

## **Perceptions of Teachers on the Instructional Roles of School Heads in the Secondary Schools in Botswana**

**Annie M. Isaiah**

Principal Curator II- Botany  
Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism  
Department of National Museum and Monuments  
Private Bag 00114, Gaborone, Botswana, Southern Africa 00267  
E-mail: annie.isaiah@yahoo.com

**Mpho N. Isaiah**

(Corresponding Author)  
Director- Educational Planning and Research Services  
Ministry of Education and Skills Development  
Private Bag 005, Gaborone, Botswana, Southern Africa 00267  
E-mail: misaiah@gov.bw, mphoisaiah@yahoo.com

(Received: 6-11-12 / Accepted: 28-2-14)

### **Abstract**

The study was a descriptive survey that investigates the perceptions of teachers on the instructional roles of School Heads as regarding demographic data, instruction, communication and resource provision. A simple random sampling of teachers in the South Central Region was used. Data was collected using a questionnaire administered to all respondents, and an interview of School Heads from each sampled school. The quantitative data analysis involved computing of percentages, means and standard deviations. Quantitative data were summarized to augment the findings of quantitative data. The study revealed that School Heads were not seen in many ways by their teachers as performing their instructional functions, but were very active in setting school objectives. The findings also indicated that communication channels were not clearly defined. The School Heads appreciated the fact that they are not performing as they would like to do as instructional leaders. The study concludes that teachers' perceptions of the School Heads are vital in the whole education of students as they motivate and encourage those they are working with especially teachers. It also concludes that School Heads play a highly significant role in the operations of schools.

**Keywords:** Instructional functions, school Heads roles, Instructional leadership, supervision, Teacher morale, students' performance.

### **Introduction**

Education has a definite role to play in the development of countries such as Botswana. It reflects the skills needed in the economy, employment, income level, social status and quality of life. Education may be viewed as a socializing process through which values, norms and skills are perpetuated. United Nations Development Programme, UNDP, (1990) and The Commonwealth Secretariat (1993) viewed people as a focus for development and thereby

proclaim education as a means for and an indicator of development. The potential for education to play such roles will be dependent to some extent on the instructional roles of School Heads and the perceptions of teachers as mentors of the education system. DeBevoise (1984) described instructional leadership as those actions that School Heads take to promote growth of student learning.

The study adopts DeBevoise's definition of instructional leadership as the School Heads attitude towards instruction within his/her school. Instructional leadership is also viewed as multidimensional and a constellation of attitudes (Saal and Night, 1988). Teachers may have perceptions toward various aspects of the instructional roles of School Heads such as class visits, lesson observations, communication, resource provision, students' achievement; supervision and inter-personal relationships. A positive perception towards different aspects of instructional roles indicates high instructional leadership while a negative emotional perception decree dissatisfaction of teachers on the performance of the School Head's instructional duties.

Instructional leadership has been found to be correlated to teachers' commitment, high students' achievements and better employment opportunity for the students (Seisa and Young, 1990). Instructional leadership is therefore an important factor to consider in education management and development. Instructional leadership brings change, and successful change adoption depends on the perceptions of teachers as change agents on the roles of School Heads.

Against this background School Heads in Botswana are empowered with conducting staff meetings, visiting classrooms, teachers' workrooms, checking schemes and records of work, measuring efficiency of instruction, adjusting pupil's difficulties, rating teachers and giving teachers instructions. In doing these, School Heads were also assisted by Inspectors of schools who assessed both School Heads and teacher's instructional performance in the classroom. Inspectors were feared by majority of teachers, hence teachers wanted to keep their work up to date and the School Heads were involved in all activities of instruction. Also, some of the School Heads tended to see themselves and the School Inspectors as applied philosophers, managers or professionals who are imbued with special knowledge and understanding of the behavioural sciences as they relate to the school leadership. It was deemed necessary therefore to carry out a study on how teachers perceive the instructional role of School Heads as we begin the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The changing context of education poses a multitude of challenges for School Heads. This country's revenues are not keeping pace with the demands on school budgets to ensure proper instruction. School Heads are important; hence no other position in the school has greater potential for maintaining and improving the quality of education in schools. It is clear that schools are functioning exceptionally well and school achievements are high, much of the credit typically belongs to the School Heads. The National Commission on Education of 1977 revealed that in many ways the School head is the most important and influential individual in any school (Republic of Botswana, 1977). It is the School Head's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate of learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. If a school is vibrant, innovative, a child centred place, if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability one can almost always point to the School Head's leadership as the key to success.

More and better instructional leadership is invariably the exhortation one hears in calls for reform and in attendant prescription for school improvement (Shoemaker and Fraser, 1981).

A study by cuberly (1929) revealed that as is the School Head, so is the school, meaning that the character of the school reflects the kind of School Head. He believes that knowledge,

insight, skill and qualities for helpful leadership of the School Head practically determine the ideals and standards of achievement of both teacher and students within the school. The School Head is a critical actor on the school scene, and the effectiveness of instruction and achievement by students can be tied directly to efforts by the school head to lead, manage and supervise teachers and school programmes (Hughes and Ubben, 1989). Ongiri and Abdi (2004) noted that the school head was viewed as the instruction leader of his school, and more recently DeBevoise (1984) suggested that instructional leadership means those actions which School Heads take to promote student learning.

Traditionally, in Botswana schools, like many developing countries, the School heads influenced the whole running of the schools. The School Head ensured that everything was done according to the beliefs, values and norms of the society.

To understand the dilemma faced by School Heads, one must begin by recognizing that School Heads view their role from a leadership perspective. One main problem is the education system has not clearly defined what it expects from the School Heads, thus no clear mandate for any particular type of leadership behavior. The vast majority of School Heads expect their roles to revolve around instructional leadership, but they find themselves performing other roles like being keepers of discipline.

It is therefore important that training of School heads must be a priority and they must be assessed fairly, regularly and objectively (Botswana, 1993). McCurdy (1983) noted that in-service training of School Heads in the skills and behaviours required for effective leadership is the most neglected aspect of school improvement efforts. At the same time there is need for sound in-service training than ever.

In his study Sikongo (1996) found that the newly recruited School Heads are not given any formal training nor induction on matters pertaining to their roles as instructional leaders in the school. It is therefore necessary to find out the perception of teachers on instructional roles of their School Heads.

The School Heads play a major role in determining how effective schools respond to the challenges. Although School Heads are important, their mere presence does not automatically result in the required leadership being provided. Often some circumstances prevent School Heads from becoming the leaders they want to be and one of this is the perception of leadership by the teaching staff.

This study was designed to ascertain the perception of teachers towards the instructional role of the School Head in secondary schools in Botswana. Teachers' perceptions of School Heads' roles have not been treated seriously yet say a lot and influence the relationship between the School Head and the teaching staff. The purpose of the study therefore was to provide baseline data on how teachers perceive the instructional roles of the School Heads. The primary purpose of this study is to identify the perceptions of teachers about the instructional roles of School Heads in secondary schools of Botswana. The research also wanted to determine the instructional roles which most School Heads prefer or are involved in as perceived by teachers.

School Heads play an important role in the running of schools. Sikongo (1996) revealed that the clearer the perceptions among teachers of the instructional roles of School Heads in as far as what they do, the better their performance.

## Research Methodology

The study employed descriptive survey method. In this study a cross sectional survey design was used. The researcher felt that a survey is useful, especially, when one opts to study different teachers' perceptions of School Heads over a wider area. The survey of the teachers' perceptions on the instructional role of School Heads was based on a questionnaire with a section of open ended questions to collect information from respondents. In addition, interviews were also carried out to solicit information from School Heads on what they think of their roles.

Secondary school teachers in Botswana were the target population. Teachers' attendance registers were used to determine the number of teachers in the school. The researcher used 20 teachers from the sampled schools. All School Heads from the selected schools were subjected to an interview. The target sample size was 200 teachers plus 10 School Heads. Prior to sampling, a list of schools which provided School Heads was collected from Department of secondary education. A list of teachers was collected from schools. It was from this list that a purposive sample of teachers employed was selected. The advantage of purposive sampling was that a representative of the target population in terms of certain critical factors was catered for. This was because only qualified teachers were targeted for this study. The major reason for using purposive sampling was to study a workable number of cases from the large group to derive findings that are relevant for all members of the group and also information based on carefully drawn sample is better than information from the entire group. The School Heads were selected because they occupy a strategic position in the supervision of teachers.

To collect data for the study, an instrument designed by Sikongo (1996) was used with some modification to fit the requirements of the study. Some modifications were, however, made to reflect the change from general functions of School Heads to Instructional functions. The data was collected by administering the questionnaire to respondents. Since the researcher was advised not interrupt the normal teaching questionnaires were given to respondents in advance for completion during their spare time. Majority of the teachers who were given the questionnaires returned them.

The data was analyzed using a descriptive statistical method. The analysis of data was interpreted in relation to ordinal scales. The frequencies, percentage, means and standard deviation were used in the analysis and interpretation of data.

## Results and Discussions

This study was carried out to find perceptions of teachers on the instructional roles of School Heads which affect or impinge on the instructional effectiveness of the teachers. The questions addressed in this study are;

- i) How do teachers perceive instructional functions of School Heads?
- ii) To what extent to School Heads provide instructional communication of teachers?
- iii) What is the extent to which School Heads are resource providers for effective instruction?

Frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations were used report findings of three major constructs which are instructional functions, instructional communication and resource provision, each with items ranging from 4 to 7. Each item rated on a four point likert scale system with strongly agree given the highest score (4) and strongly disagree the lowest score (1). Through open ended question respondents were also requested to indicate what they thought to be the four most important functions of their School Heads, whether the their

instructional responsibility is clearly defined and to explain their perceptions concerning the school head as a resource provider. The findings from the open ended questions were meant to compliment findings from the closed ended questions. In the case of the open ended questions and interview, the findings were reported as per response.

What follows are the results on the teachers' perceptions of the school head's instructional responsibility.

## Demographic Data

A description of respondents' characteristics is presented here according to gender, position, qualification, age, and teaching experience. Data presented below indicates the variable of, numbers and percentages in relation to question of gender, age, qualification, experience, and position of the teacher.

**Table 1:** Numbers and percentages of respondents by Demographic variable

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N=130</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
<b>Gender</b> (i) Male	54	41.5%
(ii) Female	76	58.5%
<b>Age</b> (i) 21-25 years	18	13.8%
(ii) 26-30 years	61	46.9%
(iii) 31-35 years	31	23.8%
(iv) 36 years and above	20	15.4%
<b>Qualification</b>		
(i) Diploma	105	80.8%
(ii) Degree	25	19.2%
<b>Experience</b>		
(i) Less than 1 year	26	20%
(ii) 1-4 years	64	49.2%
(iii) 5-9 years	23	17.7%
(iv) 10-14 years	11	8.5%
(v) 15 years and above	6	4.6%
<b>Position</b>		
(i) Deputy head	7	5.4%
(ii) Senior teacher	19	14.6%
(iii) Teacher	104	80.0%

As indicated in Table 1, 41.5% of the respondents were males and 58.5% were females. In respect of age 13.8% were aged 21-25 years, 46.9% were aged 26-30 years, 23.8% were aged 31-35 years while 15.4% were of the age 36 years or above. 20% of the respondents had less than one year teaching experience, 49.2% had 1-4 years experience, 17.7% had 5-9 years experience, 8.5% had 10-14 years and only 4.6% had 15 years or above teaching experience.

An overview of respondents characteristics from the school perspective shows that 80.8% of the respondents had a diploma qualification while 19.2% had a degree. The school level characteristics of respondents show that 5.4% were deputy school heads, 14.6% were senior teachers 80% were teachers.

## Instructional Roles: Teachers' Perception by Instruction Facets

The tables that follow present the percentages, means and standard deviations computed to answer the question: How do teachers perceive instructional functions of the school head?

**Table 2:** Percentages, means and Standard Deviations for teachers' perception of School Head's instructional functions with regard to school goals

ITEM	A (agree)	M	STD
Frame specific curricular goals	86%	3.35	0.84
Attempts to clarify the purpose, aims and goals of instruction to all teachers	90%	3.28	0.78
Supports staff to achieve academic goals	74%	3.16	0.96
Spends time one – on – one to remind teachers of central visions	7%	1.56	0.74
Demonstrates commitment to academic goals	75%	3.12	0.99
OVERALL	66.4%	2.86	0.86

Strongly Agree (SA)=A, Agree(A)=3, Disagree(D)=2, Strongly Disagree(SD)=1 (n=130)

The respondents were affirmative that school head involved in setting of goals, clarifying them to teachers and were supportive to ensure their achievements. The findings agree with the study by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) that School Heads who lead are highly goal orientated and have keen sense of goal clarity. It is important to note that teachers hold schools in esteem of matters of school goals. It is important to note also that School Heads still place priority on school having a set of objectives / goals to achieve at the end of each year. This finding agrees with the findings of Afe (2001) that instructional leaders facilitate learning to achieve the set goals of the school. The study revealed that almost two thirds of the respondents recognise the role played by School Heads in setting and ensuring the achievements of school goals. As perceived by Montimore and Sammond (1987) who said: "associated with this performance of School Heads to purposeful leadership, and they understand the needs of their schools as they are actively involved in the school work" (p32). This may be due to the fact that in most secondary schools, the School Heads have been spearheading the school development plans and encouraging each department to develop their objectives which are in line with the whole school plan. Despite the success of the School Heads, almost all the teachers indicated that School Heads do not spend time with teachers reminding them of central visions of the school. This may mean that School Heads, after developing the school plan, do not continually check on the progress/difficulties faced by teachers during the implementation period. The findings are in agreement with Hughes and Ubben (1989) who noted that: "the School Head is a critical actor in the school scene, and the effectiveness of instruction can be tied directly to the efforts by the Scholl Head to lead, manage, supervise teachers and the whole school programme" (p146).

Failure to make teachers aware of these central visions may result in failure of the teachers to meet the school goals. Reasons for agreeing were unfortunately not captured during the administration of the questionnaires but some cited reasons like school development plans as the major item for agreeing that School Heads are involved in goal setting for their schools. Disagreement was due to the fact that most School Heads do not usually call teachers to discuss issues of 'the way forward' and how to get there.

**Table 3:** Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations for teachers' perception of school head instructional functions with regard to curriculum

ITEM	A (agree)	M	STD
Leads discussions concerning instruction	11%	1.8	0.68
Aware of each teachers curriculum	29%	2.04	0.91
Creates a climate of high expectations in schools characterised by a tone of respect for teachers.	67%	2.72	0.82
Place priority on curriculum demands	80%	3.20	0.90
Establishes high standards of performance for teachers in academic work	29%	2.23	0.74
Establishes high standards for teachers in extra-curricular activities	16%	1.79	0.78
Encourages independent and critical thinking among teachers	29%	2.07	0.97
Overall	30%	2.12	0.82

Strongly Agree (SA) =4, Agree (A) =3, Disagree (D) =2, Strongly Disagree (SD) =1 (n=130)

Table 3 show that overall, teachers disagreed (A=30%, M=2.12, STD=0.82) with the statement that school instructional leaders on matters of curriculum administration. However, they agreed that School Heads create a climate of high expectations in the schools characterised by a tone of respect for teachers (A=67%, M=2.72, STD=0.82), place priority on curriculum demands (A=80%, M=3.20, STD=0.90). Curriculum administration and improvement were rarely mentioned during data collection or from the interviews.

The findings from open ended questions and interviews indicate that the School Heads' performance concerning the administration of the curriculum is very poor. This study shows that the teachers' performance in administering curriculum is not rated against any set standards by the School Head; hence most teachers were not affirmative on the issues that affect curriculum implementation. It is clear from the findings that the School Heads do not create a conducive climate to ensure proper implementation of the curriculum. The findings reveal that the roles performed by School Heads pertaining to curriculum or issues of instruction as perceived by their teachers is not beneficial to the teachers as School Heads do not supervise the teachers' curriculum by checking the coverage of the syllabi topics or teachers workbook. These findings indicate that for proper curriculum implementations to take place, School Heads must place priority on curriculum demands, lead discussions and establish high standards of performance for teachers in their academic work. The study revealed that in the Botswana, School Heads are not really helpful when it comes to curriculum implementation and improvement. This is in agreement with the observations of Sikongo (1996) that on average, only 17.4% of the School Heads 'time is spent on instructional matters, reflecting the fact that the activities of the School Head show only marginal association with instructional activities of teachers and learning activities of learners.

This is also confirmed by the fact that they only come to know what is happening in the classrooms, if there is a problem to be addressed by the senior management team. These observations were acknowledged by Boyer (1983) that School Heads cannot exercise leadership without classroom experience or without a thorough grounding in the realities of the curriculum, School Heads will continue to feel uncomfortable and inadequate in instructional matters with their teachers.

In fact two thirds of the respondents perceived the roles performed by School Heads on issues of curriculum instruction as not being beneficial to them as classroom teachers. Then,

following the above consideration and items under investigation the School Head's functions were underrepresented by teachers. This is probably because the school head is not actively involved in the instruction activities. If this is the case, it can safely be concluded with a phrase such as, while this is surprising it can be dysfunctional for the system as a whole and consequently instructional activities will suffer.

**Table 4:** Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations for teacher's perception of school heads instructional functions with regard to student's performance

ITEM	A (agree)	M	STD
Continually monitors students progress by checking scheme books and records of work.	5%	1.51	0.65
Leads discussions concerning students achievement	9%	1.71	0.72
Promotes a learner centred approach by regular class visits	5%	1.24	0.63
Instil discipline by minimising factors that may disrupt the learning process	77%	3.12	1.02
Overall	24%	1.90	0.75

Strongly Agree (SA) =A, Agree (A) =3, Disagree (D) =2, Strongly Disagree (SD) =1 (n=130)

The overall perception of teachers in relation to School Heads instructional roles concerning students achievement as shown in Table 4, portray total discontentment (A=24%, M=1.90, STD=0.75) Teachers perceptions were negative towards three quarters of the statements in this category. They perceive School Heads as not monitoring students progress by checking teachers work books such as scheme books and record books (A=5%, M=1.51, STD =0.64); not leading in important discussions concerning students achievements (A=9%, M=1.71, STD=0.72) and promoting learner centred approach by regular class visits (A=5%, M=1.24, STD=0.63). Teachers agreed that School Heads instil discipline (A=77, M=3.12, STD=1.02). This may be due to the fact that School Heads believe that a well disciplined student will perform much better in class. Interviewees corroborated quantitative results by stating that there was no monitoring of students progress and no class visits by school heads.

The items investigated under this section referred more to how the School Heads' instructional role assists in improving students' performance. In general the results have revealed that almost all the teachers perceived School Heads as not doing enough on issues which are aimed to address student performance. In view of the observations, the issue at stake is: what can be the cause of these perceptions of the staff regarding the instructional functions of the school head. In this respect, Bookbinder (1992) reminds the reader that the School Head is a counsellor of students, the school disciplinarian, the organiser of schedule, the supervisor of instructional programme, the pupil-relations representative for the attendance area, the director and evaluator of teaching efforts, the manager of the school facilities, the supervisor of custodial and professional leader. This describes the School Head's instructional functions in relations to student achievements issues. Then following these given functions, it is work noting that there are certain problems which seem to be prevalent in some schools in the country, viz: high failure rate, absenteeism, to mention just a few.

From the findings such problems can be attributed to the ineffective instructional leadership in schools. On the contrary, Beach (1991), observed that School Heads who set or maintain the school environment in which effective teaching and learning take place and which in turn are more directly linked to important outcomes such as student achievements are influenced by the School Head's continuous monitoring of student progress by checking the scheme books and record books, and by promoting a learner centred approach by regular class visits. It is important to note that this study revealed that School Heads are not performing in this,



hence the negative perception of teachers. Following these observations, one may conclude that school heads instructional role is assessed on the basis of student performance and overall maintenance of student discipline. It is interesting to realise that teachers have rated School Heads on instructional matters below average thus they are not perceived as instructional leaders that our schools deserve to have. These results agree with the findings by Duke (1988) that School Heads have diverse interests, but felt that they have neglected their role of instructional leadership. These diverse interests make it very difficult if not impossible for most School Heads to carry out their instructional roles. In reality, understanding instructional leadership is not easy and implementing it, remains a persistent challenge to some School Heads in Botswana.

As revealed in the study by Bruce and Grimseley (1987) Instructional leadership is expected to address two initial tasks of guiding teachers in the selection of methods, preparing and renewing teachers to discover the best procedures of performing the teaching tasks and to help teachers acquire these methods in-order to ensure maximum student achievements. The results in this study show that teachers are clear that this kind of support which can be fruitful in their instruction is seriously lacking from their School Heads. It must be acknowledged that the efficiency of teachers in instructional matters would be increased through the guidance of heads who are expected to translate aims of the school into terms which teachers understand. It is also important to realise that the findings show that the perceptions of the majority of teachers were not in the affirmative on basic issues like class visits, checking of scheme books, registers, inspecting student progress reports and even teacher class attendance.

The functions which are from the respondent clearly show that most teachers feel that School Heads must ensure that there is discipline in the school to ensure that instruction takes place properly without any disturbances. This agrees with the findings of Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) and Sikongo (1996) that the mark of a School Head from the office perspective is to keep things calm and see that the work of the school proceeds smoothly. To emphasise the need for discipline in the school set up, Crowson and Port-Gehrie (1980) found that School Heads of schools spend about 53% of their working time in motion touring school halls, monitoring teachers attendance to classes, checking items of information with the school staff, ensuring that individuals are on duty, and being available to all members and students ... to quell potential problems.

The study also found that the instructional responsibilities for School Heads were not clearly defined, and there was very little that was said about their instructional supervision. This according to the findings may be a clear indication that no attempt is made to consider whether or not the School Head in question does have knowledge in instructional task expected of him/her even though these are not clearly defined. It is clear that lack of clearly defined instructional roles, influence the School Head action in relation to instruction. One respondent commented that despite the roles being not clearly defined the School Heads seem to rely too much upon their deputies to carry out the role of instructional leadership and this brings in the issue of role conflict. The respondent also indicated that School Heads are bound to office work than to instructional leadership. Thus, their impact or influence is hardly felt on teaching-learning in the school. It may be said that probably teachers are right in their perceptions because the instructional roles of School Heads are not clearly defined.

## **Perceptions of Instructional Communication Role of School Heads**

Table 5-7 presents percentage, means and standard deviations computed to answer the question: To what extent do school Heads provide instructional communication to teachers.

**Table 5:** Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations for teacher's perceptions of School Head's instructional functions with regard to channels of communication

Item	A (Agree)	M	STD
Uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance	9%	1.68	0.73
Provide frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance	8%	1.57	0.66
Assist faculty in interpreting test results	2%	1.39	0.55
Makes himself/herself accessible to teachers on matters of instruction	81%	3.17	0.89
Encourages the use of different instructional communication strategies	12%	1.63	0.77
Communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters	24%	1.99	0.80
Overall perception	23%	1.91	0.73

Strongly agree (SA) = 4; Agree (A) = 3; Disagree (D) = 2; Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 (n = 130)

The research findings established that the perception of teachers with regard to channels of communication was poor in secondary schools. These findings do not agree or support the findings of Dufour (1991) that an effective School Head communicates to the teachers clearly to make them aware of the way forward and how their performance will be judged. This means that the School Heads in this country have poor communication strategies and based on this perception the researcher assumed that schools are not effective.

It is clear from the findings that School Heads do not communicate with their teachers on issues that affect instruction. School Heads are seen as the most important and influential personalities in any school. It is the way they communicate with their teachers that will assist teachers to know what is expected of them. The results also show that it is the School Head who creates organisational conditions under which people are motivated to do their best. Bradt (1988) noted in his study that teachers perceptions on the instructional roles of school Heads reflected that good communicating leaders were characterised by frequent monitoring and feedback to their teachers. The results also revealed that School Heads do not have any laid down communication strategies and their instructional leadership is not effective.

From the interviews it was found that channels of communication seem not to be clearly defined. In a few isolated incidents it was alleged that School Heads do not have any laid down communications strategies.

**Table 6:** Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations for teachers' perceptions of School Heads instructional communication functions

Item	A(Agree)	M	STD
Encourages formal discussions among teachers on matters of instruction	72%	2.92	1.02
Encourages teachers to evaluate their own professional competence to set goals for their own growth	62%	2.81	0.94
Monitors the amount of class time devoted to instruction	73%	3.05	0.98
Expects teachers to be successful in their work and communicates this expectations to them	55%	2.59	0.71

Supports staff so that they will be able and willing to render services to pupils	41%	2.38	0.79
Understands learning and teaching styles	3%	1.20	0.49
Allows freedom of expression	60%	2.58	1.09
overall	52%	2.50	0.86

Strongly agree (SA) = 4; Agree (A) = 3; Disagree (D) = 2; Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 (n = 130)

The respondents gave an affirmative response on most of the issues concerning instruction. The results show that School Heads encourage teachers to discuss among themselves issues that affect instruction and professional growth of teachers. In every secondary school despite the failure to have clear communication channels School Heads are seen to be expecting their teachers to be successful in their work and communicate these expectations to them. On the issues of whether School Heads have set guidelines and procedures which are understood by all teachers regarding instruction improvement, the teachers' perception was such that School Heads failed to support teachers to ensure that they are motivated and their morale improved. This may be a result of the School Heads' failure to understand teaching and learning styles necessary for instruction improvement and thus cannot be of any assistance to their teachers.

**Table 7:** Percentages, Means and Standard Deviation for teacher's perceptions of School Head's instructional communication with regard to changes in the schools

Item	A (Agree)	M	STD
Keeps teachers abreast of changes in the school	40%	2.52	1.09
Makes teachers aware of the implications of the changes	39%	2.16	1.13
Provides teachers with opportunities to visit and interact with others for professional development	8%	1.90	0.56
overall	29%	2.10	0.93

Strongly agree (SA) = 4; Agree (A) = 3; Disagree (D) = 2; Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 (n = 130)

The respondents perception indicated that most School Heads in the secondary schools do not communicate and keep teachers abreast of the changes that are likely to occur in the school and what the implications of these changes will be in the teachers' instruction. The assumption may be that School Head's failure to inform teachers of the possible changes to take place may be due to lack of training and in-servicing on communication, hence some have fallen into the trap of their own decisions.

This agrees with the findings by McCurdy (1983) that in-service training of School Heads in the communication skills is the most neglected aspect of school improvements efforts. This dissatisfaction of teachers on the School Head's role in communicating change in schools may be a result of what Sikongo (1996) found to be lack of formal training or induction at the time of appointment of School Heads on matters of instructional communication. The situation is such that the School Heads seem to be weak in communicating change to their teachers and other staff members. The School Heads indicated that in most cases it is true that communication in the schools seem difficult because of the lack of laid down channels of communication at their disposal to communicate with teachers. They acknowledged the fact that most communication is through notice boards, hence no proper communication on instructional matters. Failure to communicate change was consistently revealed as a source of concern.

## Teachers' Perceptions of School Heads as Resource Providers for Instructional Materials

The tables 8 and 9 present the percentages and standard deviations computed to answer the question: what is the extents to which School Heads are resource providers for effective instruction?

**Table 8:** Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations for teachers' perceptions regarding the knowledge of School heads as resource provider

Item	A (Agree)	M	STD
Is knowledgeable about instructional resources	77%	3.15	0.98
Is considered an important resource person in the school	8%	1.45	0.66
Participates in selection of instructional materials	5%	1.79	0.57
Produces needed reports and records without inconveniencing teachers	60%	2.92	1.27
Expresses support for new practices related to programme improvement	60%	2.74	1.05
overall	42%	2.41	0.91

Strongly agree (SA) = 4; Agree (A) = 3; Disagree (D) = 2; Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 (n = 130)

The respondents were of the view that some School Heads were knowledgeable about instructional resources, but almost all teachers acknowledged that School Heads are not important resource persons and do not participate in the selection of instructional materials. Teachers do not consider School Heads as important resource providers. The perceptions of teachers are such that School Heads rarely participate in the selection of the teaching materials. These perceptions may be due to the fact that School Heads do not teach at all.

### Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

It has been observed that School Heads play a highly significant role in the operations of the school. It is then assumed that School Heads can be the key leaders of instructional roles in secondary schools. The study revealed that for a school to function effectively the role of the School Head must be clear to all teachers. The perceptions of the teacher indicated that school heads in secondary schools were administrators and have very little to do with instruction in their schools. This revelation meant that School Heads are overwhelmed by the duties they are expected to carry out. It is clear that teachers understand what instructional roles School Heads are supposed to do but very little is happening in schools.

The conclusion of the study revealed that:

- School heads are not performing their instructional functions.
- School Head are failing in their daily duties to monitor teaching and learning process.
- School Heads do not communicate valuable information with their teachers.
- Instructional roles and responsibilities of School Heads are not fully performed by the majority of the so called instructional leaders.

The study therefore recommends that:

- School heads be re-trained on how best to carry out their instructional roles for the benefit of their teachers and students.
- The range of functions that School Heads perform should focus more on methods of instructional supervision.
- Communication channels in the school must be clearly defined for all teachers.
- School heads must monitor the use of class time by teachers and students.

## References

- [1] Botswana, *Report of the National Commission on Education*, (1977), Ministry of Education, Gaborone: Government Printer.
- [2] Botswana, *Report on the National Commission on Education*, (1993), Ministry of Education, Gaborone: Government Printer.
- [3] Commonwealth Secretariat, *Foundations for the future: Human resource development, A Report of the Commonwealth Working Group on Human Resource Development Strategies*, (1993), London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- [4] E.P. Cuberley, *Public School Administration*, (1929), New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [5] W. De Bevoise, *Synthesis of Research on the Principals as Instructional Leaders*, (1984), Educational Leadership: ASCD.
- [6] L.M. Hughes and G.L. Ubben, *The Elementary Principals Handbook*, (1989), Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- [7] J. McCurdy, *The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools: Problems and Solution Education*, (1983), Sacramento: California.
- [8] I. Ongiri and A. Abdi, *Hard Work is the Secret of Success*, (2004), Nairobi: Kenya, The Standard.
- [9] F.E. Saal and P.A. Knight, *Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Science and Practice*, (1988), Pacific Grove: Books/Cole Publishers Company.
- [10] S. Seisa and F. Youngman, *Education for all in Botswana*, (1991), Gaborone: Macmillan.
- [11] J. Shoemaker and H. Fraser, What principals can do: Some implications from studies of an effective schooling, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 63(3) (1981), 178-182.
- [12] E.H. Sikongo, A study of the staff perceptions of school administrators of senior secondary in Rundu and Ondangwa regions in Northern Namibia, *MED Thesis*, (1996), University of Botswana.
- [13] UNDP, *Human Development Report*, (1990), New York: Oxford University Press.