

**TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF PRIMARY SCHOOL HEAD
TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR:
THE CASE OF SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF
MUFUMBWE DISTRICT**

By

Given Kapaya

A dissertation submitted to the University of Zambia in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in Sociology of Education.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

LUSAKA

November, 2013

@ 2013 by Kapaya Given

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this document may be made without written permission. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this document may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims of damages.

DECLARATION

I, Kapaya Given, declare that this dissertation represents my own work and that it has not been previously submitted for a degree at the University of Zambia or at any other University and that all published work or material incorporated in this report have been acknowledge and adequate reference is provided.

Signed

Date

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

APPROVAL

This dissertation of Kapaya Given has been accepted as fulfilling part of the requirements of the degree of Master of Education in Sociology of Education of the University of Zambia.

Signed Date

Signed Date

Signed Date

ABSTRACT

The focus of this study was to explore primary school teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership and how these perceptions may be affected by teachers' own particular experiential factors, such as school location, school size, teacher's gender, work experience and age. Data for this quantitative study was gathered using a questionnaire which was a synthesis of Hallinger & Murphy (1985), Murphy (1990) and Weber's (1996) work. The framework for the instrument consisted of 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'. The instrument was distributed to 150 primary school teachers who were randomly sampled from 16 out of 44 primary schools in Mufumbwe district. Teachers included in the sample represented rural/remote areas, and small/medium/large schools. Participants completed and returned 149 surveys, representing a 99.3% return rate. Sixty seven (44.7%) teacher respondents were male while 82 (54.7%) were female. Nonparametric statistical tests (Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U) were used to analyze the data. The results showed statistically significant differences in the level of teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership in terms of: school location:- teachers from rural schools responded more favorably than teachers from remote schools, implying that head teachers in rural schools of Mufumbwe district are demonstrating instructional leadership behaviors than their counterpart in remote schools; school size:- teachers from large schools responded more favorably than those from small schools, implying that head teachers from these large schools are demonstrating instructional leadership behavior than those from small schools in Mufumbwe district; and teacher's gender:- female teachers responded more favorably than male teachers, implying that head teachers are demonstrating their instructional leadership according to female teachers. Through these same tests, the results showed no statistically significant difference in the level of teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership in terms of: teacher's age and teacher's work experience. Indications from these findings can be useful to universities and colleges involved in training of head teachers in instructional leadership, furthermore, the findings will be more useful to all head teachers in Mufumbwe district and also other supervisors from DEBS office and Provincial officers to include the rural-remote divide in their routine monitoring of the education system and effectiveness of the head teachers.

Dedicated

In Memory of My Mother

Rodah Mwape Kapaya

1953 - 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No undertaking of this scope would have been possible for me without the grace of GOD, and the consistent support and guidance of my supervisor, my family, friends and colleagues. I gratefully acknowledge their unique contributions that have enabled me to pursue and complete this journey.

To Dr. Akakandelwa Akakandelwa, my supervisor who would only accept the best, thank you for your patience and time in instructing me through this process. His comments and corrections on my work gave me an impetus to work hard. This truly has been an unforgettable experience.

To Dr. Oswell Chakulimba and Dr. Kalimaposo Kalisto, my lecturers in Sociology of Education, thank you for inspiring me to achieve this goal. Your guidance has been invaluable. I also wish to thank the entire staff at the Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies (DRGS).

I also wish to acknowledge the Ministry of Education, particularly the DEBS office in Mufumbwe for allowing me to carry out a research in their schools.

I thank my Pastor, Pr Angel Chipulu, for being my spiritual guide and my Mufumbwe Main Seventh-Day Adventist Church family for being a network of support.

To the head teachers and teachers who participated in this study, thank you for your time and unconditional assistance. Without you, this study would not have been possible.

To Japhat Chokwe, my friend, thank you for going above and beyond the call of duty as a friend and colleague. I could never truly express my heartfelt gratitude for your own transport provided to me for the successful data collection. I am proud to be your friend.

To my family, my wife Ivy Malichi Kapaya, and my children Bupe and Mwape who sacrificed not to live comfortably and lacked fatherly care while I was away for studies and research. I am proud to be your husband and your father respectively.

I thank you all, May God bless you.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Author's declaration	ii
The University of Zambia Approval	iii
Abstract	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgement	vi
List of Tables	xi
List of Abbreviations	xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	4
1.3 Purpose of the study	4
1.4 Objectives of the study	5
1.5 Research Null Hypotheses	5
1.6 Significance of the study	6
1.7 Delimitations	6
1.8 Limitations of the study	6
1.9 Operational definitions	6
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Overview	8
2.2 Instructional Leadership	8
2.3 Leadership Theory	10
2.3.1 Trait Theory	10

2.3.2 Leadership Behavior Theory	11
2.3.3 Contingency Theories	11
2.3.4 Charismatic Leadership	12
2.3.5 Transformational and Transactional Theories	12
2.3.6 Instructional Leadership and Leadership Theories	12
2.4 Models of Instructional Leadership	13
2.4.1 Hallinger & Murphy's Model (1985)	13
2.4.2 Murphy's Model (1990)	14
2.4.3 Weber's Model (1996)	16
2.4.4 Hypothesized Framework of Instructional Leadership	18
2.5 How Leadership Perceptions are formed	19
2.6 Perceptions of Teachers and Instructional Leadership	22
2.7 Head teachers' and Teachers' Demographic	24
2.8 Understanding the Primary School Concept	24
2.9 Work Behavior: Allocating Appropriate Time and Attention	25
2.10 Summary	25
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Overview	26
3.2 Target Population	26
3.3 Research Sample and Sampling Procedure	26

3.3.1 Description of the Sample	26
3.4 Research Instrument	27
3.4.1 Validity of the Instrument	28
3.4.2 Reliability of the Questionnaire	28
3.5 Data Collection Procedure	28
3.6 Data Analysis	29
3.7 Ethical Consideration	29
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF DATA	
4.1 Overview	30
4.2 Hypotheses	30
4.3 Descriptive Statistics	31
4.3.1 Response Distribution of Items	31
4.3.2 Response Distribution to scale Instructional Leadership by School Location	32
4.3.3 Response Distribution to scale Instructional Leadership by Gender	32
4.3.4 Response Distribution to Instructional Leadership scale by School Size	33
4.3.5 Response Distribution to instructional leadership scale by Age	33
4.3.6 Response Distribution to Instructional Leadership scale by Work Experience	34
4.4 Inferential Analysis	34
4.4.1 Research Null Hypothesis 1	34
4.4.2 Research Null Hypothesis 2	35

4.4.3 Research Null Hypothesis 3	36
4.4.4 Research Null Hypothesis 4	40
4.4.5 Research Null Hypothesis 5	41
4.5 Summary	42
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS	
5.1 Overview	43
5.2 Summary	43
5.3 Discussion	44
5.3.1 Outcomes of null hypothesis 1	45
5.3.1.1 Conclusions from null hypothesis 1	46
5.3.2 Outcomes of null hypothesis 2	47
5.3.2.1 Conclusions from null hypothesis 2	49
5.3.3 Outcomes of null hypothesis 3	50
5.3.3.1 Conclusions from null hypothesis 3	51
5.3.4 Outcomes of null hypothesis 4	51
5.3.4.1 Conclusions from null hypothesis 4	52
5.3.5 Outcomes of null hypothesis 5	52
5.3.5.1 Conclusions from null hypothesis 5	53
5.4 Theoretical Implications	53
5.5 Summary	54

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Overview	55
6.2 Conclusion	55
6.3 Recommendations	56
6.4 Recommendations for Further Research	57
References	58
Appendices	67
A Teacher Letter of Participation	67
B Questionnaire for Teachers	68

LIST OF TABLES

1 Framework of Instructional Management (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985)	13
2 Murphy's Comprehensive Instructional Leadership Framework (1990)	15
3 Weber's (1996) Instructional Leadership Framework	17
4 Instructional Leadership Model Created for the Current Study	19
5 Demographic Characteristics of the teachers	27
6 Means, Median, Mode and Standard Deviations of each Item	31
7 Distribution of Teachers' Responses to scale Instructional Leadership	32
8 Level of Agreement by Location	32
9 Level of Agreement by Gender	33
10 Level of Agreement by School Size	33
11 Level of Agreement by Age	33
12 Level of Agreement by Work Experience	34
13 Mann-Whitney U Test Output	35
14 Mann-Whitney U Test Output	36
15 Kruskal-Wallis Test Output	37
16 Comparing Groups 1 & 2 (<600 vs. 600-799)	38
17 Comparing Groups 2 & 3 (600-799 vs. >800)	38
18 Comparing Groups 1 & 3 (<600 vs. >800)	39
19 Kruskal-Wallis Test Output	40
20 Kruskal-Wallis Test Output	41

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA - Cumulative Agreement

DEBS – District Education Board Secretary

EMIS – Education Management Information System

LTM – Long Term Memory

MG – Managing Goals

MOE – Ministry of Education

PD – Professional Development

PTA – Parents Teachers Association

SD – Standard Deviation

TL – Teaching and Learning