had the following to say.

As the head of school, I am supposed to be creative; especially spending time reminding teachers about what they should do to ensure effective teaching and learning. For example, I usually remind teachers in the staffroom that they must use authorized textbooks and reference books to prepare lesson notes. I also emphasize the use of student-centered approach or competency-based approach rather than the traditional teacher-centered approach. (Head of school 2)

The above quote show that heads of schools considered improving instructional delivery one of their instructional leadership roles. In a similar way, Manaseh's (2016) study revealed that heads of schools perceived themselves to be the role models of instructional leadership. That is, the school heads needed to illustrate an unwavering example of instructional leadership in order to improve instruction.

Moreover, Table 2 shows that 53 (74.2%) teachers agreed that the heads of schools' instructional role is to ensure the provision of teaching and learning resources. The teaching and learning resources include but not limited to text books as well as audio and visual aids. This finding corroborates with Manaseh's (2016) findings which indicated that heads of schools have instructional role to ensure the availability of teaching and learning aids in schools. However, Dhinat's (2015) and Mtitu's (2008) studies revealed adverse instructional role where heads of schools failed to provide adequate teaching and learning resources in secondary schools.

Teachers believe that it is the role of school heads to ensure adequate instruction delivery by putting in place necessary teaching and learning aids. The study solicited more information from District Secondary Education Officer on this. During the interview session, a key informant at the district office said.

To the best of my knowledge, I know that there is no instructional leadership without teaching and learning aids...but heads of schools also know very well. No, my side, I usually remind heads of schools to purchase all materials such as wall charts, models, chemicals, and biological specimens to aid the teaching and learning process. (District official 2)

The above quotation shows that the instructional leadership of heads of schools include making available teaching and learning materials. The finding concurs with Sisman (2016) who indicated that the preparation of teaching and learning resources to be one of major components of instructional leadership. In other words, it is the responsibility of heads of schools to ensure that schools have adequate resources to implement the school curriculum.

The rate of curriculum implementation and syllabi coverage in schools more often depend on the extent to which the teaching and learning resources are available and effectively utilized by teachers during teaching. Furthermore, Table 2 shows that majority of teachers 55 (87.3%) perceived that the heads of schools' instructional leadership role is to improve teacher capacity to enhance the teaching and learning process. This finding is in line with the findings from the study conducted by Doss and Tosh (2019) which showed that most of participants

perceived the instructional leadership to be closely associated with teacher professional development. In addition, the results from the FGDs with heads of schools indicated that heads of schools perceived one of their instructional leadership roles is to promote professional development of teachers by improving pedagogic techniques; which in turn, improves instructional delivery. On this, one head of school had this to say.

Honestly speaking, for quality delivery of instruction...teachers are not denied opportunities to attend any available training. This way, the teaching standards of my teachers improved after attending a series of INSET-programmes the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology organized for science and mathematics teachers by. Nowadays, new teaching techniques are used to simplify the teaching and learning process. (Head of school 10)

The findings above indicate that most of heads of schools understand that enhancing capacity building is part of their instructional roles. Also, it was revealed that enhancing teacher capacity is benefits heads of schools. This observation concurs with Lambert (1998) who point out that teacher capacity building improves collaboration in the teaching and learning process. That is to say; instructional leadership builds the capacity of teachers and improves teacher self esteem regarding what was learnt and its application in actual classroom delivery.

Instructional Leadership Practices in Secondary Schools

The second specific objective of the study was to identify secondary school heads' instructional leadership practices in Biharamulo district. Secondary school teachers were requested to rate their agreement regarding the presence of heads of schools' instructional leadership practices. The results are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3: Instructional Leadership Practices in Secondary Schools (N=63)

Instructional Leadership Practices	Level of Agreement		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Supervising preparation of scheme of works and lesson plans	57 (90.5%)	2 (3.2%)	4 (6.3%)
Monitoring the teaching process of all teachers	63 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Setting and communicating instructional goals	55 (87.3%)	1 (1.6%)	7 (11.1%)

Field data, 2020

As shown in Table 3, a great number 57(90.5%) of teachers agreed that supervising the preparation of schemes of work and lesson plans is one of heads of schools' instructional leadership practices in secondary schools. This implies that most of school heads paid attention on the School Management Tool Kit - the guide provided to heads of secondary schools. This guide requires heads of schools to ensure that teachers prepare all necessary pedagogical documents including lesson plans and schemes of work (MoEST, 2015). Similarly, Musungu and Nasongo's (2008) findings indicate that heads of schools' instructional leadership practices include regular checking of lesson plans, schemes of work as well as records of work covered. However, Swai and Ndidde (2006) found that 14 out of 26 heads of schools had signed without paying attention to the content or accuracy of the plans or schemes of work. To this end, researchers employed FGD with heads of schools to further solicit deep information on the extent to which heads of schools inspected schemes of work and lesson plans. Results from the FGD indicate that heads of schools supervised the preparation of lesson plans and schemes of work and they encouraged teachers to prepare comprehensive lesson plans and schemes of work. One of the heads of schools said the following.

In my school, I have been more serious in reminding teachers to prepare lesson plans than ever before. Though some of the teachers view the preparation of lesson plans for each lesson to be a difficult, repetitive and tiresome task... a tedious and boring task but there is no option...teachers must obey and comply. (Head of school 7)

The findings indicate that there is improvement in supervising the preparation of schemes of work and lesson plans. However, school inspectors' report in Kagera region (2015) found that majority of heads of schools poorly supervised teachers to deliver and as a result a number of teachers failed to prepare pedagogical documents when inspectors visited schools. Weak preparation of lesson plans and schemes of work render the loss of instructional time and traditional teaching methodologies. However, heads of schools that successfully implement policies that limit interruptions of classroom learning time can increase allocated learning time, and potentially, student achievement (Stallings, 1980 cited in Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Therefore, it is the responsibility of heads of schools; being the fulcrum of all school activities, to ensure that teachers prepare schemes of work and lesson plans before actual teaching takes place in classrooms.

Moreover, findings show that all teachers 63 (100%) agreed that monitoring the teaching process of all teachers is one of school heads' instructional leadership practices. This finding corroborates with Enueme and Egwunyenga (2008) who revealed that heads of schools monitored the teaching ability of all teachers and assisted them in their classroom instruction. That is, both veteran and novice teachers were often monitored by heads of schools. This is supported by MoEST (2015) that the school head should supervise the teaching process of all teachers as well as monitoring school and class attendance of teachers. Researchers went further soliciting deep information from FGD on whether or not instructional delivery was well monitored in schools. Results indicate that in most cases there is inadequate monitoring of teachers' teaching ability when teaching in classrooms. One head of school narrated the following.

Being honest...throughout my administrative responsibilities...I have never visited teachers in classrooms to observe the way they teach. Instead, I always pass along corridors to check whether teachers enter classrooms according to the timetable. That way, teachers are usually left on their own in classrooms. I think, it is my role as the head of school to ensure that the instruction is well delivered through paying informal visits to classrooms in order to observe the way teachers teach. (Head of school 3)

The above quotation implies that heads of schools inadequately pay attention on how teachers teach in classrooms. To the contrary, Enueme and Egwunyenga (2008) found that teachers experienced high level of instructional leadership as well as classroom instruction assistance by heads of schools. This is in line with Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom and Anderson (2010) who found that effective heads of schools who made more frequent and spontaneous observations of classroom instruction could provide direct and immediate feedback to improve their teachers' work performance.

That is, teachers' teaching techniques are improved as the head of school invests in classroom visits and observations. Researchers gathered further deep information by using interview method with the District Secondary Education Officer (DSEO). Results from the interview with the DSEO reveal that heads of schools had clear understanding about the importance of monitoring teachers' teaching process including paying classroom visits and observations in schools. For instance, a key informant at the district education office remarked the following.

Very often, heads of schools are asked to monitor teachers' classroom attendance and the teaching and learning process. Heads of schools need to pay more classroom visits to see the methodology used by teachers when teaching students. However, they seem to have forgotten this responsibility...I will remind them in the next meeting of all secondary school heads. (District official 2)

The above show that heads of schools should be reminded about monitoring teachers' teaching and instructional delivery as well. The necessity of monitoring teachers through school heads' informal classroom visits and observation is also observed by Lashway (2003) who contends that heads of schools are expected to be able to recognize whether or not lessons are aligned with the standards-based curriculum, develop assessments that are consistent with standards, and be able to determine if students' work meeting set academic standards.

Furthermore, heads of schools mentioned the provision of instructional teaching and learning resources to be among instructional leadership practices heads of schools employed in secondary schools. For instance, one of heads of schools said the following during FGD.

Frankly speaking...there is no teaching and learning process in the absence of relevant teaching and learning materials. As the head of school, I must ensure the availability of necessary teaching and learning resources for the delivery of quality instruction. However, a monthly disbursed fund from the central government is too small to purchase textbooks, reference books and other necessary teaching and learning aids such as biological specimens, models, wall charts and chemical reagents. (Head of school 2)

The above shows that the heads of school's purchase teaching and learning materials in small quantities due to inadequate financial support from the central government. This finding, however, contradicts with that of Onuma (2016) which indicated that heads of schools provided teachers with various instructional resources including visual as well as audio-visual teaching and learning aids. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) describing the education policy outlook in 2015 in member countries argued that resources needed to be invested in the best possible ways in order to bring about knowledge and skills which promote growth and development (OECD, 2015). However, Mtitu (2016) found that Tanzanian community secondary school teachers experienced limited supply of both instructional facilities and resources.

In other words, heads of schools as instructional leaders need adequate financial support from the government for purchasing all necessary teaching and learning resources to aid the teaching and learning process.

FGDs indicate that promoting instructional development programmes is another instructional leadership practice the heads of schools must undertake. One head of school had the following to say about promoting instructional development.

What I know is that the word instruction is all about the teaching and learning process. To ensure teachers teach properly, I must do whatever it takes to allow them to attend professional development programmes organized at the district and regional levels. I think this is another strategy that equips teachers to be competent in teaching subjects at the schools.
(Head of school 9)

The illustration above concurs with the study by Onuma (2016) who found that the heads of schools ensured the provision of instructional development programmes in schools. In other words, the study reveal that the heads of schools allowed teachers to be involved in instructional development programmes such as collaborative planning, Teacher Development and Management Strategy (TDMS) and other organized in-service training. For instance, UNICEF (2000) suggested that for the betterment of teacher's heads of schools should allow teachers' dialogue and reflections with colleagues, peer and supervisor observations and reviewing journals all of which are effective ways for teachers to advance their knowledge. In an attempt to get deep information on the extent to which heads of schools promote instructional development programmes, researchers interviewed District Secondary Education Officer (DSEO). Results from interviews indicated that school heads usually allow teachers to attend workshops, seminars and other in-service training at the district and regional levels as one DSEO said.

I have seen a very good number of teachers attending TDMS and seminars; this means that heads of schools allow these teachers to attend. TDMS and seminars have made most of our teachers improve their methodology and academic performance of the students. (District official 2)

It is clear from the above response that heads of schools allow and encourage teachers to attend in-service trainings when opportunities arise. The seminars help to improve the ability of teachers to teach effectively.

At school level, heads of schools need to be creative to come up with a number of instructional development programmes such as peer coaching, teachers' dialogue and reflections as well as encouraging teachers to read capacity building journals (UNICEF, 2000). Well designed instructional development programmes result into improved teachers' teaching ability together with improved teachers' teaching techniques. This, in turn, improves the instruction delivery and teachers' work performance.

Table 3 indicates that most teachers 55 (87.3%) agreed that setting and communicating instructional goals is another instructional leadership practice carried out by heads of schools. This finding corroborates with Sisman (2016) who revealed that the first instructional leadership practice by heads of schools is to identify school vision, mission and, school goals. Using the FGD, heads of schools gave deep information regarding the extent to which heads of schools as instructional leaders set and communicate instructional goals. Results from FGD indicate that heads of schools usually disseminate preset instructional goals to teachers during staff meetings. For instance, one head of school had the following to say.

As the head of school, I always consider every staff meeting the golden chance to tell staff members what should be done...insisting that teachers should implement competence-based curriculum. I have also been inviting teachers' cooperation even when planning school annual budget before being presented to the school board. Also, I usually remind all heads of departments to prepare their respective departmental requirements so as to ensure smooth running of teaching and learning process. (Head of school 1)

The above indicates that heads of schools are cooperative in secondary schools to an extent of sharing with other teachers all preset goals which need to be achieved by staff members. In other words, communicating instructional goals makes teachers aware of what they are supposed to do. This finding is supported by Jones and Egley (2006) who contend that teachers who are supported by their school heads in a more collaborative way communicate their instructional goals better; thus, producing higher student outcomes than school heads who are more traditional in their leadership style. Thus, communicating instructional goals as a practice, leaves teachers with an understanding of what is to be done for effective instructional delivery.

Challenges Facing School Heads' Instructional Leadership

The third objective was to find out challenges facing secondary school heads' instructional leadership in Biharamulo District. Teachers were requested to rate their agreement regarding the challenges that hinder heads of schools from practicing instructional leadership in secondary schools. The results are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4: Challenges Facing School Heads' Instructional Leadership (N=63)

Challenges Facing Instructional Leadership	Level of Agreement		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Lack of financial support	60 (95.2%)	1 (1.6%)	2 (3.2%)
Heavy workload	63 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Teachers' negligence	55 (87.3%)	1 (1.6%)	7 (11.1%)
Lack of training on instructional Leadership	50 (79.4%)	3 (4.8%)	10 (15.8%)

Field data, 2020

Results in Table 4 indicate that most teachers 60 (95.2%) agreed that the major challenge hindering the implementation of instructional leadership practices is the lack of financial support in schools. That is to say that heads of schools receive inadequate financial support from the government to implement school curricular. In the same vein, Ekyaw (2014) found that lack of financial support hindered the implementation of instructional leadership practices. It should be noted that the implementation of instructional leadership practices has cost implication on the overall school budget; and that, the implementation is impossible with meager funds. Ekyaw (2014) also found that lack of financial allowances hindered school heads from carrying out their duties concerning instructional leadership practices. However, starting from 2016, the financial allowance of Tshs. 250,000/= has been disbursed to heads of schools on monthly basis in Tanzania. Using interviews with key informants at the District Education Office, the study obtained information on whether or not the financial allowance extended to heads of schools helped implement instructional leadership practices. The results from the interviews indicate that financial allowance remitted to schools aimed at supplementing salaries of heads of schools and not otherwise. Commenting on this finding, one key informant at DEO said the following,

It is true that nowadays the government has added financial allowances to salaries of heads of schools. However, the allowance has nothing to do with the implementation of instructional leadership practices...what I know is that heads of schools cannot use it for purchasing instructional requirements in schools rather they use such amount to cater for the needs of their families (District Education Officer 1).

The above reveal that the so called administrative financial allowances were not meant to be used to improve the implementation of instructional leadership practices. Therefore, the government needs to address the issue at hand by providing adequate funds for heads of schools to easily purchase school instructional requirements including the teaching and learning materials.

Moreover, results in Table 4 indicate that majority 55 (87.3%) of teachers agreed that teachers' negligence hinders the smooth implementation of instructional practices in schools. This finding concurs with Ng'oma and Simatwa (2013) who found that negligence of duty had adverse impact on teachers' curriculum delivery. In addition, Ekyaw (2014) found that school heads' instructional leadership was hindered by the negligence of teachers to accept directives and recommendations. In the same vein, Makokha (2015) found that teachers' negative attitude hindered the implementation of instructional leadership practices in schools. That is to say teachers' negative attitude and negligence to implement the desired instructional leadership practices portray conflicting relationship between heads of schools and teachers. This relationship between school heads and teachers leads to the lack of common understanding. In turn, heads of schools fail to implement instructional leadership practices in schools. To solicit deep information concerning teachers' negligence, researchers conducted interviews and FGD with the District Secondary Education Officer (DSEO) and heads of schools respectively. Results from the interview and FGDs revealed that teachers seldom follow heads of school's directives. Heads of schools reported that teachers were ignored directives from the heads of schools; and this, leads to poor delivery of the instructions. In other words, efforts of heads of schools to implement effective instructional leadership practices are hardly implementable in the presence of teachers who are negligent. One head of school said the following.

In my school, I usually urge teachers to observe their responsibilities as teachers. For example, I usually call upon teachers to prepare teaching

notes, schemes of work, lesson plans, to compensate lost periods, and fill subject log books as soon as they complete every topic. Most teachers respond positively with some sort of delays whereas few of them totally ignore my directives. When you peruse some of the personal files of some teachers you will see reprimand letters issued to negligent teachers. (Head of school 5)

The teachers' failure to implement agreed instructional goals and school heads' instructions hinders effective implementation of instructional leadership. For adequate instruction delivery, teachers need to comply to instructions and directives given by heads of schools.

Table 4 shows that heavy workload was agreed by all teachers 63 (100%) to be among the factors that hinders heads of schools' instructional leadership practices. This finding concurs with Ekyaw (2014) who pointed out that poor implementation of instructional leadership practices was due to the fact that heads of schools were overburdened with many other tasks. In the same vein, results from the interview session with the District Education Officer (DSEO) indicate that the heads of schools did not effectively implement the instructional leadership practices due to a pile of administrative tasks and regular meetings with their seniors. Commenting on this finding, the key informant from the District Education Office said:

Nowadays, the government emphasize on hard working than ever before. This has made me to conduct various meetings with heads of schools. These meetings are done so as to communicate important administrative activities to be well supervised. It is likely that these meetings and administrative tasks have made most of school heads too busy to supervise the instruction leadership practices in secondary schools. (District official 2)

The above quotation implies that the heads of schools seldom implement fully instructional leadership practices due to overloads. This line of thinking concurs with Dhinat's (2015) findings which revealed that heads of schools had difficulty to supervise instruction because of being overburdened with administrative activities. . This finding is also in line with Carron & Chau (1996) which showed that heads of schools are always overloaded with tasks ranging from personal to administrative ones. School heads, therefore, need to balance the range of administrative tasks and instructional leadership practices for effective supervision.

Nevertheless, the results in Table 4 indicate that a good number 50 (79.4%) of teachers point out the lack of training on instructional leadership to be one of the factors that hinder the implementation of instructional leadership practices. This finding concurs with Ekyaw's (2014) findings which revealed that the lack of adequate training remains a challenge facing school heads' instructional leadership. This implies that heads of schools lack professional skills to guide instructional leadership practices. According to Sisman (2016), heads of schools as immediate instructional leaders need to have necessary skills for identifying and defining the school visions, missions and goals; building consensus about school goals; providing the necessary resources for teaching; coordination, management, control and evaluation of teaching and curriculum; monitoring, evaluating and developing the staff; creating close relationship and cooperation between staff; ensuring regular teaching and learning climate; enabling the support from society and environment; and being a role model and teaching source. Therefore, the instructional leadership training for school heads is of greater importance in schools. That is, heads of schools need to be equipped with requisite skills for them to adequately supervise the instruction in their respective schools. However, some of the heads of schools consider lack of training an excuse for not making a change. (Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2008).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has pointed out that heads of schools perceive instructional leadership in terms of showing right direction regarding the teaching and learning process, ensuring the availability of teaching and learning resources including the teaching staff, and improving teachers' teaching capacity. This means that the heads of schools must have vision and work to develop high expectations, develop relationships with teachers, be supportive, and enable teachers to effectively teach students. The study has also revealed that effective teaching and learning process is made possible when heads of schools devise a number of instructional practices such as supervising preparation of schemes of work and lesson plans, monitoring the teaching process, setting and communicating instructional goals; maintaining visibility and classroom visits, and organizing in-service trainings for teacher professional development. It can as well be observed that heads of schools seldom visit teachers in classrooms to know what teachers exactly do when in classrooms. Moreover, school heads are often faced with challenging issues such as resistance to instructional leadership in schools, lack of financial support, teachers'

negligence, heavy workload, and lack of instructional leadership trainings for school heads.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, K. A. (2016). Instructional leadership practices in secondary schools of Assosa zone Ethiopia. *Instructional Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Review*, 4(7), 191-211.
- Ali, S. Q. (2019). *The principal supervisor's role, practices and challenges in developing principals' instructional leadership capacity* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). University of Texas, Austin.
- Carron, G., & Chau, T. N. (1996). *The quality of primary schools in different development contexts*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dhinat, S. A. (2015). *Influence of the head teachers' instructional supervisory practices on teachers' work performance in Tanzania* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Doss, C. J., & Tosh, K. (2019). *Perceptions of principal leadership: Implications for principal effectiveness*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Available on: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2575z5.html.
- Ekyaw, A. B. (2014). *The practices and challenges of instructional supervision in Asossa zone primary schools* (Unpublished Master's Dissertation). JIMMA University, Ethiopia.
- Enueme, C. P., & Ekwunye, E. J. (2008). Principals' instructional leadership roles and effects on teachers' job performance: A case study of secondary schools in Asaba Metropolis, Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 13-17.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-248.
- Hallinger, P., & Walker, A. (2014). *Exploring whole school vs. subject department improvement in Hong Kong secondary schools. School improvement and school effectiveness*. Retrieved from <http://www.philliphallinger.com> on 1st April 2019.
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale*, New York, NY: Springer Science Press.
- Jones, B. D., & Egle, R. J. (2006). Looking through different lenses: Teachers' and administrators' view of accountability: Teachers and

- principals don't always agree about the effects in education of accountability system based on high-stakes testing. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87, 767-773.
- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Role of the school leader*. Clearinghouse on educational policy and management. Retrieved from http://eric2.uoregon.edu/trends_Issues/rolelead/index.html
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 27–42.
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Makokha, N. V. (2015). *Factors affecting principals' instructional supervisory practices in public secondary schools in Makadara sub-county* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Manaseh, A. M. (2016). Instructional leadership: The role of heads of schools in managing the instructional programme. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 4(1), 30-47.
- Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. (2015). *Secondary school management toolkit: Practical guide for heads of schools*. Dar es Salaam: MoEVT.
- Mtitu, E. A. (2016). Challenges of top -down curriculum on the quality of classroom instructional practices: Voices from the bush. *Journal of Issues and Practices in Education*, 8(1), 50-68.
- Musaazi, J. S. (1988). *The theory and practices of educational administration*. London: Mc Millan Publisher.
- Musungu, L. L., & Nasongo, J. W. (2008). The head teacher's instructional role in academic achievement in secondary schools in Vihiga district, Kenya. *Educational Research and Review*, 3(10), 316-323.
- Ngirwa, C. C. (2006). *The effects of leadership styles in promoting academic performance in primary education*. (Published MA Dissertation). Tanzania. University of Dar es Salaam.
- Ng'oma, O. P., & Simatwa, M. E. (2013). Forms, factors and preferred strategies in management of professional misconduct among public primary school teachers in Kenya. *International Research Journal*, 4(1), 44-63.

- Nguni, S. (2005). *Transformational leadership in Tanzania education: A study of the effects of transformational leadership on teachers' job satisfaction, commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in Tanzania primary and secondary schools*. (Published Doctoral Thesis). Rod bound University.
- Onuma, N. (2016). Principal performance of supervision of instructions in secondary schools in Nigeria. *British Journal of Education, 4* (3), 40-52.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development: Education policy outlook, making reforms happen, OECD. (2015, January 18). Available at:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264225442-en>
- Pustejovsky, J., Spillane, J. P., Heaton, R. M., & Lewis, W. J. (2009). Understanding teacher leadership in middle school mathematics: A collaborative research effort. *Journal of Mathematics and Science: Collaborative Explorations, 11*(2), 19-40.
- School inspectors' report. (2015). *Inspection of secondary schools on general and pedagogical documents* [Brochure]: Kagera region, Author.
- Sisman, M. (2016). Factors related to instructional leadership perception and effect of instructional leadership on organizational variables: A meta-analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 16*, 1761-1787.
- Sumra, S., & Rajani, R. (2006). *Secondary Education in Tanzania: Key Policy Challenges*. Hakielimu Working Paper No. 06.4 - Presented at The Norwegian Post-Primary Education Fund for Africa (NPEF) Seminar, Oslo, September 13-14, 2006 co-organized by the Norwegian Government and the World Bank.
- Swai, F., & Ndidde, A. (2006). *Local research on the characteristics of effective primary schools in Singida, Tanzania*. Paper produced for the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) Biennial Meeting, Libreville, Gabon.
- Ubben, G., & Larry, W. (1997). *The principal creative leadership for effective schools*. (3rded.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- United Nations International Children Education Fund. (2000). *Curriculum report card. Working paper series, education section, programme division*. New York: Palgram Macmillan.
- Willison, R. (2008). What makes an instructional leader? *Scholastic Administrator, 64*, 64.

World Bank. (2010). *Recruiting, retaining, and retraining secondary school teachers and principals in sub-Saharan Africa*. Retrieved from www.data.worldbank.org.