Effect of Leadership Styles on Classroom Instruction for Secondary Schools in Tanzania

Anthony Nyangarika and Zacharia Joseph Ngasa

Department of Adult and Continuing Education Studies, Institute of Adult Education,
P.O. Box 20679, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effect of leadership styles namely instructional, transactional, and transformational on classroom instruction. The study was conducted at Arusha region secondary schools whereby six schools were used to collect data through questionnaires and four schools through interviews. This study 90 teachers involved in filling the questionnaire, however, 71 (78.9%) teachers responded from six different schools whereas all the four head teachers who were expected to participate in the interview responded. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative techniques were used for data collection. The study findings showed that instructional leadership affect classroom instruction by the head of school highly developing detailed school calendar and conducts school program in order to achieve goals by defining school mission(M=3.37). Also, it was found out that school heads lowly manage school curriculum and instruction (M=2.86) so as to ensure new and innovative teaching methods are shared among teachers. Transactional leadership had effect classroom instruction as a result of the head of school awarding for good performance while on the other side impose punishment or warnings for misconduct (M=3.01). Transformational leadership styles affect classroom instruction by the head of school setting direction(M=3.15), Developing People(M=3), and Redesigning the organization (M=3.14). Also, the results show that there is a significant positive correlation at a level of p<0.05 was found between the effect of leadership on teaching and instructional leadership, transactional leadership as well as tranformational leadership styles. Between all variables a significant positive correlation with p<0.01 was found ranging between r=0.32 to r=0.41. The proposed strategies to improve classroom instruction include training, financial and material resource, empowerment of school head, motivation, and involvement of educational stakeholders.

Keywords: *Leadership Styles; Secondary Schools; Classroom Instruction; Tanzania; Education*

1. Introduction

Educational leadership has become a focal point when thinking of improvement of education in both developed and developing countries. This is because of the belief that human capital is one of the important determinants of economic progress and welfare Kirchsteiger & Sebald, (2009). With regard to that, attention has been given to school leadership and its impact on student outcomes. When leaders interact with followers they employ combination of traits, skills and behaviors that is called leadership style Lussier, (2004). The style which a leader adopts commonly based on combination of their beliefs, ideas, norms, and values. Different theories and assumptions lead to a number of different leadership styles that includes authoritarian, democratic, laissez faire, Instructional, transformational and transactional leadership. On the other hand, Tableman (2004) stressed on consideration of school climate and school culture for better school performance. Fullan (2000) emphasizes that school leaders should pay attention on developing professional learning community in which staff work collaboratively for successful student learning, develop action plans to increase student achievement as well as monitoring their progress. Leithwood (2006) points out that leaders are associated to students learning indirectly through their influence on other people which is second to classroom instruction.

Furthermore, according to Witzier et al (2003), two reasons for sources of contradiction among researchers and educational practitioners on how school leadership affects student outcome. First, researchers use different models; those using direct model produce different results from those using indirect model. Second, educational leadership has been conceptualized and operationalized in many different ways thereby making the results hardly complementary and difficult to compare. According to Fullan & Watson (2000); Wildy and Louder (2000) school leaders are held accountable for education quality in the belief that students' success or failure is determined by the way a school is run.

Considering all these important facts about leadership we can conclude that school leadership is very crucial for educational development and attention should be given to school leaders as Oduro, Dachi and Ferty (2008) observe that in the context of Tanzania very little attention is devoted in studies related to school leadership and management for the aim of improving the quality of education. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate leadership styles that can affect classroom instruction in selected secondary school in Arusha city.

Leadership is crucial for improving the quality of performance in a school. Throughout Africa, including Tanzania, there is no formal requirement for head of schools to be trained as school leaders. Thus, they are often appointed on the basis of a successful record as teachers with the implicit assumption that this background provides a sufficient starting point for school leadership. School leadership is expected to provide a link between characteristics of the school organization and instructional climate which in turn could affect student academic performance in the context of Tanzania very little attention is devoted in studies related to school leadership and management for the aim of improving the quality of education. In order to learn how school leadership contributes to student learning, one has to know how leadership affects school instruction. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate leadership styles that can affect classroom instruction in selected secondary school in Arusha city. This study on the Effect of Leadership Styles on Classroom instruction in Arusha City Council Secondary assumes that there is no significant relationship (Ho) between leadership styles and improvement observed on classroom instructions.

2. Material and Methods

Educational researchers and practitioners hold different views regarding ways that school principals (leaders) foster improvement in their schools. While some researchers found that the school leadership matters to student achievement others found no effects on student academic achievement (Witziers, Bosker & Kruger, 2003). Leithwood & Montagomerly (1982) suggest that the effective school heads come to the fore as an institutional or educational leader who effects school climate and student's achievement. Also, in order to learn how school leadership contributes to student learning, one has to know how leadership affects school instruction (Louis, Dretzke & Wahlstrom, 2010). School leaders are expected to play supervisory role and different authors asserts that leadership styles are considered to be fruitful for institution and pupils' academic performance. The key roles of a school leader include setting directions of the organization, developing people, redesigning the organization and managing the instruction programme (Lous et al., 2010; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Similar observation reported by Leithwood et al (2004), Fullan (2000) and Sebring & Bryk (2000) with specific attention to school organization. Sebring and Bryk (2000) cautioned school leaders not to forget paying attention on strengthening parent and community ties to the school. Louis, Dretzke & Wahlstrom (2010) asserts that, in order to learn how school leadership contributes to student learning, one has to know how leadership affects school instruction.

According to De Grauwe (2001) researchers have demonstrated that the quality of education studied in the four countries including Tanzania depends primarily on the way schools are managed, more than the abundance of available resources, and that the capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly influenced by quality of leadership provided by the head teacher. In this study classroom practices and conditions will involve two sub parts; *quality of instruction* and *teaching and learning resources*. First, quality of instruction: It is anticipated that the way teaching and learning are carried out do have direct relationship with student's academic achievement. Teachers should employ teaching strategies that involve learners in the whole process of learning. Second, teaching and learning resources: an effective instructional leader pays attention on what happens in classrooms in terms of teaching and learning as well as ensuring school has sufficient resources to be used by both teachers and students. Makule (2008) found out that pedagogical quality and overall classroom practice depends on school organization for instruction.

Many texts describe leadership as ambiguous, evolving concepts to be defined. However, school leadership as any other kinds of leadership can be described by referring to two core functions of providing direction and exercising influence, (Lous et al., 2010). Leithwood and Riehl (2003) define a school leader as a person(s) occupying various roles in a school working with others while providing direction and exert on persons and things in order to attain or achieve the school goal. There are different leadership styles exercised in schools. According to Leithwood et al (2004) these forms of leadership with adjectives such as instructional, transformational, collective, participative, democratic, moral, strategic capture different methodological approach but all have two main objectives of setting direction and influencing organization members to move in certain direction. However, no monopoly of a particular leadership style claiming to be perfect for improved school performance (Gamage, 2006) and (Nyangarika 2016c). Moreover, the practice of leadership and management in schools seem to have different forms of development. In some educational system a school

leader is perceived to be a distinct resource holding central power practices which has direct influence to student or pupil academic performance (Makule, 2008).

The transformational school leadership mode has it genesis in the late 20 Century and it was developed by Burns (1978) who made an analysis of political leadership (Givens, 2008). The concern of transformational leadership is the unification of the organization members to be focused on organizational goals rather than personal interests. According to Lous et al (2010) and Givens (2008) transformational leadership focuses on the ways in which leaders exercise influence over their colleagues. Transformational leadership impacts certain characteristics related to the followers such as empowerment, commitment, self-efficacy beliefs, job satisfaction, trust and motivation. It is clear that this mode builds a strong foundation between the leader "transformer" and organization vision where as the leader inspires the employee to believe in new vision that will have new opportunities (Givens, 2008).

Ross and Gray (2008) found no significant direct effect of leadership on student achievement. However, some elements of transformational leadership like teacher's beliefs about the capacity and their professional commitment mediated the impact of leadership on student achievement. According to Ross and Gray, 2008 there is strongest impact on achievement which occurs through teacher commitment to school to school community partnerships. Gamage (2008), (Nyangarika 2016b) has similar observation that teachers who are committed to the organization values are likely to adopt instructional practices encouraged by the organization, assist colleagues and work harder to achieve the organizational goals which in turn contributes to higher levels of students' performance particularly if the goals are focused on pupils' academic achievement. Thus we can conclude that transformational leadership has charismatic features and its key qualities are idealized influence to the subordinates who have self-esteem, intellectually stimulated, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration of followers.

Transactional Leadership is a type of leadership style which is commonly used in behavior sciences. According to Burns (1978), the pioneer of transformational leadership, transactional leadership is described as leadership that exchanges the relationship between leaders and subordinates. Major focus of transactional leaders is follower role clarification and leaders have to know about the needs of employee which require meeting the organizational goals. According to Avolio et al (2004), the attributes of the transactional leadership is in two ways, first is contingent rewards and other is management by exception. Hellriegel and Slocum (2006), (Nyangarika 2016a) explain that transactional leadership based on three primary components; contingent reward, active management by exception and passive management by exception. In contingent reward, transactional leader provide reward in exchange of achieving targets and these targets are set on the basis of short term and measurable. In active management by exception, leader monitors the subordinate performance and eliminates the deviation of subordinate from the path of goal. In passive management by exception, transactional leader interface in the matter of employee when subordinate give unaccepted performance. Transactional leadership is one who switches over interaction among subordinates for rewards and increasing their productivity. In nutshell that transactional leadership provides benefit at the achievement of goals while penalizes at not achieving the targets.

Blasé and Blasé (2000) define instructional leadership as all actions undertaken with the intention of developing a productive and satisfying working environment for teachers, desirable learning conditions and outcomes for children. Instructional leadership implies a direct and primary focus on instructional matters at school (Cardno & Collet, 2003). According to Lous et al (2010) different leadership models have been developed specifically for use in schools of which instructional leaderships mode is the most well-known. Gamage (2006) suggests that instructional leaders lead the teachers, students and the community for creating excellent school by establishing vision collaboratively, developing trust and encourage teachers to critically reflect on their student learning and far most the professional practice in classrooms. Accordingly, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) cited in Salleh and Hatta (2011) suggest three dimensions of instructional leadership or management. These are: defining school mission, managing instructional programme and promoting a positive school learning climate. These practices are explained as follows: -First, Defining the school mission: means framing the school goals and communicating these goals to school community (teachers, staff and students) and other stake holders ready for implementation.

Second, managing instructional programme: means working with teachers specifically in curriculum and instruction issues. It includes supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum and monitoring student's progress. Thirdly, promoting positive school learning climate: means an instructional leader is responsible in protection of instruction time, providing incentives to both teachers and learners, promoting professional development which will enable teachers work effectively (Louis et al., 2010 and Leithwood et al.,

2004), maintaining visibility at school and enforcing academic standards though observation of teaching and learning processes at school.

Transformational-transactional leadership theory is one way in which the behaviours of leaders can be described and evaluated. Transformational leaders exhibit charisma and shared vision with their followers, stimulating others to produce exceptional work. Transactional leadership describes more of a "give and take" working relationship – rapport between leader and follower is established through exchange, such as a rewards system for meeting particular objectives. Meta-analyses studies reveal that transformational leadership is correlated to more positive outcomes than any other leadership style, and it also predicts better contextual performance, describing follower performance above and beyond what is delineated by job requirements alone (Eagly, et al., 2003). Finally, research has also shown that female managers typically outscore male managers on measures of transformational leadership, leading some to suggest the existence of a "female leadership advantage" (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003). However, stereotypes remain salient (since leadership is stereotypically a male domain) and give rise to pressures such as role incongruity and a double-bind effect that remain a challenge today.

Lous et al (2010) gives out factors whose interaction leads to student learning. These factors are: features of state and district policies and practices, leader's professional development, school leadership, student/family background, school conditions, classroom conditions, Teachers, and other stakeholders. In the same vein, according to Bosker, DeVos and Witzier (2000) on the studying school effectiveness in primary and secondary schools of Netherlands found leadership as one of the school conditions which showed effects on student outcomes indirectly through teacher job satisfaction, teachers' achievement orientation and evaluation and feedback practices. Therefore, according to this model, the effect of school leadership is perceived to have indirect relationship with student learning.

Though school leadership itself is directly influenced by state and district policies and practices, leaders' professional development, leader's working experience and other stake holders; school leadership has direct effect to school conditions, classroom conditions and teachers. Within this model the factors that are directly linked to student learning are school and classroom conditions, teachers' professional community and student background conditions (Lous et al., 2010) as well as school factors related to teaching and learning (instructional organization) and instructional climate which in turn have direct influence to pupil academic performance. However, in this framework school leadership is contextually dependent variable as it can be influenced by contextual antecedent variables such as personal characteristics, and gender, teaching experience, parent involvement and school SES.

3. Methods

This study designed to investigate the effect of school leadership styles on classroom instruction. The study further employed mixed method where by both qualitative and quantitative techniques for data collection were used. This study, quantitative data collected using questionnaire were used to identify whether there was any effect of leadership style as a factor affecting classroom instruction. Qualitative data were used to collaborate the Quantitative results. The two approaches enabled the use of triangulation method by using multiple sources of evidence. According to Yin (2003) any finding or conclusion in case study is likely to be more convincing and accurate if it is based on the use of different sources of information. Data collected through questionnaire were coded and a Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was utilized. Descriptive statistics were employed to establish on whether there was any improvement of classroom instruction as a results of leadership style. Secondly, correlation analysis was conducted to observe whether there was relationship between the leadership thought to influence effects observed on classroom instruction. Finally, regression analysis was then being carried to analyze the extent to which Transformational leadership, transactional leadership and instructional leadership are related observed on classroom instruction. Qualitative data were being categorized into various themes using phrases and words depending on the issue under discussion and research questions.

4. Results

Therefore, in the preceding part, multiple comparisons tests were executed using Tukey Test to indicate the extent to which these schools differ. Multiple comparison results in Table 4.1 show that mean difference ranged from 0.04 to 0.88. Significant difference between schools was found between School 2 and School 3. No significant difference was observed among other schools.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicates that schools differ significantly F= (5, 70) = 2.693, p<0.05) on effect of school improvement as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Analysis of Variance

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Effect on Classroom instruction	Between Groups	6.653	5	1.331	2.780	.025
	Within Groups	31.112	65	.479		
	Total	37.765	70			

**The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level and *the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

This section presents percentages and value of the responses based on the items used to measure the three independent variables, namely instructional, transactional and transformational leadership styles. Further, analysis of variance followed with Comparison of means were performed to assess variability of the overall effect of leadership styles between the six schools. In this study instructional leadership items were treated in defining school mission, managing curriculum and instruction and fostering teaching and learning components. Result on frequency and percentage (in brackets) of items on instructional leadership as a factor affecting instructional leadership is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Comparison of effect of Leadership Styles on Classroom instruction among Schools

School label	Means difference between schools					
	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6
School 1	-					
School 2	0.79	-				
School 3	0.09	0.88*	-			
School 4	0.45	0.34	0.54	-		
School 6	0.04	0.75	0.13	0.41	-	
School 6	0.30	0.49	0.39	0.15	0.26	-

**The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level and *the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

Regarding instructional leadership style, results (Table 4.2) show that school leaders develop detailed school calendar and conducts school programmes to achieve goals with highest (*M=3.37*) both under defining school mission component. Results further indicates that lowest mean values (*M=2.86*) was on the extent to which heads of schools manage curriculum and instruction so as to ensure new and innovative teaching methods are shared among teachers. According to Slavin (2005), schools can be categorized as seed, sand or stone school. In this regard, schools that have extraordinary capacity to translate a vision into reality were referred as seed schools. Such schools were those that had staff cohesive, excited about teaching, led by a visionary leader who is willing to involve the entire staff in decisions. Schools with high innovation capacity were found to express improvement in teaching and learning as a result of school inspection (Kosia, 2010). There is need to ensure that head of school are facilitated to enhance innovation capacity in their schools.

The items overall mean (*M=3.16*) indicates that teachers agree that instructional leadership style had effect on classroom instruction in six schools. However, results further show that school heads, exercise more potential in defining school missions (*M=3.24*) compare to the extent to which they both manage curriculum and instruction (*M=3.11*) and foster teaching and learning (*M=3.12*). These results are consistent with the findings reported by Cardno & Collet (2003). Cardno and Collet asserts that, the instructional leadership implies a direct and primary focus on instructional matters at school. In Tanzania, the use of management instruments such as the Open Performance Review and Appraisal Syatem (OPRAS) at school level ought to be instituted in this regard by ensuring that the head of schools will be assisted to develop instructional leadership capacity (URT, 2008).

Table 4.3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean values of the Extent to which Instructional Leadership style affects Classroom instruction in six schools

S/N	Items	Frequency and Percentage of Response				Mean Value (N=71)
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	strongly agree	
	Defining school mission					**3.24**
1	Explains school vision and mission	3 (4.2)	9 (12.7)	37 (52.1)	22 (31.0)	3.10
2	Explains school objectives/goals	3 (4.2)	5 (7.0)	39 (54.9)	24 (33.8)	3.18
3	Develops detailed school calendar	1 (1.4)	4 (5.6)	34 (47.9)	32 (45.1)	3.37
4	Conducts school programs to achieve goals	1 (1.4)	2 (2.8)	38 (53.5)	30 (42.3)	3.37
5	Prioritize school academic goals through student assemblies, notice boards and newsletter	4 (5.6)	9 (12.7)	27 (38)	31 (43.7)	3.20
	Managing curriculum and instruction					**3.11**
6	Involves teachers in planning and implementing the term scheme of work	6 (8.5)	6 (8.5)	27 (38)	31 (43.7)	3.19
7	Guides teachers to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching	2 (2.8)	9 (12.7)	30(42.3)	30 (42.3)	3.24
8	Ensures teachers start the class and end the class in time	1 (1.4)	4 (5.6)	39 (54.9)	27 (38)	3.30
9	Gives more attention and supervision to teachers who are facing problems in teaching	4 (5.6)	7 (9.9)	46 (64.8)	14 (19.7)	2.99
10	Ensures new and innovative teaching methods are shared among teachers	5 (7)	15 (21.1)	36 (50.7)	15 (21.1)	2.86
11	Ensures instructional resource in the classroom is adequate for students and teachers		15 (21.1)	37 (52.1)	19 (26.8)	3.06
	Fostering of Teaching and Learning Climate					**3.12**
12	Emphasis collaboration and the morale of teamwork	1 (1.4)	12 (16.9)	35(49.3)	23 (32.4)	3.13
13	Appreciates those who improve school performance	7 (9.9)	10 (14.1)	24 (33.8)	30 (42.3)	3.08
14	Ensure the school facilities are adequate and in good conditions	2 (2.8)	8 (11.3)	44 (62)	17 (23.9)	3.07
15	Meet with teaches to discuss matters related to teaching and learning	3(4.2%)	10(14.1%)	27(38%)	31(43.7%)	3.21
	Items Overall Mean					**3.16**

Note: Instructional Leadership Style is high when M≥3, medium when 2<M<3 and rare when M≤2.

In view of the above, the mean values of the effect of instructional leadership styles on classroom instruction was computed so as to observe whether there was variation of the overall effects among schools. Results of mean values for the effects of leadership styles affect classroom instruction for all schools and for each school are presented. Results presented in Table 4.3 show that teachers perceive that the improvement observed on classroom instruction are at moderate level (*M=2.82*). Table 4.3 indicates that effects of leadership styles on classroom instruction vary between schools. In this case, the highest effect of leadership style on classroom instruction was observed on School 3 (*M=3.15*). Also, the lowest effect of leadership style on classroom instruction was observed in School 2 (*M=2.27*). Results further showed that schools that had high effect of leadership on classroom instruction (School 1, 3 and 5) also indicated to have exercised high level of instructional leadership style. In contrast, School 2 which had lowest effect of leadership style on classroom instruction (*M=2.27*) was associated with lowest means score of the extent to which head of schools exercise instructional (*M=2.51*) leadership styles. As presented in Table 4.4 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test whether instructional leadership style factor differ significantly between schools.

Table 1: Analysis of Variance on factors affecting Classroom instruction

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Instructional Leadership	Between Groups	6.619	5	1.324	7.186	.000
	Within Groups	11.974	65	.184		
	Total	18.593	70			

SS=Sum of Squares, df=Degree of freedom, MS=Mean Square, F=F value and p=p value.

Results in Table 4.4 show that a significant difference at a level of $p<0.01$ was found between schools on how head of schools exercise instructional leadership style between the six schools. Thus, multiple comparisons test was performed so as to identify which school had significant difference. Multiple comparison results in Table 4.5 show that mean difference ranged from 0.01 to 0.87. Significant difference between schools was found between School 2 and School 1, School 3, School 4, School 5 and School 6.

Table 2: Comparison of instructional leadership style among Schools

School label	Means difference between schools					
	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6
School 1	-					
School 2	0.87**	-				
School 3	0.16	0.71**	-			
School 4	0.15	0.73**	0.01	-		
School 5	0.04	0.83**	0.12	0.11	-	
School 6	0.09	0.78**	0.06	0.05	0.05	-

**The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level

This reveals that the head of School 2 exercise significantly lower ($p<0.01$) instructional leadership style compared to the head of all other schools (School 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6). No significant difference was found in instructional leadership style was observed between School 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Table 4.6 represents the frequency, percentage and means values which show the extent to which head of schools exercise transactional leadership style in the six schools.

Table 3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean values of the Extent to which Transactional Leadership style affects Classroom instruction in six schools

S/N	Items	Frequency and Percentage of Response				Mean Value (*N=71*)
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
Active management by exception						**2.90**
1.	Focuses attention on irregulaties, mistakes, exceptions and diversion of what expected on me	7 (9.9)	19 (26.8)	33 (46.5)	12(16.9)	2.70
2.	Keep careful track of mistakes	5 (7)	10 (14.1)	36 (50.7)	20 (28.2)	**3.00**
3.	Monitors performance for error need correction	3 (4.2)	12 (16.9)	39 (54.9)	17 (23.9)	**2.99**
Contingent reward						**2.94**
4.	Point out what I will receive if I do what is required	4 (5.6)	16 (22.5)	37 (52.1)	14 (19.7)	2.86
5.	Tells me what to be rewarded for my efforts	3 (4.2)	19 (26.8)	33 (49.3)	14 (19.7)	2.85
6.	Is alert for failure to meet standards	1 (1.4)	13 (18.3)	43 (60.6)	14 (19.7)	**2.99**
7.	Works out agreements	3 (4.2)	14 (19.7)	36 (50.6)	18 (25.4)	**2.97**
8.	Talks about special reward for good work	4 (5.6)	12 (16.7)	34 (47.9)	21(29.6)	**3.01**
9.	Demonstrates strong conviction in his or her beliefs and Values	3 (4.2)	13 (18.3)	40 (56.3)	15 (21.1)	2.94
Passive management by exception						**2.27**
10.	As long as I meet minimal standard he/she avoids trying to make	12 (16.9)	29 (40.8)	25 (35.2)	5 (7)	2.32

	improvement					
11.	Avoids getting involved when important issue arise	17 (23.9)	29 (40.8)	21 (29.6)	4 (5.6)	2.17
12.	Problems have to be chronic before he/ she will take action	18 (25.4)	23 (32.4)	23 (32.4)	7 (9.9)	2.27
13.	Things have to go wrong for he/ she have to take action	21 (29.6)	17 (23.9)	28 (39.4)	5 (7)	2.24
14.	Avoids making decisions	24 (33.8)	19 (26.8)	23(32.4)	5(7)	**2.13**
15.	If I don't bother him/her he/she doesn't bother me	16 (22.5)	18 (25.4)	24 (33.8)	13 (18.3)	2.48
Items Overall Mean						**2.66**

Note: Transactional Leadership style is high when M≥3, medium when 2<M<3 and rare when M≤2.

Results indicated in Table 4.6 shows that teachers perceive that heads of the slightly express both active management by exceptional (*M=2.90*) and contingent reward (*M=2.94*) than passive management by exception (*M=2.26*). This in agreement with the interview results which revealed that whenever students score A or B grade in external examinations, teachers are awarded for student's good performance. On the other side, it was reported that teacher is given either oral or written warning observed misconduct. Overall results (M=2.66) indicates that heads of school express transactional leadership at medium level. The extent to which different heads express transactional leadership. Results indicate that though there was no clear pattern on the mean values of transactional leadership visa via effect of leadership styles on classroom instruction, school 1 and school 5 which had high contingent rewards (*M=3.18 and M=3.29*, respectively) had higher mean effects on classroom instruction (*M=3.06* and *M=3.02*). In the same vein, School 3 which had lowest mean value (*M=2.18*) on passive management by exception had highest mean value (*M=3.15*) of effects of leadership style on classroom instruction implying that this school's head was kin in matters pertaining school supervision.

These results are in consistent with Eagly, et al (2003) who found out that transactional leadership motivates followers by appealing to their self-interest and it is based on exchange relationship, whereby follower compliance is exchanged for expected rewards. Other researchers (Hellriegel & Slocum, 2006) found out that transactional leadership provides benefit at the achievement of goals while penalizes at not achieving the targets. Therefore, results show that transactional leadership had effect classroom instruction as a result of head of school awarding for good performance while on the other side impose punishment or warnings for misconducts. As presented in Table 4.7 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test whether transactional leadership style as a factor affecting classroom instruction differed significantly between schools.

Table 4.7: Analysis of Variance on factors affecting Classroom instruction

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transactional Leadership	Between Groups	3.744	5	.749	4.257	.002
	Within Groups	11.432	65	.176		
	Total	15.176	70			

SS=Sum of Squares, df=Degree of freedom, MS=Mean Square, F=F value and p=p value

Results in Table 4.7 show that, there was a significant (p<0.01) difference on how head of school's exercise. Thus, multiple comparisons test was performed as presented in Table 4.8 to find whether which school had significant difference.

Table 4.8 : Comparison of transactional leadership style among Schools

School label	Means difference between schools					
	School 1	**School 2**	**School 3**	**School 4**	**School 5**	**School 6**
School 1	-					
School 2	0.57*	-				
School 3	0.46	0.11	-			
School 4	0.08	0.50	0.38	-		
School 5	0.02	0.59*	0.48	0.09	-	
School 6	0.18	0.39	0.28	0.10	0.20	-

**The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level and *the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

Results in Table 4.8 indicate that both school 1 and school 5 had significantly (p<*0.05*) higher transactional leadership style compared to school 2. Transformational leadership items were treated in setting direction, developing people and redesigning the organization components (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006)). Result on frequency and percentage (in brackets) and mean value of items on transformational leadership as a factor affecting instructional leadership is presented. The mean value results show that head school portrayed to high extent on how they set direction of the schools (M=3.15), develop their staff (M=3.0) and redesign the school (M=3.14) as an organization so as to address raising challenges in the school. However, results also reveal that head of schools did not provide more individual support to enable their staff to implement school development plan. Regarding overall transformational leadership style, results (Table 4.9 shows that schools that had high mean values (M=3.06, M=3.15 and M=3.02) of the effects of leadership on classroom instruction (school 1, school 3 and school 5, respectively). In contrast, school 2 (M=2.27) and school 5 (2.76) that showed low effect of leadership style on classroom instruction had low mean values on transformational leadership styles (M=2.44 and M=2.99, respectively). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented in Table 4.9 was conducted to test whether transformational leadership styles factors differ significantly between schools.

Table 4.9: Analysis of Variance on factors affecting Classroom instruction

Transformational	Between Groups	8.511	5	1.702	7.397	.000
Leadership	Within Groups	14.958	65	.230		
	Total	23.469	70			

SS=Sum of Squares, df=Degree of freedom, MS=Mean Square, F=F value and p=p value

Results in Table 4.9 show that, a significant difference at a level of p<0.01 was found between schools on how head of schools exercise transformational leadership styles among the six schools. Thus, multiple comparisons test was performed to identify which school had significant difference. Results in Table 4.10 showed that head of school 1 and school 5 exercised significant higher (p<*0.01*) transformational leadership style compared to school 2. But school 3 expressed significant different higher transformational leadership at the level of p<*0.01*.

Table 4.10: Comparison of transformational leadership style among Schools

School label	Means difference between schools					
	School 1	**School 2**	**School 3**	**School 4**	**School 5**	**School 6**
School 1	-					
School 2	0.98**	-				
School 3	0.34	0.64*	-			
School 4	0.41	0.56	0.76	-		
School 5	0.00	0.98 **	0.34	0.41	-	
School 6	0.43	0.54	0.10	0.02	0.44	-

**The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level and *the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

No significant difference was observed on the extent to which heads of school 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 exercise transformational leadership styles. These results are in consistent with results reported by Kosia (2010) in the study on the effects of school inspection on school improvement. According to Kosia (2010), variation of transformational leadership was observed among different schools where as schools with higher transformational leadership as a result of school inspection effects were observed to have higher improvement on classroom instruction. In view of the variations observed on the effects of leadership styles on classroom instruction and the extent to which heads of schools exercise instructional, transactional and transformational leadership styles; analysis of correlation was conducted to find the existence of the relationship between leadership styles and the effects observed on classroom instruction. The first three research questions were on the extent to which leadership styles affect classroom instruction in the six selected secondary schools. To answer these questions, two steps of analysis were performed. First, correlation analysis was conducted to observe on whether there was relationship between leadership styles as factors thought to influence classroom instruction. Secondly, regression analysis was done to investigate which leadership style had significant effect on classroom instruction. Thus, regression analyses were performed, first using effect on classroom instructional as dependent variable and instructional leadership, transactional leadership as well as transformational leadership as independent variables. In this case, two models were exploited, a first model used main variable as predictor while second transformative leadership and school innovation capacity were split into their components.

Results of the Pearson Correlation matrix among the effects on effects on classroom instruction and head of school leadership styles are presented in Table 4.11. A significant positive correlation at a level of p<0.05 was

found between effect of leadership on teaching and instructional leadership, transactional leadership as well as transformational leadership styles. Between all variables a significant positive correlation with p<0.01 was found ranging between r=0.32 to r=0.41.

Table 4.11: Relationship between leadership styles as factors affecting school instructions and classroom instruction effects

Variables	Instructional Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Transformational Leadership
Effect on Classroom instruction	$.41^{**}$	$.32^{**}$	$.41^{**}$

**The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level and *the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

These findings   agrees with Bazo (2011) who found out that school leader transformational practices (for example vision and goals, intellectual stimulation, and performance expectations) in Mozambigue schools were positively associated with changing teaching practices. Significant positive relationship between leadership styles and classroom instruction reveal that Leadership contributes to organizational learning, which in turn influences what happens in the core business of the school – the teaching and learning (Mulford, 2003). The existence of significant correlation between effects of leadership styles on classroom instruction and the leadership styles, pose a challenge to investigate the extent to which each independent variable explain the variation in classroom instruction model. The extent to which instructional leadership style, transactional leadership style and transformational leadership style affect classroom instruction is presented in Table 4.12 and Mathematical expressed as a linear equation.

Table 4.12: Regression analysis of leadership styles as predictors of the effects of classroom instruction

Dependent Variable	Beta Value for predictors			
	Constant	Instructional Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Transformational Leadership
Effects on Classroom Instruction (R^2=0.197)	0.675 (p≤0.237)	0.297 (p≤0.247)	0.181 (p≤0.394)	0.232 (p≤0.341)

The equation of the model of $Y = 0.297x_1 + 0.181x_2 + 0.232x_3 + 0.675$

Whereas: x_1 is Instructional Leadership style,

x_2 is Transactional Leadership style and

x_3 is Transformational Leadership style.

Results in Table 4.12 show that the extent to which the three leadership styles affect classroom instruction ranges from 0.181 to 0.297. However, the results indicate that there was no significant contribution on the extent to which instructional leadership, transactional leadership and transformational leadership affect classroom instruction. This is consistent with Ross and Gray (2008) who found out that there was no significant direct effect of leadership on student achievement. From the results in Table 4.12, show a significant positive correlation at a level of p<0.05 was found between effect of leadership on teaching and instructional leadership, transactional leadership as well as transformational leadership. Therefore, there is significant relationship of leadership style and classroom instruction and thus null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. According to the results on the effect of leadership style on classroom instruction head of school can facilitate teachers through workshops, seminars and on job training in order to improve and update their skills, knowledge for betterment of classroom instruction by improving the use of syllabi in preparation of scheme of work, lesson plans, preparation and use of teaching aids, better teaching methods, using better assessment methods and improving the quality of pupils notes. Head of school to improve job performance by motivating their teachers, and encouraging participation, transparency and team work in the work place, also head of school has to ensure that there is conducive environment for learning and teaching materials provided on time.

5.   Conclusion

There is positive significant relationship on leadership style and classroom instruction. Results of the Pearson Correlation matrix among effects on classroom instruction and head of school leadership styles are presented in

Table 4.11; A significant positive correlation at a level of p<0.05 was found between effect of leadership on teaching and instructional leadership, transactional leadership as well as transformational leadership styles. Between all variables a significant positive correlation with p<0.01 was found ranging between r=0.32 to r=0.41. Secondly, it was concluded that there is variation in the extent to which school leaders exercise different leadership styles as presented in Table 4.12. However, these leadership styles differ significantly between schools. Leadership style affects classroom instruction as expressed by significant positive relationship among different leadership styles. In Instructional, transactional, transformational leadership styles observed on different six schools they affect classroom instruction. From the results and discussion of this study, number of issues should be address so as to ensure that school leadership result to intended effects on classroom instruction. Some of the proposed strategies include training, financial and material resource, empowerment of school head, motivation, coordination of activities and further research. Recommendations have been presented under government, community and head of school. Government under Ministry of Education and Vocational Training should provide resource and training assistance to head of school in order to enhance classroom instruction at school level. Community as stake holders of education should cooperate with head of school in order to ensure classroom instruction is well taking place for school improvement. Head of schools should build collaborative culture to share knowledge and skills within their schools. Further research should be done to find other factors that can contribute to classroom instruction rather than leadership style.

References

[1] Bazo, M. (2011). Transformational Leadership In Mozambican Primary Schools. A Dissertation to obtain the degree of Doctor at the University of Twente, on the authority of the Rector Magnificus, prof. dr. H. Brinksma, on account of the decision of the graduation committee. The Netherlands.

[2] Bosu, R., Dare, A., Dachi, H., and Fertig, M. (2011). "School leadership and social justice: Evidence from Ghana and Tanzania." International Journal of Educational Development, 31(1), 67-77.

[3] Creswell, J.W. (2009). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. SAGE Publications, 2009.

[4] Gamage, D.T. and Zajda.J. (2009), Decentralization, School Based Management and Quality. DOI. 10.1007/978-90-481-2703-0

[5] Hallinger, P., and Heck, R. H. (2010). "Leadership for Learning: Does Collaborative Leadership Make a Difference in School Improvement?" Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 38(6), 654-678.

[6] Hartog, D.N.D., Muijen, J.J.V. & Koopman, P.L (2011). Transactional versus Transformational Leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology (1997) 70: 19 – 34 Article first published online: 17 AUG 2011. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00628.

[7] Heck, R.H. & Hallinger, P.H. (2010). Testing a longitudinal model of distributed leadership effects on school improvement. The Leadership Quarterly, 21, 867–885

[8] Kosia, E.M. (2010) Effects and Side Effects of School inspection in Public Primary schools of Monduli District Council, Arusha, Tanzania. A Thesis Submitted in Partial fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Educational Science & Technology (Educational Management, Evaluation and Assessment) of University of Twente. Enschede, the Netherlands

[9] Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking Leadership to Student Learning: The Contributions of Leader Efficacy. Educational Administration Quarterly 44: 496-528

[10] Leithwood, K., Patten, S., and Jantzi, D. (2010). "Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning." Educational Administration Quarterly, 46(5), 671-706

[11] Louis, K. S., Dretzke, B. & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 21(3), 315 -336.

[12] Makule A. O. (2008) Globalization in Education: The Changing of School Leadership Role in the Provision of Primary Education in Tanzania. A thesis submitted for the partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Philosophy in Comparative and International Education Institute for Educational Research, University of OSLO.

[13] Nyangarika, A & Felician S.M. Bundala. (2020a). Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Deposits Growth in Sacco's Development Case of Geita Tanzania. International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education, 6(2), 1273-1288.

[14] Nyangarika, A, & Felician S.M. Bundala. (2020b). Challenges Facing Administration System for Quality Improvement on ODL Programs in Tanzania. International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education, 6(2), 1259-1272.

[15] y Nyangarika, A & Felician S.M. Bundala. (2020c). Influence of Retirement Benefits and Its Impact on Socio-Economic Development of Retirees in Tanzania. International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education, 6(2), 1245-1258.

[16] Nguni S. (2005). Transformational Leadership in Tanzania Education: A study of the effects of Transformational Leadership on Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Tanzania Primary and Secondary Schools. Doctoral thesis, Rodbound University.

[17] Nyangarika Anthony (2016a). An Analysis of Service Quality for Customer Satisfaction at Tanzania Posts Corporation. Journal of Consumer and Market Research, 1-12.

[18] Nyangarika Anthony (2016b). Impact of Networking on Performance of Small and Medium Enterprises in Tanzania. European Journal of Business and Management, 40-57.

[19] Nyangarika Anthony (2016c). Social-Economic Constraints Towards Women Business Growth in Tanzania. European Journal of Business and Management, 130-139.

[20] Nguni S., Sleegers P. & Denessen E. (2006) 'Transformational and Transactional Leadership Effects on Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: the Tanzanian Case'. School Effectiveness and School Improvement. Vol 17 No 2 pp 145-177.

[21] Ovando, M. N., and Ramirez, A. (2007). "Principals' Instructional Leadership Within a Teacher Performance Appraisal System: Enhancing Students' Academic Success." Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20(1-2), 85-110.

[22] Salleh, M. J & Hatta, M (2011). Relationship between Principals' Instructional Leadership Practices and Students' Academic Achievement of Secondary Schools in

[23] Sim, Q. C. (2011). Instructional Leadership among Principals of Secondary schools in Malaysia. Educational Research 2(12): 1784 – 1800.

[24] Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. School Effectiveness and School Improvement

[25] Leithwood, K., Patten, S., and Jantzi, D. (2010). "Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning." Educational Administration Quarterly, 46(5), 671-706

[26] Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking Leadership to Student Learning: The Contributions of Leader Efficacy. Educational Administration Quarterly 44: 496-528

[27] Louis, K. S., Dretzke, B. & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 21(3), 315 -336.