

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Ministry of Education has over the years been seeking ways to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools which would subsequently raise the standards of education in Zambia. The research which was done by Policy and Operations Evaluation Department [IOB], (2008) in Primary Education in Zambia revealed that children who completed the lower and middle basic school were not exhibiting the expected fundamental reading, writing and numeracy skills. There was extensive rote learning geared largely to memorization of facts, simply for the purpose of passing examinations. The other research done by Education Management Information System, EMIS, (2007) in basic schools in Zambia, confirmed that whereas Zambia was successful in improving access to education, the quality of education in basic schools, as measured by test and examination results, was still low. The evaluation pointed to several weaknesses among them lack of effective management capacity at the school level.

A dominant belief in education and government circles was that head teachers can and should make a difference in the academic standards of schools (Christre, 1998). Head teachers should, therefore, become leaders of instruction and with dynamic and inspirational leadership focus on raising the teaching and learning practices in schools. This responsibility of the head teachers to ensure that effective teaching and learning takes place is, however, not new – it can be and was always regarded as his/her primary task (American Association of School Administrators, AASA, 1992). The head teacher is expected to provide the appropriate leadership which would assist each staff member make a maximum contribution to the schools' effort to providing quality and up-to-date education. He/she is expected to have experience in this area because, according to Sergiovanni (1996), “after all, knowledge about teaching and learning ability to share these insights with teachers is a key factor in any head teachers selection process”.

School head teachers are expected to provide academic leadership in their roles as teachers and administrators. As teachers they provide a model for other teachers in the preparation of their work, the organization and management of their classes, their punctuality and orderliness, their instructional techniques, and their evaluation of pupils. As administrators they have many and diverse responsibilities: organizing the implementation of the curriculum in the school,

supervising and evaluating teachers, procuring materials, keeping records, communicating with the ministry, maintaining facilities and equipment, dealing with parents and the community, serving on the PTA (Ministry of Education, 1992). Additionally, the good head teacher stimulates improvements, fosters resourcefulness in the use of locally available materials, takes the initiative in promoting the well-being of the school within the community, and creates among staff and pupils a bond of identity with each other and with the school.

Instructional leadership is the dynamic delivery of the curriculum in the classroom through strategies based on reflection, assessment and evaluation to ensure optimum learning (Heywood, 2008). The increasing emphasis on managing teaching and learning as the core activities of educational institutions had led to instructional leadership being endorsed (Bush, 2003). In the building, the formal school leader is expected to understand the tenets of quality instruction, as well as have sufficient knowledge of the curriculum to know that appropriate content is being delivered to all pupils (Marzano et al., 2005).

Instructional leadership represents behaviours of a school leader. Through synthesis of different instructional leadership models (Weber, 1996; Murphy, 1990; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985) the following dimensions of instructional leadership have emerged: - an instructional leader is one who –

1. Defines and communicates shared goals. This means that the leader works collaboratively with staff to define, communicate, and work toward data-driven shared goals of the school. Goals are used in making organizational decisions, aligning instructional practice, purchasing curriculum materials, and providing targets for progress. These goals focus the staff around a common mission to achieve.
2. Monitors and provides feedback on the teaching and learning process. This describes the activities of an instructional leader around the academic curriculum. These activities include being visible throughout the school, talking with pupils and teachers, providing praise and feedback to teachers, pupils and the community regarding academic performances, and ensuring that the instructional time of the school is not interrupted.
3. Promotes school-wide professional development. Encompasses behaviours of the leader that is consistent with life-long learning. The instructional leader encourages teachers to learn more about pupil achievement through data analysis, provides professional

development opportunities that are aligned to school goals, and provides professional literature and resources to teachers.

This study includes a survey that was designed to explore teachers' perceptions of their head teacher as one who defined and communicated shared goals; monitored and provided feedback on teaching and learning process; and promoted school-wide professional development. Teachers provided information about how school location, gender, school size, years of experience and their own age may affect a relationship between their beliefs that instructional leadership was an important role of the head teacher.

Followers form opinions of their leaders based upon school conditions that are generally open to the influence of their leader, such as vision, culture and decision-making processes that are implemented and monitored by the leader (Leithwood, et. al., 2006). The theory of charismatic leadership brings further support to the claim that, followers' perceptions were important, and maintains that, followers' perceptions of leadership are also tied to the leader's ability to lead organization during a time of crisis (Yukl, 1998; House, 1977).

In tandem, these leadership practices and behaviours of the head teacher has been shown to build capacity in teachers (Fullan, 2008). Instructional leadership characteristics and behaviours of the head teacher, however, play prominently in the focus of this research. Instructional leadership modes are identified and cited to show a common set of behaviours which had been shown to have a correlation between instructional leadership and pupil achievement. Specifically, Hallinger & Murphy (1985) identified three constructs of instructional leadership important to the work of head teacher, which may shape teachers' perceptions of their leaders' effectiveness.

Supporting the above discussion, Obi (2002) noted that to be a successful instructional leader, the head teacher must give primary attention to the programme of staff improvement, which comprises leadership techniques and procedures designed to change the teachers' roles in this include: classroom visitation, observations, conferences, seminar, and workshop, professional associations, in-service educational programme and others, while Sach (1995) added that conducive environment enhances teachers' work performance.

Although there has been research focused on primary and secondary school leadership, there is not enough empirical data regarding primary school head teacher instructional leadership

behavior and teachers' perceptions of primary school head teachers instructional leadership behavior.

This study seeks to increase the understanding of primary school instructional leadership behavior and inform the issue of teachers' perceptions of primary school instructional leadership by providing an extensive description and analysis of primary school teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of primary school head teachers.

While primary school head teachers are being held accountable for meeting needs of every stakeholder, he/she often lacks the foundation for constructing techniques, traits, and characteristics to lead the primary school to success. This study examines this problem as it compares what is expected of effective primary school head teachers (as indicated in the literature), to how they actually perform, as perceived by teachers.

1.2 Statement of the problem

It is important to understand perceptions held by teachers of the leaders they follow (Leithwood et. al., 2006). Such perceptions influence "followers" to accept and share a leader's vision to pursue and accomplish goals in the interest of the school. Perceptions, while different from concrete observation of behaviours, provided valuable information about how leaders communicate goals and manage the curriculum (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). However, Leithwood and Colleagues (2006) suggested that followers base their perceptions on whatever evidence they have in their specific experience.

It has been observed that individual component schools in Mufumbwe district and their leaders and teachers are naturally connected through a common regional culture of professional circles and expectations. There may be common instructional leadership behaviours among component school leaders within Mufumbwe district. Teachers may hold common perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours like it has been exemplified in many empirical studies. Therefore, this study sought to explore school head teachers in Mufumbwe District as perceived by primary school teachers.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate, identify and analyze teachers' perceptions of effective primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behaviour.

1.4 Objectives of the study

Following the purpose above, the specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Find out whether there is difference between teacher's perceptions of primary school head teacher's instructional leadership behavior and the school location (Rural vs. Remote).
2. Find out whether there is difference between teacher's perceptions of primary school head teacher's instructional leadership behavior and teacher's gender (Male vs. Female).
3. Find out whether there is difference between teacher's perceptions of primary school head teacher's instructional leadership behavior and school size (Small, Medium, and Large).
4. Find out whether there is difference between teacher's perceptions of primary school head teacher's instructional leadership behavior and teacher's age.
5. Find out whether there is difference between teacher's perceptions of primary school head teacher's instructional leadership behavior and teacher's work experience.

1.5 Research Null Hypotheses

This study investigated the instructional leadership behaviours of primary school head teachers, as perceived by primary school teachers. The following five null hypotheses were tested in this study: -

1. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership behaviours of their head teachers and school location [rural (urban) or remote (rural)].
2. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership of their head teachers and teachers' gender (male or female).
3. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership behaviours of their head teachers and the school size.
4. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behavior and teachers' age.
5. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours and teachers' work experience.

1.6 Significance of the study

As this study unfolds, it may identify teacher perceptions of primary school head teachers that may affect teacher-head teacher relations as they work in concert to ensure developmentally appropriate teaching and learning, and optimal pupil achievement outcomes. It may also be of use to leadership consultants, staff developers and school board members. It should be of use to anyone studying school leadership.

1.7 Delimitations

The study will be delimited to primary schools in Mufumbwe District of North-Western Province.

1.8 Limitations of the study

School leadership study has been beset with problems and limitations. “Leadership has proved to be both an elusive concept and one hard to define; there is as yet little or no agreement on a basic operational definition to guide research and even less agreement about related concepts” (Cunningham & Gephart, 1973).

The schools included in this study are taken from a list of schools in Mufumbwe district. This “selective” sampling may decrease the generalizability of its findings. It is possible that this study may not be generalizable to the primary head teachers who are not in Mufumbwe district.

1.9 Operational definitions

Terms used throughout the current study are defined below for clarity and understanding:

Instructional leadership: - represents behaviors of a school leader. In this study, specific behaviors of primary school head teachers were examined. Through synthesis of different instructional leadership models (Weber, 1996; Murphy, 1990; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Hallinger & Heck, 1996), the following dimensions of instructional leadership have emerged:

- **Defines and Communicates Shared Goals:** means that the leader works collaboratively with staff to define, communicate, and work toward data-driven shared goals of the school. Goals are used in making organizational decisions, aligning instructional practice, purchasing curricular materials, and providing targets for progress. These goals focus the staff around a common mission to achieve.

- **Monitors and Provides Feedback on the Teaching and Learning Process:** describes the activities of an instructional leader around the academic curriculum. These activities include being visible throughout the school, talking with pupils and teachers, providing praise and feedback to teachers, pupils and the community regarding academic performances, and ensuring that the instructional time of the school is not interrupted.
- **Promotes School-wide Professional Development:** encompasses behaviors of the leader that are consistent with life-long learning. The instructional leader encourages teachers to learn more about pupil achievement through data analysis, provides professional development opportunities that are aligned to school goals, and provides professional literature and resources to teachers.

Perception: - Recognition and interpretation of sensory stimuli based chiefly on memory (Beverly, 2001).

Behavior: - the actions or reactions of persons or things in response to external or internal stimuli.

Primary Schools: - schools that serve adolescents ages 7-14 and that focus on the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical developmental needs of this age group.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview

This chapter is dedicated to the review of relevant literature on instructional leadership and other pertinent theories of leadership, and teachers' perceptions of leadership. Specifically, literature around the role of the instructional leader in terms of attributes of leaders as an instructional resource, resource provider, communicator and visible presence will be presented.

Numerous researchers have made meaningful arguments about the moderating effects of environmental variables, quality teachers dedicated to their profession, and effective boards and building head teachers on pupil achievement. The highly interactive instructional leadership behaviours of the head teachers and teachers' perceptions of them are central to the instructional dynamics of school (Bjork, 2009). Furthermore, teachers' perceptions of the head teacher's skill and engagement as an effective instructional leader may tell us something about the evidence and importance of shared leadership of the head teacher for purposes of instructional improvement.

2.2 Instructional leadership Defined

The definition of leadership in literature has been very diverse. Generally, leadership is defined in terms of traits, behaviors, roles and processes. Yuki's (1998) syntheses of definitions, "reflect the assumption that [leadership] involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization" (p.3). Said in another way, Hoy & Miskel (2000) assert that "leadership should be defined broadly as a social process in which a member of a group or organization influences the interpretation of internal and external events, the choice of goals or desired outcomes, organization of work activities, individual motivation and abilities, power relations, and shared orientations" (p.394).

The leadership definition continues to evolve and expand, especially in education. Van de Grift and Houtveen (1999), demarcate educational leadership as "the ability of the head teacher to initiate school improvement, to create a learning oriented educational climate, and to stimulate and supervise teachers in such a way that the latter may exercise their tasks as effectively as possible" (p. 373). Instructional leadership exemplifies this definition in practice. Instructional leadership consists of head teacher behaviours that set high expectations and clear goals for

student and teacher performance, monitor and provide feedback regarding the technical core (teaching and learning) of schools, provide and promote professional growth for all staff members, and help create and maintain a school climate of high academic press (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Furthermore, Hoy & Hoy (2003) tells us “Above all, the head teacher must communicate a clear vision on instructional excellence and continuous professional development consistent with the goal of the improvement of teaching and learning” (p.2).

Seyfarth (1999: 169) defines it as an eclectic merging of instructional supervision, curriculum development and staff development. The definition is supported by Blasé and Blasé (1999: 53) when they contend that instructional leadership is a blend of several tasks such as shaping and communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instructional practices, developing and coordinating the curriculum, developing staff and evaluating progress on learner achievement.

According to Leithwood (1994: 3) instructional leadership is a series of behaviors that is defined to affect classroom instruction. In this environment head teachers are responsible for informing teachers about new educational strategies, technologies and tools that apply to effective instruction. Head teachers must also assist teachers in critiquing these tools to determine their applicability to the classroom (Whitaker and Moses, 1994).

Instructional leadership encompasses those actions that a head teacher takes or delegates to others to promote growth in pupil learning and it comprises of the following tasks: defining the purpose of schooling, setting school wide goals, providing the resources needed for learning to occur, supervising and evaluating teachers, coordinating staff development programmes and creating collegial relationships with and among teachers (Van De Grift, 1993: 24).

It is in the spirit of the above definition that Weller (1999: 36) refers to instructional leadership as the high visibility and involvement of the head teacher in every phase of the school programme. Andrews, Basom and Basom (1994), contended that to create a visible presence in day to day activities head teachers must model behaviors consistent with the school’s vision, live and breathe their beliefs in education. They must organize resources to accomplish goals, informally “drop in on classroom”, make staff development activities a priority and most of all to help people do the right things and to reinforce those activities.

2.3 Leadership Theory

Educational leadership theory has evolved during the last fifty years (Griffiths, 1988 for an extensive review). Several eras of leadership have emerged and are reviewed to provide an historical perspective of instructional leadership.

2.3.1 Trait Theory

The trait approach may be categorized into two phases: early and modern. The early phase of trait theory professed that leadership capacity could be determined by a person's individual attributes such as personality, physical characteristics, intelligence, motives, temperament, and skills. This early development of the theory focused on comparing leaders to non-leaders. This theory dominated the research until Stogdill's review demonstrated that certain personal traits were associated with leadership. The five general categories include:

- Capacity – intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, judgment;
- Achievement – scholarship, knowledge, athletic accomplishments;
- Responsibility – dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, desire to excel;
- Participation – active, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, humor; and
- Status – socioeconomic position, popularity (Stogdill, 1948 p.63-64).

However, Stogdill (1948) concluded that although traits could differentiate between leaders and non-leaders, they alone do not produce reliable empirical results. He proposed that situational factors must be considered:

“A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of the combination of traits...the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers” (Stogdill, 1948, p.64).

The modern phase of trait theory produced more consistent results about the relationship between traits and leadership effectiveness. Stogdill's follow-up study (1974) reviewed 163 trait studies conducted between 1949 -1970. He determined that many of the leadership traits that distinguished leaders from non-leaders were consistent with leadership effectiveness.

“The leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor, and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesomeness and originality in problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision an action, readiness to absorb, interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other persons’ behavior, and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand” (Stogdill, 1974, p.81).

Trait theory and research have provided researchers and practitioners with useful information about leadership traits and effectiveness. It is important that when selecting an educational leader for a particular district or building, a balance and fit are made between the person’s personal traits and the environmental situations that are involved.

2.3.2 Leadership Behavior Theory

The conceptualization of leadership behaviors has centered around two main characteristics: interpersonal relations or consideration for others and task-oriented behaviors such as goal attainment, production and structure (Hoy & Miskel, 2000; Yukl, 1998). Behavioral theories of leadership are based upon the belief that great leaders are made, not born. Rooted in behaviorism, this leadership theory focuses on the actions of leaders not on mental qualities or internal states. According to this theory, people can *learn* to become leaders through teaching and observation.

2.3.3 Contingency Theories

Contingency theories of leadership focus on particular variables related to the environment that might determine which particular style of leadership is best suited for the situation. According to this theory, no leadership style is best in all situations. Success depends upon a number of variables, including the leadership style, qualities of the followers and aspects of the situation. They embrace leadership traits, characteristics of a situation, and how these factors impact leader effectiveness (Yukl, 1998).

2.3.4 Charismatic Leadership

It embraces behaviors that build leader influence consist of providing a vision for success, demonstrating personal identification to followers, role modeling behaviors for followers, to emulate, setting high expectations about followers' performance and simultaneously professing confidence in their ability to achieve (Hoy & Miskel, 2000).

2.3.5 Transformational and Transactional Leadership

Relationship theories, also known as transformational theories, focus upon the connections formed between leaders and followers. Transformational leaders motivate and inspire people by helping group members see the importance and higher good of the task. These leaders are focused on the performance of group members, but also want each person to fulfill his or her potential. Leaders with this style often have high ethical and moral standards. Transformational leadership is a process in which "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation" (Burns, 1978).

Transactional leaders motivate followers by exchanging services or rewards for certain acts of behavior. These theories base leadership on a system of rewards and punishments. Transactional theories are often used in business; when employees are successful, they are rewarded; when they fail, they are reprimanded or punished.

2.3.6 Instructional Leadership and Leadership Theories

The above leadership theories provide framework for the historical evolution of instructional leadership. Leadership in social organizations evolves as the social and political climate influence the organization. Thus, the instructional leadership construct amalgamates trait, behavior, contingency, charismatic, transformational and transactional theories. Strong instructional leaders possess specific traits and behaviors, such as charisma, which can be applied in different situations and environments. The premise of instructional leadership is to lead teachers and pupils to reach full potentials by creating climates characterized by defining and communicating shared goals, monitoring the teaching and learning process, and promoting life-long learning of stakeholders and the organization.

2.4 Models of Instructional leadership

Researchers define instructional leadership through the traits, behaviours and processes a person needs to lead a school effectively. Thus, a multitude of conceptual models that demonstrate instructional leadership exist. The following sections will review three prevailing conceptualizations of instructional leadership and introduce a new parsimonious conceptualization of instructional leadership.

2.4.1 Hallinger & Murphy's Model (1985)

Hallinger and Murphy developed their model of instructional management from examining the instructional leadership behaviours of ten elementary head teachers in one school district and a review of the school effectiveness literature. They collected information from head teachers, school staffs and central administration supervisors, via a common questionnaire on instructional leadership behaviours. They supplemented this data with organizational information extracted from school documents, such as observations of the principals during clinical assessments, narratives that describe activities the head teacher engaged in to support the curriculum and instruction in their schools, and faculty meeting minutes and agendas. From the synthesis of questionnaire and the organizational information, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) created a framework of instructional management with three dimensions and eleven job descriptors. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) used the eleven job descriptors from the three dimension of instructional management to create an appraisal instrument of principal instructional management behaviour, The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. Hallinger & Murphy's (1985) conceptualization of instructional management is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Framework of Instructional Management (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985)

Defines the Mission	Manages Instructional Program	Promotes School Climate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Framing school goals -Communicating school goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Supervising and evaluating instruction -Coordinating curriculum -Monitoring student progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Protecting instructional time -Promoting professional development -Maintaining high visibility -Providing incentives for teachers -Enforcing academic standards -Providing incentives for students

According to Hallinger and Murphy, “Principals can influence student and teacher attitudes through the creation of a reward structure that reinforces academic achievement and productive effort; through clear, explicit standards embodying what the school expects from students; through the careful use of school time; and through the selection and implementation of high-quality staff development programs” (1985, p.223). The job descriptors in this dimension embody the activities necessary to influence the promotion of a positive learning climate through indirect activities.

2.4.2 Murphy’s Model (1990)

Murphy (1990) provided a systematic and comprehensive review of instructional leadership in his synthesis of research findings from the effective schools, school improvement, staff development and organizational change literature. Using this review, he built an instructional leadership framework which incorporates studies and findings. The framework consists of four dimensions of instructional leadership broken down into sixteen different roles or behaviours. The four dimensions of the instructional leader, developing mission and goals; managing the educational production function; promoting an academic learning climate; and developing a supportive work environment, are describe below and indicate the different instructional leader roles or behaviours that make up that dimension.

Developing a mission and goals is fundamental in creating a sense of shared purpose and linking efforts within the school around a common vision (Murphy, 1990). Murphy broke down this dimension into two major roles or behaviours of the principal: framing school goals and communicating school goals. Framing school goals encompasses setting goals that emphasize student achievement for all students, incorporating data on past and current student performance and including staff responsibilities for achieving the goals. Communicating goals frequently, and formally and informally, to students, parents, and teachers stresses the importance that school goals guide the activities of the school.

Managing the educational production function of the school is the second dimension of Murphy’s (1990) framework. This dimension emphasizes management behaviours of the principal. The instructional leader promotes quality instruction by conducting teacher conferences and evaluations, visiting classrooms, providing specific suggestions and feedback on the teaching and learning process, and determining teacher assignments in the best interest of

student learning (Murphy, 1990; Teddlie &Stringfield, 1985). Additionally, the principal allocates and protects instructional time with school policies and procedures. The principal works with teachers to coordinate the curriculum through aligning school goals and objectives with state standards, assessments and district curriculum. The instructional leader monitors the progress of students frequently. An instructional leader models how to use assessment data to set goals and evaluate instruction (Murphy, 1990). Promoting an academic learning climate refers to the behaviours of the principal that influences the norms, beliefs, and attitudes of the teachers, students, and parents of a school (Murphy, 1990). “Principals foster the development of a school learning climate conducive to teaching and learning by establishing positive expectations and standards, by maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers and students, and promoting professional development” (p.174). This dimension deals directly with the teaching and learning process in classrooms.

The final dimension of Murphy’s (1990) framework below, developing a supportive work environment denotes how an instructional leader establishes organizational structures and processes that support the teaching and learning process. The principal that exemplifies this dimension creates a safe and orderly learning environment, provides opportunities for meaningful student involvement, develops staff collaboration and cohesion, secures outside resources in support of school goals, and forges links between the home and school. Murphy’s instructional leadership comprehensive framework, illustrated in Table 2 below, provides an extensive examination of an instructional leader.

Table 2: Murphy Comprehensive Instructional Leadership Framework (1990)

Developing Mission and Goals	Managing the Educational Production Function	Promoting an Academic Learning Climate	Developing a Supportive Work Environment
-Framing school goals -Communicating school goals	-Promoting quality instruction -Supervising and evaluating instruction -Allocating and protecting Instructional time -Coordinating the curriculum -Monitoring student progress	-Establishing positive Expectations and standards -Maintaining high visibility -Providing incentives for teachers and students -Promoting professional development	-Creating a safe and orderly Learning environment -Providing opportunities for meaningful student involvement -Developing staff Collaboration and cohesion -Securing outside resources in support of school goals Forging links between the home and the school.

However, this framework, developed through a synthesis of the literature, has not been empirically tested. It is not apparent that a leader who exhibits behaviours from all dimensions has an impact on the fundamental goal of schools: high student achievement.

2.4.3 Weber's Model (1996)

Weber addressed the need for instructional leadership regardless of the school's organizational structure. Weber concludes, "The research suggests that even if an instructional leader were not packaged as the head teacher, it would still be necessary to designate such a leader. The leaderless-team approach to a school's instructional program has powerful appeal, but a large group of professionals still needs a single point of contact and an active advocate for teaching and learning" (1996, p.254). Weber's point is especially poignant in today's educational arena of shared leadership and site-based management. Attention to instructional leadership will need to continue regardless of the hierarchical nature of a school organization. Weber (1996) identified five essential domains of instructional leadership: defining the school's mission, managing curriculum and instruction, promoting a positive learning climate, observing and improving instruction and assessing the instructional program.

Weber described defining the school's mission as a dynamic process of cooperation and reflective thinking to create a mission that is clear and honest. The mission of the school should bind the staff, student and parents to a common vision. The instructional leader offers the stakeholders the opportunity to discuss values and expectations for the school. Together they work to create a shared mission for the school. Managing curriculum and instruction must be consistent with the mission of the school (Weber, 1996). The instructional leader's repertoire of instructional practices and classroom supervision offers teachers the needed resources to provide students with opportunities to succeed. The leader helps teachers use current research in best practices and instructional strategies to reach school goals for student performance. Promoting a positive learning climate comprises the expectations and attitudes of the whole school community. "Indeed, of all the important factors that appear to affect students' learning, perhaps having the greatest influence is the set of beliefs, values, and attitudes that administration, teachers, and students hold about learning" (Weber, 1996, p.263). Leaders promote a positive learning climate by communicating instructional goals, establishing high expectations for performance, establishing an orderly learning environment with clear discipline expectations,

and working to increase teacher commitment to the school (Weber, 1996). Observing and improving instruction starts with the principal establishing trusting and respectful relationships with the school staff. Weber (1996) proposed that observations are opportunities for professional interactions. These interactions provide professional development opportunities for both the observer and one being observed. In other words, a reciprocal relationship develops where both people involved gain valuable information for professional growth.

Table 3: Weber’s (1996) Instructional Leadership Framework

Defining the School’s Mission	Managing Curriculum and Instruction	Promoting a Positive Learning Climate	Observing and Improving Instruction	Assessing the Instructional Program
The instructional leader collaboratively develops a common vision and goals for the school with stakeholders.	The instructional leader monitors classroom practice alignment with the school’s mission, provides resources and support in the use of instructional best practices, and models and provides support in the use of data to drive instruction.	The instructional leader promotes a positive learning climate by communicating goals, establishing expectations, and establishing an orderly learning environment.	The instructional leader observes and improves instruction through the use of classroom observation and professional development opportunities	The instructional leader contributes to the planning, designing, administering, and analysis of assessments that evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum

Head teachers enhance the experience by emphasizing research as the foundation for initiating teaching strategies, remediation, and differentiation of the lessons.

Weber’s last domain of instructional leadership, assessing the instructional program, is essential for improvement of the instructional program (Weber, 1996). The instructional leader initiates and contributes to the planning, designing, administering, and analysis of assessments that evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum. This continuous scrutiny of the instructional program enables teachers to effectively meet students’ needs through constant revision and refinement. Weber’s model (1996) of instructional leadership incorporates research about shared

leadership and empowerment of informal leaders to create a school that underscores the emphasis of academics and student achievement for all students. However, this model, like Murphy's (1990) model, has not been empirically tested. It is not clear that if a principal demonstrates behaviours from Weber's model, high levels of student achievement will result. Weber's model is summarized in Table 3 above.

2.4.4 Hypothesized Framework of Instructional Leadership:

Synthesizing the three predominate models (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 1990; Weber, 1996) of instructional leadership already discussed, three distinct similarities emerged. All three models indicated the importance of instructional leaders defining and communicating goals, monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process, and promoting and emphasizing the importance of professional development. The three similarities parallel Locke and Latham's goal setting theory. Locke and Latham's goal setting theory (1984, 1990) postulate that setting defined challenging goals help motivate individuals to increase performance toward the goals. Feedback is important to maximize the motivating force of the goals. Additionally, individuals may need resources or professional development opportunities to assist in the development of specific task strategies to accomplish the goals. The three dimensions of instructional leadership demonstrate the goal-setting theory in practice in an educational setting. An instructional leader needs to work collaboratively with staff to define shared goals for the school year. The leader needs to monitor and provide feedback of the teaching and learning process as it relates to the specified, shared goals. Finally, it is the instructional leader's responsibility to provide resources and professional development opportunities that help the staff reach the goals. Table 4 illustrates the three dimensions of instructional leadership that will be used in this research study.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Table 4: Instructional Leadership Model Created for the Current Study

- Defining a school's mission, comprised of the two functions of:
 - framing the school's goals
 - communicating the school's goals

- Managing the instructional program, comprised of the three functions of:
 - supervising and evaluating instruction
 - coordinating curriculum
 - monitoring student progress

- Promoting a positive school learning climate, comprised of the five functions:
 - protecting instructional time
 - promoting professional development
 - maintaining high visibility
 - providing incentives for teachers
 - developing high expectations and standards, and providing incentives for learning.

2.5 How Leadership Perceptions are formed

“Conceptualizing leadership in terms of the perceptions of those who experience it is the starting point for many approaches to measuring leadership” (Jantzi, et. al., 1996). In Yukl’s (1994) summation of leadership behaviours, he says that “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves an influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by the leader over followers...that it is a group phenomenon involving the interaction between two or more persons” (1989, p.3).

There are several researchers who also have defined leadership according to ‘interpersonal influence’ (perception) include the following: Lord and Maher (1993) contended that this influence is directly related to a person’s behavior and traits as being recognized and acknowledged to be leadership by those persons who assume the role of followers. In other words they ‘consent to be led’ (Greenfield, 1982, p.75). Leadership, for Lord and Maher (1993), is the “process of being perceived as a leader” (p.11).

Much of what is known from empirical research about school leadership practices is more accurately, knowledge about (primarily) teachers’ perceptions of leadership (Jantzi, et. al., 1996, p.13). Likewise, many authors contend that “much of what is learned from the literature regarding head teachers’ leadership behavior, comes from researchers’ knowledge of teachers’ perceptions of school leadership” (Jantzi et. al., 1996). Therefore, the leadership behavior of the

primary school head teacher can best be measured by how primary school teachers perceive them.

Effective primary school leadership is often measured in the literature by the following:

- a) The perception of the extent to which the head teacher involves staff in making crucial decisions that affect instruction.
- b) The degree to which the head teacher is perceived to involve parents and advisory groups in the school program.
- c) The extent to which the head teacher protects faculty from undue pressures so that their main focus is on teaching.
- d) The extent to which the head teacher leaves teachers alone to do their work and have academic freedom (Heck, et. al., 1982).

According to Lord (1993), there are two ways that leaders (head teachers) are perceived as leaders by their followers (teachers). The first way is ‘Declarative’ knowledge structures match incoming information to categories and prototypes which has already been stored in LTM (Long Term Memory). This recognition process is triggered by observations (or otherwise encountered information) about traits and behaviors of someone who might be perceived as a leader. The observed traits and behaviors are compared to the traits and behaviors stored in LTM. A strong correlation of observed traits and behaviors to previously stored traits and behaviors lead to the follower (teacher) perceptions of the other person as a leader (head teacher). Second, followers (teachers) may also develop perceptions of leaders (head teachers) through an ‘inferential’ process. This process depends on opportunities for followers (teachers) to observe events in which the potential leader is involved and to determine if the potential leader contributed to the positive outcomes of these events (Jantzi et. al., 1996).

Building on Lord and Maher’s study (1993), Jantzi & Leithwood (1996) identified two variables that attribute directly to teachers’ perceptions of head teachers’ leadership behavior. The survey collected data on primary school grade teachers regarding educational experience, years in current school, age, sex, school level, and school size. Two categories of variables, ‘alterable’ and ‘unalterable’, were included in this framework. The alterable variables include ‘in-school’ and ‘out of school’ components. In-school alterable variables include items associated with the

school's mission and goals, culture, structure, programs, and instruction, policies, etc. Out-of-school alterable variables include conditions associated with the district, the state department of education, and the local school community. All these alterable variables influence the way that teachers perceive the leadership behavior of the head teacher (Jantzi, et. al., 1996). The unalterable categories of variables include demographic characteristics of teachers and head teachers, as well as school size, locales and level. Three of the teacher demographic characteristics that influence their perceptions of the head teacher and relate to previously created leader prototypes were gender, age, and length of experience as a teacher. Differences among these variables influence the development of different leaders (head teachers) prototypes.

Some studies that address gender claim that the unique life experiences and traditional roles of women cause them to bring a more interpersonal concept of leadership as compared to men. Also, to the extent that women have participated in women's struggles to assume leadership roles, they may develop a stronger pre-disposition than men to include feminine traits and behavior in their school leader prototypes (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). This explanation addresses the traditional images of most leaders as masculine and dominant (Lord, DeVader & Alliger, 1986). Because basic and secondary head teachers have traditionally been males, there is a greater chance that primary teachers will have masculine leadership (head teacher) prototypes (Tabin & Coleman, 1993).

Once acquired, teachers' prototypes of head teachers influence subsequent information and experiences of other head teachers' leadership behavior by matching observed behavior and traits to the prototypes which teachers hold in their minds. The head teacher's gender and age influence the teacher's perception of his or her leadership behavior when the "recognition-based" process is used (Jantzi et. al., 1996). Since the leader (head teacher) prototypes of many followers (teachers) are mainly characterized by male characteristics, women's leadership behavior is often not perceived as strong and effective leadership (Lee, Smith & Cioci, 1993). Some followers (teachers) may develop separate prototypes for men and women leaders; however, this may occur with any atypical leader, whether based on gender, race, or something else (Lord et. al., 1993). In sum, men are more likely to be perceived as leaders than women; those using more aggressive leadership practices will be perceived as leaders than those at either the earlier or later stage of their careers (Jantzi et. al., 1996).

Teachers' perceptions of head teachers' leadership behavior may be formed not only through a recognition-based process, but also through an 'influence based' process. Two variables, teacher tenure and school size influence the opportunities which teachers have to observe head teachers and acquire information regarding the head teacher's effectiveness in meeting school goals and to make inferences about how the head teacher's leadership behavior is responsible for successful outcomes (Jantzi et. al., 1996). Additionally, smaller schools provide opportunities for teachers to view head teacher in their daily work and for teachers to have a more personalized working relationship. This provides teachers with evidence necessary to form leader perceptions using an inference-based prototype (Jantzi et. al., 1996). In sum, teachers' tenure and the size of the school will significantly influence head teachers' leadership perceptions. Teachers in smaller schools with long tenure may more accurately perceive the leadership behavior of the head teacher as it correlates with this previously created leader prototypes (Jantzi, et. al., 1996). Teachers' age and length of experience also influence the creation of leader (head teacher) prototypes.

Jantzi & Leithwood (1996) study, found that it was what head teachers do rather than who they are that matters most to teachers. Visibly contributing to the aforementioned school dimensions in ways that teachers find helpful is more likely to be perceived by teachers as signs of strong head teacher leadership. This perception is in disregard to any unique characteristics of the head teacher, that is, age, tenure, etc. The study concludes that, teachers' perceptions of head teachers' leadership behavior largely depends on the opportunities that teachers have to actually experience the leadership practices of the head teacher (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996).

2.6 Perceptions of Teachers and Instructional Leadership

Some studies revealed that teachers perceived their head teachers positively (Smith & Andrew, 1988; Leech, Smith & Green, 2005; Parkinson, 2008; Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003; Certi, 2009; Bogler, 2001), moderately (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Kursunogh & Tanriogen, 2009; Yu, 2005; Ho & Low, 1999), and negatively (Leech, Smith & Green, 2005; Keiser & Shen, 2000; Morefields, 2009, Khan, Saeed & Fatima, 2009; Luo & Najjar, 2007; Chan, Chin & Hsu, 2008, Fook, 2009).

Several studies reasoned why head teachers were perceived positively. Smith and Andrew (1988) reasoned that strong head teachers were rated more positively than average and weak; and average head teachers were rated more positive than weak; Parkinson (2008) wrote that one most factor teachers indicated to positively affect on their job satisfaction are head teachers' "warm and caring" (p.128). Bogler (2001) finding paralleled with these findings that "teachers' occupation perceptions strongly affected their satisfaction, head teachers' instructional leadership affected teachers' satisfaction both directly and indirectly through their occupation perceptions" (p.662).

Several studies found that head teachers were perceived moderately based on some reasons and cases. Yu, (2005) revealed that both head teacher and teacher perception on head teacher instructional leadership were considered similarly. Partly from the whole instructional leadership dimensions, Kursunogh and Tanriogen (2009) found the teachers' perceptions toward head teachers' instructional leadership behavior was "moderate" (p.252). Ho and Low (1999) find that Singapore head teachers were perceived as fair with teacher in decision-making and duties, competent, and efficient.

In some studies, head teachers were perceived negatively. Keiser and Shen (2000) found that teachers had less influence on decision-makings in terms of "school Budget, hiring new teachers, and evaluating teachers" (p.119). Khan, Saeed and Fatima (2009) also found that "the aspect of instructional leadership behavior was weaker among the head teachers" (p.766). Luo and Najjar (2007) reasoned that Chinese's top-down social system influenced on teachers' negative perception. Finally, Fook (2009) wrote that "the head teacher was too ambitious; result oriented, and had little time for teachers and pupils" (p.1).

A study by McGhee and Lew (2007) found that "head teachers who have strong instructional leadership help teachers do their best work. The study of Moreland (2009) found a possible link between implementation and practice of performance management in a school. To support this finding, Blasé & Blasé (1999) found that "the instructional leadership strategies have strong enhancing effects on teachers emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally (p.367).

2.7 Head teachers' and Teachers' Demographic Factors

The studies also found the significant differences among teachers' demographic factors (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Sodoma & Else, 2009; Hite, Williams, Hilton, & Baugh, 2006; Luo & Najjar, 2007; Menon & Saitis, 2006; Karakose, 2008; Kuku & Taylor, 2002; Mondol, 2010).

The study by Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) found out that teacher' demographic factors of gender and years of experience have the impact on instructional practice. Similarly, Hite, Williams, Hilton and Baugh (2006) found that demographics of age and experience were related to administrators, young and female administrators were more often perceived positive. The study of Luo and Najjar (2007) in China also found that long experience teachers (more than 10 years) perceived more positive on their head teacher than those of less experience. The study of Karakose (2008) also revealed that "the perceptions of teachers regarding the instructional leadership behavior of their head teachers vary significantly according to their gender, years of experience" (p.569). Kuku and Taylor (2002) showed that teachers' demographic factors that the long years experience teachers (11-20 Years) were more "actively involved than their peer in decision-making related to staff development and instruction" (p.19). Finally, female respondents were more positive on head teachers' roles in school tasks compared to male (Mondol, 2010).

2.8 Understanding the Primary School Concept

"The practicalities of organizational life suggest that a leader has a better chance of survival when he lets the followers know (1) that he identifies himself with the purpose of the organization, and (2) that in doing so he is working for the welfare of the followers group" (Cunningham, et al.,1973, p.99).

Defining primary schools' concept and purpose is a complex process that mandates the consideration of several components. These include purposes, separation, organization, curricula, and programs. The purpose of the primary school is to be developmentally responsive to the special needs of the young children. Primary schools must be separate; however, separation does not only mean a separate facility with special accommodation for children's needs. It also means a separate and unique program and curriculum. The way primary school is organized depends on the grade levels that have the greatest number of children (Clark and Clark, 1994). Currently,

Zambia's formal education system has a 7—5—4 structure, with seven years of primary education (four years of lower and three years of upper primary) (MOE, 1996).

Primary school curriculum features content that connects with the everyday lives of pupils as well as instruction, it actively involves them in the learning process. Primary school programs often include interdisciplinary teaming, teacher advisories, alternative approaches to scheduling and instruction, and exploratory pupil activities (Clark et al., 1994).

2.9 Work Behavior: Allocating Appropriate Time and Attention

Research on leadership practice has generally been concerned with the behavior rather than the personality of leaders. Many researchers have concluded that the effectiveness of the head teacher is founded on the theory of the head teacher as instructional leader (Blank, et al., 1976). Approaches have been recommended that examine the instructional organization at the school level in order to find factors that shape a classroom's instructional effectiveness and the head teacher's accountability for effectiveness (Bossert et al., 1982). How the primary school head teacher allocates time and attention towards this effect may be key in understanding the primary school head teacher's leadership behavior (Kmetz & Willower, 1982). Numerous patterns of behavior have been investigated. Two patterns of behavior-consideration and structuring expectations have been studied in a variety of educational situations. Superiors and subordinates expect leaders to exhibit both behaviors.

“Initiating structure” refers to the leaders' behavior in delineating the relationship between him and the members of his work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. “Consideration” refers to leadership behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of staff (Halpin, 1956, as cited in Cunningham et al., 1973).

2.10 Summary

The problem investigated in this study is whether or not effective primary school leadership behavior is evident in the practices of primary school head teachers, as perceived by teachers. In order to thoroughly investigate this problem; the researcher reviewed the literature relevant to primary school head teacher instructional leadership, and work behavior.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

The purpose of this chapter was to present the participants, instrument, methods and procedures that were used in this study. This chapter will include information regarding the sampling, instrument chosen, data collection, data analysis, factor analysis and summary.

3.2 Target population

A population is a group of elements or causes, whether individuals, objects or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001: 169). The target population of this study comprised 418 teachers: of these 181 were female teachers and 237 male teachers from all primary schools of Mufumbwe district.

3.3 Research Sample and Sampling Procedure

A sample is a group of subjects or situations selected from a larger population. According to De Vos (1998: 191) a sample comprises the elements of the population considered for actual inclusion in the study. In this study the sampling design involved 150 respondents who were stratified randomly by location and size sampled from 16 schools nested within the district. Teachers included in the sample represented rural/remote areas; and small/medium/large schools of Mufumbwe district.

Using information gathered from the District Education Board Secretary office (DEBS), of the 16 primary schools in the sample, five schools were recognized as being in rural areas and eleven schools were considered as being in remote area. Furthermore, four of these schools were considered being small, seven schools were considered medium-sized schools and five schools were considered large schools.

3.3.1 Description of the Sample

Sixteen out of 44 primary schools in Mufumbwe were involved in the study. Five of these schools were recognized as being in rural area and 11 schools were considered as being in remote area. This classification of schools is according to the District Education Board Secretary

office (DEBS) in Mufumbwe and the Payroll Management & Establishment Control System (PMEC), which categorize all primary schools in the district as either rural or remote. Furthermore, four of these schools were considered being small as their population was less than 600 pupils; seven schools were considered medium-sized because their population was between 600 and 799; and 5 schools were considered large as their population was greater than 800.

A hundred and fifty questionnaires were distributed to teachers, out of which 149 were returned, giving a response rate of 99.3%. Sixty seven (44.7%) teacher respondents were male while 82 (54.7%) were female. Thirty percent of teachers were aged 25 – 29 years, 39.6% were aged 30 – 34 years and 30.2% were aged 35 years and above. Furthermore, 21.1% of the teachers had worked for 3 years or less, 25.5% had worked for 4-6 years, 31.5% had worked for 7-10 years, while 20.8% of the teachers had worked for more than ten years (Table 5).

Table 5: Demographic Characteristics of the teachers

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	67	45.0
	Female	82	55.0
	Total	149	100.0
Age	25-29 years	45	30.2
	30-34 years	59	39.6
	35 years & above	45	30.2
	Total	149	100
Working Experience	0-3 years	33	22.1
	4-6 years	38	25.5
	7-10 years	47	31.5
	More than 10 years	31	20.8
	Total	149	100

3.4 Research Instrument

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire. The model of instructional leadership used in the current study was a synthesis of Hallinger & Murphy (1985), Murphy (1990) and Weber’s (1996) work. The framework for the instrument consisted 27 items representing three dimensions of instructional leadership: ‘defining and communicating the school goals’, ‘monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning processes’, and ‘promoting school-wide professional development’ (Appendix A). A five-point Likert scale was employed

for a response system: 0(Neither agree nor disagree), 1(strongly disagree), 2(disagree), 3(agree), 4(strongly agree). There were five options from which to choose. These items used ordinal data and to encourage participation from the respondents, the number of items was kept to a minimum.

Four additional items were added to collect personal data about the participants' gender, age, working experience, and level of higher education. These items used nominal data. Again, the number of items was kept to a minimum. There are 31 items in total.

The purpose of this questionnaire was to investigate various aspects of instructional leadership. It was also designed to investigate primary school teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' leadership behavior.

3.4.1 Validity of the Instrument

The questionnaire was validated by the researcher himself, the supervisor and other experts in Educational Research and Methods at the Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies (DRGS), who critically examined the face and content values of the instrument. They made necessary corrections for the improvement of the instrument.

3.4.2 Reliability of the Questionnaire

Reliability of the survey instrument was tested using Cronbach's coefficient alpha to measure the internal consistency of the groups of items that were intended to measure the constructs of instructional leadership, namely: defining and communicating school goals consisted of 10 items (alpha 0.97); monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process consisted of 10 items (alpha 0.96); and promoting school-wide professional development consisted of 7 items (alpha 0.98). Survey questions pertaining to instructional leadership were proven to be consistent and highly related within each of the three construct, as the overall cronbach's alpha for all 27 items was 0.99.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

Primary data was collected through the use of questionnaires which were distributed to teachers by the researcher himself. The researcher, using the authority letters from Ministry of Education (HQ) and DEBS office, then asked permission from head teachers to canvass the teachers in the

building in order to get their voluntary participation in a Staff Survey on Primary School Head Teachers Instructional Leadership Behavior. The first part of the questionnaire had a formal letter, in which the researcher identified himself, gave the purpose for the contact, the title of the dissertation and its purpose (see Appendix B).

Secondary data was collected from official records, reports, internet, dissertations, and books available in the libraries and from organizations where data related to the topic could be obtained. The Ministry of Education (HQ) Documentation Center was also used to collect data.

3.6 Data Analysis

After the surveys were completed, they were numbered and 31 responses from each participant were each entered horizontally on the spreadsheet and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized to aggregate the data.

This study utilized frequencies, standard deviations, means and percentages. Non-parametric tests known as Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U were used to determine significant differences of groups of teacher gender, age, years of experience, school size and school location: then analyze how these demographic data were affecting teachers perceptions of primary school head teachers instructional leadership.

3.7 Ethical Consideration

To facilitate smooth collection of data as per requirement in research, permission to conduct this study was sought from relevant authorities at the University of Zambia Directorate of Graduate Research Ethics Committee, the Ministry of Education Headquarters, the Provincial Education Office, the District Education Board Secretary's Office and the Head teachers' of respective primary schools. All data collected during this study was specifically for the purpose of the study, and was kept strictly confidential. Consent was sought from respondents and no informant was forced to participate in the study. The names of the respondents were not disclosed in any way.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Overview

This chapter presents the findings of the data gathered and the understandings gathered in the course of the effort to investigate teacher perceptions of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours in Mufumbwe district. The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of school location (rural or remote); teacher's gender, work experience, age and school size, to the teacher's perceptions of head teacher's instructional leadership in order to verify the following null hypotheses. To meet this purpose of the study, a twenty-seven-item Likert-type survey was used.

4.2 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested.

1. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of head teacher instructional leadership in each of the three dimensions of instructional leadership and areas where they reside.
2. There is no relationship between teachers' perceptions of their head teacher instructional leadership and their gender (male or female).
3. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teacher instructional leadership behaviours and school size.
4. There is no relationship between teachers' perceptions of their head teacher instructional leadership behaviours and teacher age.
5. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of head teacher instructional leadership behaviours and their work experiences.

This chapter reports the findings of the research hypotheses posed earlier. Furthermore, this chapter presents the characteristics of the sample, characteristics of the schools, and the findings with regard to the research hypotheses.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics

In order to test all five hypotheses, descriptive statistics such as means, medians, mode, standard deviations and alpha reliability for teacher responses were calculated on the 27 items of instructional leadership. The instructional leadership instrument was developed specifically for this research.

The model of instructional leadership used in the current study was a synthesis of Hallinger & Murphy (1985), Murphy (1990) and Weber's (1996) work. The 27 items of instructional leadership were broken into three subsets: Managing Goals; Teaching and Learning; and Professional Development. Alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each of the three subsets: Managing Goals consisted of 10 items (alpha 0.97); Teaching and Learning consisted of 10 items (alpha 0.96); and Professional Development consisted of 7 items (alpha 0.98). Table 6 above consists of individual items of instructional leadership means, median, mode and standard deviations (SD).

Table 6: Means, Median, Mode and Standard Deviations of each Item

	N	Mean	Median	Mode	SD
Managing Goals (.97)	149	3.14	3.00	3	.717
Monitoring Teaching and Learning Processes (.96)	149	2.95	3.00	3	.601
Professional Development (.98)	149	2.99	3.00	3	.819

This data indicated that teachers in all schools, on average, rated their head teachers at a score of 3 (agree) as a mode in all cases. Mean score of 3.14 was the highest and the smallest mean score was 2.95.

4.3.1 Response Distribution of Items

This section presents the patterns of responses for each item. The patterns were based on the perception of teachers' cumulative agreement (CA). The researcher had scaled the percentage of cumulative agreement given in teacher responses as follows: a) 90 – 100 Very High; b) 80 – 89 High; c) 70 – 79 Moderate; d) 60 – 69 Low; e) 50 – 59 Very Low; and f) Under 50 Lack of Majority Agreement. Table 7 shows this distribution.

Table 7: Distribution of Teachers' Responses to Scale (Instructional Leadership)

	SA	A	D	SD	N	CA
Managing Goals	29.5	58.4	9.4	2.0	0.7	89.9
Monitoring Teaching and Learning Processes	14.4	72.2	10.1	2.7	0.7	87.6
Professional Development	20.2	60.4	8.1	2.7	0.7	85.6

In all factors, teachers responded most favorably to all items. On average, the factor Managing Goals, 89.9% of the teachers perceived their head teachers as leaders who were showing all the behaviours in this area; 87.6% of the teachers perceived that all items in Monitoring Teaching and Learning were being exhibited by their head teachers and 85.6% of the teachers perceived that their head teachers were good in all the items of Professional Development.

4.3.2 Response Distribution to Scale Instructional Leadership

Table 8 below shows the distribution of teachers' responses in connection with the location of their schools. On average, 49.00% of the rural teachers perceived their head teachers as leaders who were showing all the behaviours in Managing Goals, and 38.92% of the remote teachers perceived their head teachers as leaders exhibiting all the items of Managing Goals.

For Monitoring Teaching and Learning Factor about 47.65% of the rural teachers perceived their head teachers as leaders who were demonstrating all the behaviours in this factor and 40.61% of the remote teachers perceived their head teachers as leaders who were demonstrating these behaviours. For Professional Development Factor, about 47.32% of the rural teachers responded that their head teachers demonstrate these items, and 37.58% of the remote teachers perceived their head teachers as good in this factor.

Table 8: Level of Agreement by Location

	N	Remote	Rural	Total
Managing Goals	149	38.92%	49.00%	89.92%
Monitoring Teaching and Learning	149	40.61%	47.65%	87.91%
Professional Development	149	37.58%	47.32%	85.90%

4.3.3 Response Distribution to scale Instructional Leadership by Gender

Table 9 shows the distribution of teachers' responses to the three factors of instructional leadership. For Managing Goals Factor, on average, 38.3% male teachers perceived their head teachers as leaders who were demonstrating these behaviours and 51.3% female teachers perceived their head teachers as good in Managing Goals factor.

For Monitoring Teaching and Learning factor, on average, 37.5% male teachers responded that their head teachers were demonstrating these behaviours and about 49.1% female teachers responded in the same way. For Professional Development, about 37.8% male teachers perceived their head teachers as leaders demonstrating these behaviours and 49.9% female teachers gave the same response.

Table 9: Level of Agreement (By Gender)

	Male	Female	Total
Managing Goals	38.9%	50.3%	80.2%
Monitoring Teaching and Learning Processes	38.3%	51.7%	90.0%
Professional Development	37.6%	49.0%	86.6%

4.3.4 Response Distribution to scale Instructional Leadership by School Size

Table 10: Level of Agreement (by School Size)

	N	<600	600-799	>800	Total
Managing Goals	149	15.4	23.5	49.0	87.9
Monitoring Teaching and Learning Processes	149	15.4	26.2	49.0	90.6
Professional Development	149	15.4	24.2	49.7	89.3

Table 10 shows that teachers from schools with higher population such as (600 – 799) and greater than 800 responded more favorably than did teachers from small primary schools (under 600).

4.3.5 Response Distribution to scale Instructional Leadership by Age

Table 11 indicates that teachers aged between 30 – 34 years responded favorably than those who were less than 30 years old and those who were aged above 34 years.

Table 11: Level of Agreement by Age

	N	25-29	30-34	>34
Managing Goals	149	27.5	36.2	24.1
Monitoring Teaching and Learning Processes	149	28.2	38.3	24.2
Professional Development	149	26.2	38.3	24.8

4.3.6 Response Distribution to scale Instructional Leadership by Work Experience

Table 12 indicates that teachers who had 7–10 years work experience responded more favorably than the others who had different work experiences.

Table 12: Level of Agreement by work experience

	N	<3 yrs	4-6	7-10	>10
Managing Goals	149	18.8	22.8	20.1	19.5
Monitoring Teaching and Learning Processes	149	20.1	23.5	27.5	19.5
Professional Development	149	18.1	24.2	28.2	19.5

4.4 Inferential Analysis

4.4.1 Research Hypothesis 1

The data that was based on the perceptions of teachers of instructional leadership behaviours in relationship of the location where they reside indicated that head teachers were frequently exhibiting almost all the dimensions of instructional leadership. The data also indicated that, on average, head teachers of rural schools were demonstrating the instructional leadership behaviours more frequently than head teachers of remote schools.

In order to address the first null hypothesis, Mann-Whitney U Test (a non-parametric test) was used to assess mean rank differences among the groups. The mean changes in ranks were compared by “Location of School”, coded as remote (1), rural (2). An alpha level (p) of .05 was set for this analysis. The first null hypothesis was stated as follows:

1. There is no difference between teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership behaviours of their head teachers and the location where teachers reside (remote, rural).

Table 13 provides the results of analysis of all 3 items of instructional leadership. The Mann-Whitney U Test Output for 3 items of instructional leadership based on teachers’ perceptions and the location of their schools, indicated that, based on $p < 0.05$, there were statistically significant differences in the means for all 3 items. The first null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 13: Mann-Whitney U Test Output

Ranks				
	location of the school	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Managing Goals	remote	75	52.51	3938.50
	rural	74	97.79	7236.50
	Total	149		
Teaching & Learning	remote	75	59.13	4435.00
	rural	74	91.08	6740.00
	Total	149		
Professional Development	remote	75	56.69	4251.50
	rural	74	93.56	6923.50
	Total	149		

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Managing Goals	1088.500	-6.832	.000
Teaching & Learning	1585.000	-4.886	.000
Professional Development	1401.500	-5.827	.000

From table 13 above, 74 rural teachers have significantly higher mean ranks (97.79) than 75 remote teachers (52.51) on managing goals, $U = 1088.5$, $p = .000$, $r = -.49$, by application of the Cohen criterion (1988) this is considered a medium to large effect size (0.1-small effect, 0.3-medium effect, and 0.5-big effect). Likewise, there was a significant difference in the mean ranks of rural (91.08) and remote (59.13) on monitoring teaching and learning processes, $U = 1585.0$, $p = .000$, $r = -.40$, which is a medium to large effect size. Similarly, there was a significant difference in the mean ranks of rural (93.56) and remote (56.69) on professional development, $U = 1401.5$, $p = .000$, $r = -.48$, which is considered a medium to large effect size.

4.4.2 Research Null Hypothesis 2

In order to address the second null hypothesis, Mann-Whitney U Test was utilized to compare the mean scores of teachers. An alpha level (p) of 0.05 was set for this analysis. The second null hypothesis stated as follows:

2. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership and their gender

The mean changes were compared by "Gender", coded as male (1) and female (2). Table 14 provides the results of analysis of 3 items of instructional leadership.

Table 14: Mann-Whitney U Test Output

Ranks				
	gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Managing Goals	m= Male	67	63.90	4281.50
	f= Female	82	84.07	6893.50
	Total	149		
Teaching & Learning	m= Male	67	67.41	4516.50
	f= Female	82	81.20	6658.50
	Total	149		
Professional Development	m= Male	67	66.96	4486.00
	f= Female	82	81.57	6689.00
	Total	149		

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Managing Goals	2003.500	-3.027	.002
Teaching & Learning	2238.500	-2.099	.036
Professional Development	2208.000	-2.298	.022

From table 14 above, 82 female teachers have significantly higher mean ranks (84.07) than 67 male teachers (63.90) on managing goals, $U = 2003.5$, $p = .002$, $r = -.25$, which according to Cohen (1988) is a small to medium effect size. Likewise, there was a significant difference in the mean ranks of females (81.20) and males (67.41) on monitoring teaching and learning processes, $U = 2238.5$, $p = .036$, $r = -.17$, which is a small to medium effect size. Similarly, there was also significant difference in the mean ranks of females (81.57) and males (66.96) on professional development, $U = 2208.0$, $p = .022$, $r = -.19$, which is a small to medium effect size.

4.4.3 Null Hypothesis 3

In order to address the third null hypothesis, Kruskal-Wallis a non-parametric test was used to assess mean rank differences among the groups. The mean changes in ranks were compared by “School Size”, coded as < 600 (smaller) (1), 600 – 799 (small) (2) and > 800 (large) (3). All 3 items were analyzed. Table 15 provides the results of analysis of all 3 items of instructional leadership. An alpha level (p) of 0.05 was set for this analysis. The third null hypothesis stated the following:

3. There is no difference between teachers’ perceptions of their head teachers’ instructional leadership and the size of their school.

The Kruskal-Wallis output for 3 items of instructional leadership based on teachers’ perceptions, indicated that, based on $p < 0.05$, there were statistically significant differences in the means.

Table 15: Kruskal-Wallis Test Output

Ranks			
	School size	N	Mean Rank
Managing Goals	< 600	23	67.41
	600-799	52	45.92
	> 800	74	97.79
	Total	149	
Teaching & Learning	< 600	23	69.98
	600-799	52	54.34
	> 800	74	91.08
	Total	149	
Professional Development	< 600	23	72.72
	600-799	52	49.60
	> 800	74	93.56
	Total	149	

Test Statistics^{a,b}			
	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Managing Goals	51.184	2	.000
Teaching & Learning	26.326	2	.000
Professional Development	39.666	2	.000
a. Kruskal Wallis Test			
b. Grouping Variable: School size			

A Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance indicated that school size groups differed significantly on primary school teachers' perceptions. The mean rank of teachers from large schools (97.79, n = 74) was significantly higher than small schools (67.41, n = 23) and medium schools (45.92, n = 52), on managing goals. Likewise, the mean rank of teachers from large schools (91.08, n = 74) was significantly higher than small schools (69.98, n = 23) and medium schools (54.34, n = 52) on monitoring teaching and learning processes. Similarly, the mean rank of large schools (93.56, n = 74) was significantly higher than small schools (72.72, n = 23) and medium schools (49.60, n = 52) on professional development item.

However, since there were three groups, it was difficult to know the specific pattern of that relationship. To achieve this, pair wise comparison of Mann-Whitney was done. Table 16 below provides the results of pair wise comparison.

Table 16: Comparing Groups 1 and 2 (<600 vs. 600-799)

Ranks				
	School size	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Managing Goals	< 600	23	48.83	1123.00
	600-799	52	33.21	1727.00
	Total	75		
Teaching & Learning	< 600	23	45.07	1036.50
	600-799	52	34.88	1813.50
	Total	75		
Professional Development	< 600	23	48.20	1108.50
	600-799	52	33.49	1741.50
	Total	75		

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Managing Goals	349.000	-3.088	.002
Teaching & Learning	435.500	-2.091	.037
Professional Development	363.500	-3.105	.002
a. Grouping Variable: School size			

From table 16 above, 23 teachers from small schools had significantly higher mean ranks (48.83) than 52 teachers from medium schools (33.21) on managing goals, $U = 349.0$, $p = .002$, $r = -.25$, which is a small to medium effect size. Likewise, there was a significant difference in mean ranks of small schools (45.07) and medium schools (34.88) on monitoring teaching and learning processes, $U = 435.5$, $p = .037$, $r = -.17$ a small effect size. Similarly, there was significant difference in mean ranks of small schools (48.20) and medium schools (33.49) on professional development, $U = 363.5$, $p = .002$, $r = -.25$, which is a small to medium effect size.

Table 17 also shows the results from pair wise comparisons of Mann-Whitney.

Table 17: Comparing Groups 2 and 3 (600-799 vs. >800)

Ranks				
	School size	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Managing Goals	600-799	52	39.21	2039.00
	> 800	74	80.57	5962.00
	Total	126		
Teaching & Learning	600-799	52	45.96	2390.00
	> 800	74	75.82	5611.00
	Total	126		
Professional Development	600-799	52	42.61	2215.50
	> 800	74	78.18	5785.50
	Total	126		

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Managing Goals	661.000	-6.583	.000
Teaching & Learning	1012.000	-4.792	.000
Professional Development	837.500	-5.834	.000
a. Grouping Variable: School size			

The 74 teachers from large schools had significantly higher mean ranks (80.57) than the 52 teachers from medium schools (39.21) on managing goals, $U = 661.0$, $p = .000$, $r = -.54$, which is a large effect size. Likewise, there was a significant difference in mean ranks of large schools (75.82) and medium schools (45.96) on monitoring teaching and learning processes, $U = 1012.0$, $p = .000$, $r = -.39$, which is considered a medium to large effect size. Similarly, there was a significant difference in mean ranks of large schools (78.18) and medium schools (42.61) on professional development, $U = 837.5$, $p = .000$, $r = -.48$, which is medium to large effect size.

Table 18: Comparing Groups 1 and 3 (<600 vs. >800)

Ranks				
	School size	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Managing Goals	< 600	23	30.59	703.50
	> 800	74	54.72	4049.50
	Total	97		
Teaching & Learning	< 600	23	36.91	849.00
	> 800	74	52.76	3904.00
	Total	97		
Professional Development	< 600	23	36.52	840.00
	> 800	74	52.88	3913.00
	Total	97		

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Managing Goals	427.500	-3.986	.000
Teaching & Learning	573.000	-2.568	.010
Professional Development	564.000	-2.818	.005

a. Grouping Variable: School size

The 74 teachers from large schools had significantly higher mean ranks (54.72) than the 23 teachers from small schools (30.59) on managing goals, $U = 427.5$, $p = .000$, $r = -.33$, which is a medium effect size. Likewise, there was a significant difference in the mean ranks of large schools (52.76) and small schools (36.91) on monitoring teaching and learning processes, $U = 573.0$, $p = .010$, $r = -.21$, which according to Cohen (1988) is a small to medium effect size. Similarly, there was a significant difference in the mean ranks of large schools (52.88) and small schools (36.52) on professional development, $U = 564.0$, $p = .005$, $r = -.23$, which is a small to medium effect size.

The Mann-Whitney U Test output for all 3 items of instructional leadership based on teachers' perceptions, indicated that, based on $p < 0.05$, there were statistically significant differences in the means for all 3 items. This implied that differences exist in perception of dimensions of instructional leadership between teachers from small schools and teachers from large schools.

Teachers in large schools tended to rate their head teachers' instructional leadership more highly than teachers in smaller schools. The third null hypothesis was rejected.

4.4.4 Null Hypothesis 4

In order to address the fourth hypothesis, Kruskal-Wallis a non-parametric test was used to assess mean rank differences among the groups. The mean changes in ranks were compared by "Age", coded as 25 – 29 (1), 30 – 34 (2) and >34 (3). Table 19 provides the results of analysis of 27 items of instructional leadership. An alpha level (p) of 0.05 was set for this analysis. The fourth null hypothesis stated the following:

4. There is no relationship between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours and teacher age.

Table 19: Kruskal-Wallis Test Output

Ranks			
	age	N	Mean Rank
Managing Goals	25 - 29 years	45	71.58
	30 - 34 years	59	72.65
	35 years and above	45	81.50
	Total	149	
Teaching and Learning	25 - 29 years	45	68.44
	30 - 34 years	59	72.75
	35 years and above	45	84.50
	Total	149	
Professional Development	25 - 29 years	45	73.20
	30 - 34 years	59	73.42
	35 years and above	45	78.88
	Total	149	

Test Statistics ^{a,b}			
	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Managing Goals	1.631	2	.442
Teaching and Learning	3.727	2	.155
Professional Development	.575	2	.750
a. Kruskal Wallis Test			
b. Grouping Variable: age			

The results of analysis indicates that there was no significant difference in medians, X^2 (2, N = 149) = 1.631, $p = .442$ on managing goals. Likewise, there was no significant difference in medians, X^2 (2, N = 149) = 3.727, $p = .155$ on monitoring teaching and learning processes. Similarly, there was no significant difference in medians, X^2 (2, N = 149) = .575, $p = .750$ on

professional development. Because the overall test is not significant, pairwise comparisons among the three groups was not completed.

The table 19 above showed no relationship between different age groups of primary school teachers surveyed. There was no statistical relationship; hence the fourth hypothesis was not rejected. Since all the p-values were greater than 0.05, therefore, the fourth null hypothesis was accepted.

4.4.5 Null Hypothesis 5

In order to address the fifth hypothesis Kruskal-Wallis a non-parametric test was used to assess mean rank differences among the groups. The mean changes in ranks were compared by “Work Experience”, coded as < 4 (1), 4-6 (2), 7-10(3) and > 10(4). All 3 items of instructional leadership were analyzed. An alpha level (p) of 0.05 was set for this analysis. The fifth null hypothesis stated the following:

5. There is no statistically significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership behaviors of their head teachers and teacher work experience.

Table 20: Kruskal-Wallis Test Results

Ranks			
	working experience	N	Mean Rank
Managing Goals	0 - 3 years	33	68.74
	4 - 6 years	38	70.25
	7 - 10 years	47	79.80
	more than 10 years	31	80.21
	Total	149	
Teaching and Learning	0 - 3 years	33	72.05
	4 - 6 years	38	76.78
	7 - 10 years	47	78.14
	more than 10 years	31	71.21
	Total	149	
Professional Development	0 - 3 years	33	74.56
	4 - 6 years	38	70.54
	7 - 10 years	47	80.52
	more than 10 years	31	72.56
	Total	149	

Test Statistics^{a,b}			
	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Managing Goals	2.412	3	.491
Teaching and Learning	.780	3	.854
Professional Development	1.409	3	.703
a. Kruskal Wallis Test			
b. Grouping Variable: working experience			

The results of analysis indicates that there was no significant difference in medians, $X^2 (3, N = 149) = 2.412, p = .491$ on managing goals. Likewise, there was no significant difference in medians, $X^2 (3, N = 149) = .780, p = .854$ on monitoring teaching and learning processes. Similarly, there was no significant difference in medians, $X^2 (3, N = 149) = 1.409, p = .703$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected but accepted in all the items.

4.5 Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether primary school head teachers in Mufumbwe district were demonstrating instructional leadership behaviours, as identified by Hallinger & Murphy (1985). The first part of this chapter described the sample. The second part of the chapter presented the results of descriptive statistics, including means, medians, modes and standard deviations, which were derived from teacher responses.

Results indicated that, based on location of school, gender, school size, most of instructional leadership behaviours were being demonstrated. Head teachers from rural schools and large schools were leading in the demonstration of these behaviours. The results also indicated that, based on gender, female teachers ranked their head teachers highly than male teachers.

In order to address the five null hypotheses in this study, several Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Test outputs were analyzed. Null Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 were rejected because there were statistically significant differences found in teachers' perceptions of their head teacher instructional leadership behaviours based on location of school, gender and school size. Hypotheses 4 and 5 were not supported in this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1 Overview

In this chapter, the study and foundational research questions are summarized and conclusions are drawn. A discussion of the study's potential implications and suggestions are also presented.

5.2 Summary

Because so many authors contend that much of what is learned from the literature regarding head teachers' leadership behavior comes from researchers' knowledge of teachers' perceptions of school leadership (Jantzi et al, 1996; Lord et al, 1993; Greenfield, 1995; Hallinger,1984), this study also focused on teachers' perceptions as a measurement of primary school instructional leadership behavior.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the three dimensions of instructional leadership, as identified by Hallinger & Murphy (1985), were demonstrated by head teachers in Mufumbwe district as perceived by teachers based on teachers' location (remote or rural); teachers' gender (male or female); teachers' age; teachers' work experience; and the size of their schools (smaller, small or large). Descriptive data questions were addressed. Teachers were asked which of the 27 items of instructional leadership were being demonstrated by head teachers of remote and rural primary schools. These 27 items were grouped into 3 factors such as Managing Goals (10 items), Teaching and Learning (10 items) and Professional Development (7 items).

The following five null hypotheses were also tested as part of this study:

1. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership behaviours of their head teachers and the location where teachers reside (remote or rural).
2. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of dimensions of instructional leadership and their gender (male or female).
3. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership behaviours of their head teachers and the size of their school.

4. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours and teachers' age.
5. There is no difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours and teachers' work experience.

Sixteen primary schools in Mufumbwe district participated in this study, of which 5 schools were rural schools and 11 schools were remote schools. Of these schools 4 were considered being small, 7 were considered being medium-sized and 5 were considered being large. A total of 149 primary school teachers participated in this study by completing the survey instrument, of these 67 were male teachers and 82 were female teachers. This instrument asked the individuals to choose a descriptor (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree), which best described the demonstration of a specific instructional leadership behavior by the head teacher.

Data collected from the completed surveys was analyzed using basic descriptive statistics such as means, mode, median, standard deviations, as well as non-parametric tests such as Kruskal-Wallis test and Mann-Whitney U test. This analysis indicated that, teachers perceived that most of the instructional leadership behaviours were being demonstrated by head teachers more especially in rural schools. Female teachers ranked their head teachers highly than male teachers. Teachers from larger schools ranked their head teachers highly than teachers from small schools. With regard to the null hypotheses, there were statistically significant differences found between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership and their location (remote or rural), teachers' gender (male or female) and the school size (smaller, small or large). These differences were found in the majority of instructional leadership behaviours.

5.3 Discussion

Instructional leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas both nationally and internationally, as it has been widely accepted that it plays a key role in improving school performance by motivating teachers, as well as influencing the school climate (Pont & Moorman, 2008). "Schools are often long shadows of their head teachers. The school looks and feels like its leader" (Rooney, 2009, p. 89). It is therefore imperative that primary school teachers have a knowledge and understanding of what it means to have an instructional leader. This

research has focused on the 3 instructional leadership behaviours that are evaluated by Hallinger and Murphy (1985). Some of the items included in the survey instrument include: framing the school's goals, communicate the school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring pupils progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, and promoting professional development and providing incentives for learning.

For the purposes of this study, the researcher established 3.0 as the threshold for consistent (agree) demonstration of the specific behavior of instructional leadership. On the survey instrument's five-point scale, the response of "agree" was equivalent to a score of 3.0 when calculating the mean.

The study sought to identify the instructional leadership behaviours being demonstrated by primary school head teachers in Mufumbwe district in relationship with location where the school is, teachers' gender, age, work experience, and the school size. These questions were measured by all 3 items. These questions were best answered by referring the research and data analyses from the responses to the 3 items that addressed these queries. Teachers rated their head teachers highly in almost all 3 behaviours of instructional leadership.

5.3.1 Outcomes of null hypothesis 1

The first null hypothesis stated that there was no statistically significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours and location of school. As was stated previously, this null hypothesis was rejected on the basis that statistically significant differences were found between rural teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership of their head teachers and remote teachers' perceptions.

Teacher location of school significantly influenced their perceptions in responses to 3 items, which measured primary school head teachers' work behavior. In analyzing primary school head teachers' work behavior, it made a significant difference if the teacher respondent was from remote or rural school. Rural teachers responded more favorably. There were significantly differences between remote and rural teachers' perceptions.

On average, teachers from rural schools rated their head teachers at 4.0 and 3.0 levels in most cases. Remote teachers rated their head teachers at the 3.0 and 2.0 levels in most cases. Teachers' responses to questions related to primary school head teachers' adaptation of proven instructional leadership practices in relationship to location of their schools, were most favorable with mean cumulative agreement of 48.56% of rural teachers surveyed perceived their head teachers as leaders who adapt proven instructional leadership practices in all dimensions and 40% of remote teachers surveyed perceived their head teachers as leaders who adapt proven leadership practices, giving the total cumulative agreement 88.56%. The mean rank for rural teachers was on average 89.07 and the mean rank for remote teachers on average was 55.18.

The importance of head teacher defining and communicating shared goals; monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process; and promoting school-wide professional development have been well-established as being a key to successful schools (Black, 1997; Cotton, 2003).

These findings were consistent with those reported by Bruce (2008) on the teachers perceptions of head teacher leadership compared by school location (rural versus urban). An F ratio of 47.32 indicated a significant difference between the two groups on instructional leadership items. Furthermore, the findings were also similar to those reported by Beverly (2001) on the school locale and its influence on teacher perceptions of middle school principal leadership behavior. The school locale significantly influenced teacher perceptions of middle school principals' leadership behavior. Teachers from rural schools gave the most favorable responses.

5.3.1.1 Conclusions from hypothesis 1

The study revealed that school location influences teacher perceptions of more characteristics of school head teachers' instructional leadership behavior in all 3 items of instructional leadership. There was a statistically significant difference between rural (urban) teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership of their head teachers and remote (rural) teachers' perceptions. Rural teachers responded more favorably, implying that head teachers in rural schools of Mufumbwe district are demonstrating instructional leadership behaviors frequently than their counterpart in remote schools of Mufumbwe district. Furthermore, this also implies that rural schools in this district, head teachers are defining and communicating shared goals to both teachers and pupils;

monitoring teachers and pupils and providing feedback on the teaching and learning processes; and are promoting school-wide professional development more often than remote head teachers.

This may be so because according to Word Bank (2000), monitoring of teacher/head teacher is also difficult in remote areas, for a number of reasons: first, remote schools are less likely to be visited by external monitors as such absenteeism is more frequent in remote schools where the atmosphere is more relaxed and visits by monitors are less frequent; second, the monitoring of head teachers/teachers by local community is often weaker in remote areas. The local community may place a lower value on education or may be less educated, and so feel less able to challenge the authority of teachers; third, the quality of their work may be lower. Remote teachers often have less access to support services than their urban counterparts, and fewer opportunities to attend in-service courses. In some cases they also have difficulty in accessing books and materials.

The common implications identified were based upon the score results that were less than 3.0. These scores imply areas of improvement for head teachers and DEBS office to focus. The remote schools scored low mean score indicating that head teachers here need to be serious with their work and DEBS office to be visiting these areas more often.

5.3.2 Outcomes of hypothesis 2

The second null hypothesis sought to test the instructional leadership behaviours being demonstrated by head teachers in Mufimbwe district, in relationship with gender of teachers. This null hypothesis stated that there was no statistically significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours and teachers' gender. This hypothesis was tested by all 3 items of instructional leadership. This null hypothesis was also rejected because statistically significant differences in the means were found.

Teacher gender significantly influenced their perceptions in responses to 3 items, which measured primary school head teachers' work behavior. In analyzing primary school head teachers' work behavior, it made a significant difference if the teacher respondent was male or female. Female teachers responded more favorably. Female teachers rated their head teachers highly at 3.0 and 4.0 on average; in almost all items whereas male teachers rated the same head teachers very low around 2.0 and 3.0 in most cases. On average, 87.62% surveyed teachers

agreed to all 3 items, and out of this 49.25% were female teachers and 38.37% were male teachers. The mean rank for male teachers was 64.50 and 88.13 was the mean rank for female teachers.

For defining and communicating shared goals, all the items indicated statistically significant differences; monitoring and providing feedback on teaching and learning process, all the items showed the statistically significant differences while for promoting school-wide professional development, again all items showed significant differences between means. However, they all indicated that almost all 3 behaviours of instructional leadership were being demonstrated frequently. This is so, because most male teachers are expected to be a trajectory towards senior management from the start – if they are still class teachers well into their career, the view is, as Beverly (2001) puts it, that “there must be something wrong with you”. When these happen younger men get frustrated and do not appreciate what their head teachers are doing. Beverly (2001) also points out that patience is usually considered to be a feminine quality. This quality helps them to appreciate whatever their head teachers are doing. Female teachers tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than male teachers. It is this job satisfaction which helps them to appreciate the leadership of their head teachers.

These findings were consistent with those reported by Beverly (2001) on the teacher gender influence on teacher perceptions of middle school principal leadership behavior. Teacher gender significantly influenced their perceptions in responses to items in instructional leadership scale which measured middle school principals’ work behavior. Male teachers responded more favorably. These results also were consistent with those reported by Aliakbari (2011) who reported the significance difference between teachers’ views on the head teachers’ leadership and teachers’ gender. Male teachers responded more favorably. This was somehow related to the Iranian culture in which men have more freedom and courage in expression their own personal ideas. From sociological perspectives, women are seen as cowards, conservative and the ones who accept society as it is. They are unable to relate school problems to a wide context as their society. In Zambia, on the contrary, the society is so open such that freedom of expression is supported regardless of one’s gender.

Furthermore, these results were inconsistent with the findings of Dannbauer and Boshoff (2006) who noted that demographic variables, including gender, language, ethnic group, and age were

not related to teachers' perceptions of their head teachers instructional leadership behavior. The very fact that administration of the same instrument in two countries produced different results accounts for the differences between the two educational systems, in cultures, in the way we emphasize on the promotion of gender sensitive.

This can also be so because historically, leadership has carried the notion of masculinity and the belief that men make better leaders than women, as most of the schools involved had male head teachers, and in most cases females tend to support males in leadership than their fellow women. This is so because according to Cheryl de la Rey (2005) lists the traits commonly associated with leadership as effective communication skills, task completion, responsibility, problem solving, originality, decision making, action taking, vision, self awareness, confidence, experience and power. While it is possible to develop these traits in any individual, regardless of gender, in male dominated societies (as is often the case in African societies) male leadership and leadership styles predominate and are regarded as the more acceptable forms of leadership.

5.3.2.1 Conclusions from hypothesis 2

The study revealed that gender influences teacher perceptions of more characteristics of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership. Female teachers responded more favorably, implying that, head teachers in primary schools of Mufumbwe district, according to female teachers, were demonstrating instructional leadership. Female primary school teachers believe that their head teachers were defining and communicating shared goals to teachers; monitoring teachers and pupils and providing feedback on the teaching and learning processes; and promoting school-wide professional development more often than male teachers of the same primary schools.

The implication here is that on the part of head teachers, increased efforts must be made to bring a brand of authenticity in instructional leadership that serves the perceived and true needs of all teachers. Head teachers can make great strides to encourage buy-in from teachers by communicating a vision for change with clarity. They must be attentive to their professional needs, personal anxieties, and fears around change. For leaders to be effective they must also win the trust of those they lead. It is the work of the head teacher to face the task of meeting the varied needs of all teachers regardless of their gender.

5.3.3 Outcomes of hypothesis 3

The third null hypothesis stated that there was no statistically significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours and the school size. As was stated previously, this null hypothesis was rejected on the basis that statistically significant differences were found. On average 88.9% surveyed teachers agreed to almost all 3 items asked, and 48.6% out of this were from large schools, 24.9% from medium schools and 15.4% from small schools. The mean rank for teachers from large schools was 96.25, medium schools were 52.35 and from small schools were 63.13.

The school size significantly influenced teachers' perceptions in responses to 3 items, which measured primary school head teachers' work behavior. In analyzing primary school head teachers' work behavior, it made a significant difference if the teacher responded was from large, medium or small school. Large school teachers responded more favorably in all 3 items. Using pair wise comparison of Mann-Whitney, 3 items showed significant differences between medium and small schools. For large and small schools relationship, all 3 items showed significant differences between them and for large and medium schools, all 3 items showed significant differences between them.

These findings were consistent with Beverly (2001) report on school size and how it influences teacher perceptions of middle school principal leadership behavior. School size significantly influenced teacher perceptions of middle school principals' leadership behavior as it applied to all items of instructional leadership. These items addressed middle school principals' facilitation of teacher professional development, monitoring teaching and learning processes and facilitation of optimal student achievement outcomes. Furthermore, Jantzi (1996), argued that school size influence the opportunities which teachers have to observe head teachers and acquire information regarding the head teacher's effectiveness in meeting school goals and to make inferences about how the head teacher's leadership behavior is responsible for successful outcomes. Jantzi (1996) reported that smaller schools provided opportunities for teachers to view principals in their work and for teachers to have a more personalized working relationship. This provided teachers with the evidence necessary to form leader perceptions.

However, in the current research large schools responded favorably than small schools, this may be so, because almost all 3 items grouped in three dimensions are supported. In the current research, instructional leadership incorporates behaviors which define and communicate shared goals, monitor and provide feedback on the teaching and learning process and promote school-wide professional development. All these activities are mostly practiced in large schools as they foster group unity and help provide for a climate characterized by trust and commitment (Locke and Lathan, 1990).

5.3.3.1 Conclusions from hypothesis 3

The study revealed that school size influences teacher perceptions of more characteristics of school head teachers' instructional leadership behavior. Teachers from large schools responded more favorably, implying that, their head teachers in these primary schools are demonstrating instructional leadership. Teachers from large schools believed that their head teachers were working collaboratively with them to define, communicate, and work toward data-driven shared goals of the school. Teachers also believed that their head teachers were using these goals in making organizational decisions, aligning instructional practice, purchasing curricular materials, and providing targets for progress. They also believed that their head teachers were monitoring teachers and pupils, and providing feedback on the teaching and learning processes; and promoting school-wide professional development more often than head teachers from small schools.

This implies that most of the head teachers from small schools had very low mean score implying that there was need for these head teachers to start demonstrating some qualities of instructional leadership. This was also in consistent with the finding for hypothesis one as most of the schools from remote areas were in this category of small schools. Most of these small schools are the ones located in remote areas where they are less monitored. While most large schools are located in urban and less rural areas.

5.3.4 Outcomes of hypothesis 4

The fourth null hypothesis stated that there was no statistically significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behavior and teachers' age. This null hypothesis was not rejected because statistically significant difference in the means was

not found. On average 87.9% surveyed teachers agreed to all questions asked, out of this number, 26.2% teachers had 25 to 29 years, 36.9% had 30 to 34 years and 24.2% had more than 34 years of age. Those with less than 30 years of age ranked their head teachers with the mean rank 74.21, those ranging between 30-34 years of age ranked head teachers with mean rank 76.84 and those who had more 34 years of age ranked head teachers with mean rank 73.42 on average. The age of the teachers did not significantly influenced teachers' perceptions in responses to all 3 items, which measured primary school head teachers' work behavior. In analyzing primary head teachers' work behavior, it made no significant difference if the teacher responded had 25-29, 30-34 or more than 35 years of age.

These findings were in consistent with Jantzi (1996) description of how teachers form perceptions of their head teachers' leadership. He suggested that teachers may develop perceptions of their head teachers' leadership through an "inferential" process which depends on opportunities for teachers to observe events in which the potential leader is involved and to determine if the potential leader contributed to the positive outcomes of these events. These included school size, school locale and many more, but excluded were teacher demographic characteristics. Furthermore, the results were consistent with the findings of Dannbauer and Boshoff (2006) who noted that demographic variables, including gender, language, ethnic group, and age were not related to teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership behavior of their head teachers. However, the results were inconsistent with the findings of McCuddy and Cavin (2009) who noted that individuals 60 years and older responded more favorably than individuals from the age of 40 to 49 years.

5.3.4.1 Conclusions from hypothesis 4

The results for this hypothesis showed that the perceived level of instructional leadership did not differ based on the age of teachers. It was found in this study that a teacher's age has no effect on his or her perceptions of his or her head teacher's instructional leadership behavior.

5.3.5 Outcomes of hypothesis 5

The fifth null hypothesis stated that there is no statistically significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership behavior and teachers' work experience. The 3 items were not supported. Therefore, this null hypothesis was not rejected but

accepted because statistically significant differences in the means were not found in the majority items.

The mean rank for those who had less than 4 on average was 66.83, 78.33 for those who had 4-6 work experience, 74.35 for those who had 7-10 work experience and 84.95 was the mean rank for those who had more than 10 years work experience. The means rank differences were not significant.

The finding of no statistically significant difference in the level of instructional leadership behaviors in terms of years of teaching experience was consistent with the findings of Dannbauer and Boshoff (2006) who noted that demographic variables, including gender, language, ethnic group, work experience, and age were not related to teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership of their head teachers. However, these findings were inconsistent with the findings of Metzcar (2008) who noted that as the number of years of teaching experience increased, the mean instructional leadership score increased.

5.3.5.1 Conclusions from hypothesis 5

It was found in this study that teacher work experience had no effect on teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership

5.4 Theoretical Implications

Leadership theories, such as trait, behavior, contingency, charismatic, and transformational, provide an overview of instructional leadership. Instructional leadership puts into practice many of these theories into an educational organization. For instance, effective instructional leaders demonstrate behavior theory as they initiate structure through behaviors that develop and communicate shared goals with staff, pupils and community. Instructional leaders provide consideration for staff as they monitor and provide feedback on the teaching and learning process, as well as, working closely with staff when promoting school-wide professional development. In addition, instructional leaders possess specific traits and behaviors, such as charisma, which can be applied in different situations and environments. The very essence of instructional leadership is to transform a school organization into an environment where teachers and pupils may reach their full potential.

The current research furthers instructional leadership theory by proposing a new, concise model of instructional leadership. The new model was developed by synthesizing three pre-dominant models of instructional leadership and was undergirded by sound goal-setting theory. The new instructional leadership framework consists of three, highly correlated dimensions: developing and communicating shared goals; monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process; and promoting school-wide professional development.

5.5 Summary

In conclusion, school location, school size and teacher gender influenced teacher perceptions of more characteristics of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behavior than did any other variables. Surprisingly, teachers' age and work experience had almost nothing to do with how teachers perceive their head teachers' instructional leadership behaviours. The school size and school location proved to be the most influential in forming teacher perceptions of primary school head teachers' leadership behavior.

Like the Jantzi & Leithwood study (1996), this study showed that teacher perceptions of head teachers' leadership behavior was largely in disregard to any unique characteristics of the head teacher, that was gender, age and so on. Also, much like the Jantzi et al, findings, this researcher concludes that teacher perceptions of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behavior largely depends on the opportunities that is school locale, school size, that teachers have to actually experience the leadership behavior of the head teacher.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Overview

The general purpose of this study was to determine teacher perceptions of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behavior. The study therefore aimed at filling in the knowledge gap by finding out teacher perceptions of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behavior as dependent variable compared with independent variables such as school location, school size and teacher demographic characteristics such as gender, age and work experience. The study has five null hypotheses which were tested using non-parametric tests such as Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal-Wallis Test, and their findings are discussed above. Therefore it is from this background that this chapter proposes to make the conclusions and recommendations of the said study.

The conclusions and the recommendations are based on the research findings of the said subject from respondents. The sample target of the respondents was 149 teachers from 16 schools which were divided as five schools rural and 11 schools remote. Furthermore, out of 16 schools, 4 schools were considered being small, 7 schools were considered medium-sized and 5 schools were considered being large. The analysis and presentation of results were organized around the research null hypotheses that were formulated. Therefore, the conclusions and recommendations are based on the findings that were anchored on research null hypotheses.

6.2 Conclusion

In conclusion, school location, school size and gender influenced teacher perceptions of more characteristics of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behavior than teacher's age and teacher's work experience. This study showed that head teachers from rural (urban) schools and those from large schools in Mufumbwe district were found to be demonstrating instructional leadership behaviors more frequently than those from remote (rural) schools and smaller schools.

6.3 Recommendations

In view of the findings and conclusions of this study, it was recommended that:

1. The results of this study can make educational policy makers review their educational policies and teacher training programs for the training that includes the head teachers' instructional leadership behavior.
2. Head teachers must demonstrate consistent engagement with their staff as both instructional leader and through actions that promote a culture rooted in instructional leadership.
3. It is also recommended that head teacher clarify their importance as an instructional leader among their teachers. Head teachers should articulate this importance, but need to be unwavering advocates for the teachers they influence by demonstrating that they are committed to serve as an instructional resource, resource provider, communicator, and visible presence.
4. Head teachers must make concerted efforts to communicate both formally and incidentally, verbally and visually; they must "walk the talk". If teachers believe that instructional leadership is an important role of the head teacher, it will be because the head teacher has managed to create that role as they themselves wish it to be perceived.
5. Head teachers must be attentive to teachers' professional needs, personal anxieties, and fears around change. For leaders to be effective they must also win the trust of those they lead. "Authority is a trust" (Heifetz, 1994, p. 4), and each time teachers endure a change in leadership, trust in authority must be re-established between them and head teacher.
6. It is the work of the head teacher to face the task of meeting the varied needs of all teachers regardless of their work experience, age, and gender, the size of the school or school location. Effective head teachers may possibly improve teachers' perceptions of their instructional leadership efforts by being more visible and practicing effective communication among them.
7. The findings of this study may be of use in the training of head teachers at Chalimbana College University and any other institution involved in the training of head teachers. Awareness of teacher perceptions of leadership behavior could lead to a better understanding of the head teacher/teacher relationship.

6.4 Recommendations for Further Research

In considering this study, a variety of additional unanswered questions arose that could be the impetus for future investigations. The following are some suggested research ideas the researcher feels would be of value.

1. Examinations of other variables (dependent and/or independent) that have not yet been considered. It would be valuable to test for significance of socio-economic status of pupil population where head teachers work.
2. Utilize interviews to check inaccuracies in data collection due to the survey instrument. The strength of interviews is that subjects can ask questions for clarification and the interviewer can provide explanation. There are inherent limitations to quantitative research, especially when wanting to learn and codify true feelings of human subjects in a richer way. Therefore, a large-scale qualitative study should be conducted on the perceptions of primary school teachers of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behaviors that promote efficacy in teachers in their work to sustain pupil success and achievement.
3. It is suggested that this study be replicated on a national scale and that include a large number of subjects to elevate the generalizability of the findings.

REFERENCES

- American Association of School Administrator (1992). *Changing the essence: The art of Creating and Leading fundamental change in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.
- Aliakbari, M. (2011). Teachers' Perceptions of the Principles of Critical Pedagogy. 2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences IPEDR, 17. 78 – 85. Available Online at <http://www.ipedr.com/vol17/14-CHHSS%202013-H00057.pdf>:
- Bankes, S. V. (1999). *Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of Principal's Instructional Leadership Behaviors*. College of Education. University of Denver.
- Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Beverly, R. B. (2001). Teacher Perceptions of Middle School Principals' Leadership Behavior. **Research in Middle level Education Quarterly**, 19(2), 1-133.
- Black, S. (1997, June). Creating Community. **American Board Journal**, 184(6), 32-35.
- Blasé, J & Blasé J. (1999a). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35 (3), 349- 378.
- Blasé, J & Blasé J. (1999b). Effective instructional leadership through the teachers' eyes. **High School Magazine**, 7 (1), 16-20.
- Blasé, J & Blasé, J. (1998). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bjork, L. G. (2009). The Superintendent as an Instructional Leader. Paper presented at the West Virginia Superintendents' Institute, Charleston.
- Bookbinder, R. (1992). **The principal: Leadership for the effective and productive school**. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- Bossert, S.; Dwyer, D.; Rowan, B; & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18 (3), 34-64.
- Brookover, W.B. & Lezotte, L. (1979) Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. E.Lansing, MI. ED 181 005.

- Bruce, T. S. (2008). Teacher's Perceptions of Leadership Characteristics of Public High School Principals Associated with Student socioeconomic status, community, race, and student achievement. Ed. D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, United States—Virginia. Retrieved from Dissertation & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3344704)
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). School leadership, management and governance in South Africa: A systematic literature review. Johannesburg: Matthew Goniwe School of leadership and Governance.
- Christie, P. (1998). Schools as (dis) organisations: The breakdown of the culture of learning and teaching in south African schools. **Cambridge Journal of Education**, 28 (3).
- Clark, S. N. & Clark, D. C. (1994). Restructuring the Middle Level School: Implications for school leaders. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Cohen, J.W. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences (2nd edn). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F. & York, R. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington D.C.: Government Printing.
- Cotton, K. (2003). Principals and Student Achievement: What the research says. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Cuninham, W., & Grepbart (1973). Cultural Leadership: The culture of excellence in education. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dannhauser, Z. and Boshoff, A. (2006). "The relationships between servant leadership, trust, team commitment and demographic variables" Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, school of leadership studies at Regent University. Retrieved from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/sis/publications/conference-proceedings/servant-leadership-roundtable/2013/pdf/dannhauser-boshoff.pdf>.
- Day, C., Leithwood, K., & Sammons, P. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 44, 529 – 561.
- De la Rey, C. (2005). "Gender, women and Leadership." Agenda, no. 65, 4-11.
- De Vos, A.S. (ed.) (1998). Research at grassroots. **A primer for caring professions**. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

- Edmonds, R. (1979) Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 15-27.
- Edmonds, R. (1979) some schools work and more can. *Social Policy*, 9, 28-32.
- Edmonds, R. (1990). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*. 37(4):15-24.
- Educational Management Information System (2007). Review of health and education progress in selected African countries (RHEP-SAC). Synthesis Report, Lusaka.
- Elementary and Secondary Act (2002): The Elementary and Secondary Act (**The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**). PL 107 – 110. (115. STAT1425).
- Flath, B. (1989). Third World School Quality: Current Collapse Future Potential. *Educational Researcher*, 18 (2), 12-19.
- Fullan, M. & Steigelbaurs, S. (1991). *The New Meaning of Change*. London: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, L.R. (1987). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application. (3rd ed). Columbus: Merrill.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985). Research on School Principals: An analysis. In *The Effective Principal: A research summary*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Griffith, J. and Houstveen, T. (1999). The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35 (2), 267-291.
- Grinnel, R.M. (1993). Social work research and evaluation. (4th ed). Illinois: Peacock.
- Hallinger, P & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behaviours of Principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86 (2), 217-247.
- Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of the empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32 (1) 5 – 44.
- Hallinger, P. (1994). The development of behaviourally anchored rating for appraising the instructional management behaviour of principals. **School Effectiveness and School Improvement**, 5(4), 321 – 348.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. **Cambridge Journal of Education**, 33, 329 – 331.

- Hallinger, P. (2005). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leader. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30 (3), 35-48.
- Halpin, A. W. (1956). The leadership behaviour of school superintendents: The perceptions and expectations of board members, staff members, and superintendents. Oxford, England: Ohio State University.
- Halpin, A. & Croft, D. (1962). *The organizational climate of schools*. Washington, D.C. : US office of education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Heck, R., Larsen, R., & Marsoulides, G. (1982). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 94 – 125.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Heywood, S. (2008). The Effect of Primary School Quality on academic Achievement Across Twenty-nine High and Low-income Countries. *The American Journal of sociology*, 88 (6), 1162-1194.
- Hite, M. J., Williams, J. E., Hilton, C. S., & Baugh, C. S. (2006). The role of administrator characteristics on perceptions of innovativeness among public school administrators. *Education and Urban Society*, 38(2), 160-187.
- House, R. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-338.
- House, R. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. Hunt and L. Larson (Eds.). *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp.189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hoy, A. & Hoy, W. (2003). *Instructional leadership: A learning-centred guide*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hoy, W. & Hannum, J. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33 (3), 290-311.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2000). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. (6th Ed.). New York. NY: McGraw Hill.

- Hoy, W. & Sabo, D. (1998). *Quality middle schools: Open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hoy, W.; Tarter, C.; & Kottkamp, R. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jana, M.A. (2003). A Model of School Success: Instructional Leadership, Academic Press and Student Achievement. Dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Jantzi, D. & Leithwood, K. (1996). Toward an explanation of variation in teachers' perceptions of transformational leadership. **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 32(4), 512 – 526.
- Jantzi, D., Leithwood, K., Coffin, G., & Wilson, P. (1996). Preparing School Leaders: What works? **Journal of school leadership**, 6(3), 316 – 342.
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M., Cohen, D. Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York. Harper & Row.
- Karakose, T. (2008). The perceptions of primary school teachers on principal cultural empowerment. **The journal of leadership studies**, 7(3), 115-121.
- Keeley, Michael. (1998). The trouble with transformational leadership: Toward a federalist ethic for organizations. In Ciulla, Joanne (Ed.), *Ethics, the heart of leadership* (pp 111-144). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Kmetz, J. T. and Willower, D. J. (1982). Elementary School Principals' work behaviour. **Educational Administration Quarterly** 18(4), 62 – 78.
- Kuku, M. S., & Taylor, W. J. (2002). Teacher participating in decision making: A comparative study of school leader and teacher perceptions in north Philippines academies. **InFo**, 5(1), 19-46.
- Larson-Knight, B (2000). Leadership, culture, and organizational learning. In *Understanding schools as intelligent systems*. (Ed. Leithwood, K). pp. 125-140. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Lee, V. E., Smith, J. B., & Cioci, T. K. (1993). Effects of school restructuring on the achievement and engagement of middle-grade students. **Sociology of Education**, 66(3), 164-187.
- Leedy, P.D. (1993). *Practical research: Planning and design*. (5th ed). New York: McMillan.

- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful school leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Locke, E. & Latham, G. (1984). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Locke, E. & Latham, G. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lord, R., DeVader, C. & Alliger, G. (1993). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: **An application of validity generalization procedures**. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 402-410.
- Luo, M., & Nijjar, L. (2007). The Chinese Principal Leadership Capacities as perceived by master teachers. *Academic leadership*, 4(3). Retrieved from: http://www.academicleadership.org/empirical_research/The_Chinese_Principal_Leadership_Capacities_as_Perceived_by_Masters_Teachers.shtml.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*, (5th ed) New York; Longman.
- Menon, W. M., & Saitis, C. (2006). Satisfaction of pre-service and in-service teachers with primary school organization. Evidence from Greece. **Educational Management Administration & Leadership**, 34(3), 345-363.
- Metzcar, A. (2008). *Servant leadership and effective classroom teaching*. Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana Wesleyan University, United States—Indiana. Retrieved from Dissertation & These: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3344705).
- Ministry of Education (1977). *Educational Reform – Proposals and Recommendations*. Government Printer, Lusaka.
- Ministry of Education (1996). *Educating Our Future: National Policy on Education*. Lusaka: Institutional Suppliers.
- Ministry of Education (1992). *Focus on Learning: Strategies for the Development of School Education*. Lusaka: Zambia Educational Publishing House.
- Mondol, E. (2010). *Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of Principals' Leadership effectiveness in selected Adventist schools in the Philippines*. The Free Library. Retrieved from:

<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Teachers'+and+Principals'+Perceptions+of+Principals'+Leadership...a01074045430>.

- Moos, Q. (1979). *Teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership skills in selected South Carolina secondary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia SC.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration*, (B: Changing perspectives on the school), 163-200.
- Obi, E. (2002). "Motivation and Organisational Behaviour", (pp. 18 – 25) in A.N. Ndu, L.O. Ocho and B.S. Okeke (eds), **Dynamics of Educational Administration and Management: The Nigerian Perspectiv**. Onitasha: Meks Publishes Ltd.
- Orodho, A. J., and Kombo, D. K. (2002). *Research Methods*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University, Institute of Open Learning.
- Pont, B. & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving school leadership, Volume 1: Policy and Practice*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Policy and Operations Evaluation Department [IOB] (2008). *Impact Evaluation of Primary Education*. Netherlands: The Haque/Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Purkey, S. & Smith, M. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83 (4), 427-452.
- Reitzug, U. (1994). Miss Lincoln Doesn't teach here: A descriptive narrative and conceptual analysis of a Principals symbolic leadership, **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 28 (2), 185 – 219.
- Robinson V, Lloyd C and Rowe K (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: an analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. **Educational Administration Quarterly** 44(5): 564–588.
- Rooney, J. (2009, November). Who evaluates the principals? **Educational leadership**, 67(3), 89 – 90.
- Sachs, J. (1995). "Changing Times, Changing Conditions: The work of primary Teachers". <http://www.aare.edu.au/94pap/sachj94.254>. Retrived 27th July, 2012.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1996). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Shamir, B, House, R.; & Arthur. M. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*. 4, 1-17.
- Sheppard, B. (1996) Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42 (4), 325-344.
- Smith, W. & Andrews, R. (1989). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sodoma, B., & Else, D. (2009). Job satisfaction of Iowa Public School Principals. **The Rural Educator**, 31(1), 10-18.
- Stogdill, R.(1948) Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*. 25, 35-71.
- Stogill, R. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature. New York: Free Press.
- Stronge, P. (1988). Key characteristics of effective schools; A review of school effectiveness research. London: OFSTED
- Teddle, C. & Stringfield, S. (1993). *Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10-year study of school effects*. New York. Teachers College Press.
- Van de Grift, W. & Houtveen, A. (1999). Educational leadership and pupil achievement in primary education. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 10 (4), 373- 389.
- Wahlstrom, L. K., & Louis, S. K. (2008). How teachers experience principals leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 44(4), 458-495.
- Weber, G. (1971). Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, D.C. Council for Basic Education.
- Weber, J. (1996). Leading the instructional program. In S. Smith. & P. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership*. (pp. 253-278). Clearinghouse of Educational Management. Eugene, Oregon.
- Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organizations. In T. Parsons (Ed.), A. Henderson, and T. Parsons (translated). New York: Free Press.
- Word Bank (2000). "Lesotho: Teacher Support Networks: A district resource teacher program." <http://www1.wordbank.org/education/est/resources/case%20studies/>
- Yilmaz, K. (2009). Elementary school teachers' views about the critical pedagogy. **The Asia – Pacific Educational Researcher**, 18(1), 139 – 149.
- Yukl (1998). Leadership in organizations. (4th Ed.). Upper Saddle River,NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. (1994). Leadership in organizations (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY AND SPECIAL
EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Title of the Research: Instructional Leadership: a case of selected primary schools in Mufumbwe District

Dear respondent,

I am postgraduate student studying for a Master of Education in Sociology of Education at the University of Zambia. I am conducting a research for my dissertation entitled Instructional Leadership and Student Achievement: A Case of Selected Primary Schools in Mufumbwe District. The purpose of this survey is to gather information from teachers on whether their head teacher practice instructional leadership behaviours and then assess its impact on student achievement in mathematics. You have been randomly selected to answer this questionnaire. Information from the survey is coded for research purposes, but will remain confidential and codes will be destroyed after the completion of data analysis. We will not use or publish anything that could identify you to anyone else. Kindly, fill in this questionnaire to the best of your ability and leave it with the Management Secretary at your school.

Given Kapaya

Mufumbwe High School

APPENDIX B

SECTION A: PERSONAL DETAILS

1. What is your gender?
 - a) Male
 - b) Female

2. What is your age?
 - a) 20 – 24 years
 - b) 25 – 29 years
 - c) 30 – 34 years
 - d) 35 years and above

3. How long have you been working as a teacher?
 - a) 0 – 3 years
 - b) 4 – 6 years
 - c) 7 – 10 years
 - d) More than 10 years

Position in school:.....

Highest professional qualification attained:.....

SECTION B: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Please respond to the following statements by “Ticking” in the appropriate box matching with your opinion, using the following scale:

SA= Strongly Agree A= Agree N= Neither Agree nor disagree D= Disagree

SD= Strongly Disagree

		SA	A	N	D	SD
	Defining and Communicating the School Goals. The Head teacher:					
1	Develops schools’ mission statement, school goals in collaboration with teachers.					
2	Develops school goals that promote high standards and expectations for all students.					
3	Communicates the school’s academic goals to faculty.					

4	Develops school goals that are well defined (e.g. responsibilities, time frames, and evaluation criteria).					
5	Promotes the school's academic goals to students.					
6	Uses school goals when making academic decisions.					
	Monitoring and Providing Feedback on the Teaching and learning process. The Head teacher:					
7	Visits the classroom to ensure classroom instruction aligns with school goals					
8	Evaluates teachers to improve instructional practices					
9	Ensures that curricular materials are consistent with school goals					
10	Provides time for curriculum alignment among grade levels					
11	Monitoring the classroom curriculum for alignment to National standards					
12	Uses data on student achievement to guide faculty discussions on the instructional programme					
13	Provides data on school progress to school community					
14	Encourages teachers to use data analysis of student academic progress					
	Promoting a Positive Learning Climate. The Head teacher.....					
15	Ensures that instructional time is not interrupted					
16	Protects teachers from non-instructional activities					
17	Walks around the school and talks with students and teachers					
18	Works with students on academic tasks					
19	Provides private feedback of teacher effort					

20	Provides public praises of outstanding teacher performance					
21	Provides private feedback of student effort					
22	Provides public praise of outstanding student performance					
23	Encourages teachers to attend professional development activities that are aligned with school goals					
24	Furnishes useful professional materials and resources to teachers					
25	Provides for in-house professional development opportunities around instructional best practices					
26	Sets high but achievable standards for all students					
27	Encourages teachers to enforce strong academic polices (grading, homework, discipline, etc)					