



Effectiveness of Administrative functions in promoting students' academic achievement: A Case of Community secondary schools in Missenyi District, Tanzania

Happiness Alex^{1,*} and Prosperity M. Mwila²

¹Educational Officer, Dar es Salaam City, Tanzania

²Department of Educational Foundation: St. Augustine University of Tanzania, Tanzania

Corresponding Author

Article Info

Received: 25 Nov 2021,

Received in revised form: 12 Dec 2021,

Accepted: 20 Dec 2021,

Available online: 30 Dec 2021

Keywords— administrative effectiveness, administrative practices, students' academic

Achievements, promotion, Community secondary schools

©2022 The Author(s). Published by AI Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

Abstract

School academic achievement is the main goal of any academic institution and can be achieved only if the school administration is focused and dedicated to it. The effectiveness of school administrative practices largely influences students' academic achievement. Community secondary schools in Tanzania have been performing poorly in the four national examinations of Tanzania (NECTA) compared to private schools, which dominate the top ten list of better performing schools; in turn, community secondary schools dominate the top ten poor. This study assessed the effectiveness of school administrative practices in promoting students' academic achievements in community secondary schools in the Missenyi district in the Kagera region. A descriptive survey research design under a mixed approach was employed. The sample consisted of 4 heads of schools, 4 academic masters and mistresses and 4 ward educational officers, 44 teachers and 181 students, with a total of 237 respondents. Both purposive and random sampling techniques were used to obtain the study sample size of respondents. Questionnaires, interviews and documentary review guide research instruments were used in data collection. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, while content analysis was used for qualitative data. The study established that school administrators in community secondary schools lack instructional leadership knowledge and are not accountable in performing instructional supervision effectively at school. Additionally, they fail to create a conducive school climate for effective teaching and learning. Furthermore, top-down communication direction dominates instructional policy decisions in schools. Not only but also school administrators face the challenges of external pressure and political influences during the implementation of educational policies at school, which affect school community collaboration and the general efficiency of school administration.

I. INTRODUCTION

Education has been the global concern emerging from the Universal declaration of Human Right Article 26 as well as Education for All (EFA) through Millennium Development Goal number two, which stressed the achievement of Universal Primary Education by 2015. The main concern is issues of access, equity and quality education. Access to education is essential for development. Education is one

way to reduce poverty, and it is a part of the definition of poverty reduction in society.

It is for long-term productivity and social progress. It is central to the development goals of reducing poverty, demographic changes, protective health care, and empowering women in a given nation. There are no substantive development arguments that suggest that education investment is not developmental. The reasons are

clear: knowledge and skills abilities and competencies acquired through education have value in the labor market, and social selection and mobility are increasingly mediated through education.

In development plans tied to the Millennium Development goals related to Education for All, which entails access, equity and quality to education seen as a key tenet. To eliminate poverty, increase equity, and change the developmental prospects of people and nations, it is crucial to achieve universal primary education and gender parity in enrollment throughout all low-income nations. Based on the world meeting on Education for All of 1990 declaration in Jomtien Thailand, the international community and national governments first announced commitments to provide universal education access for primary schooling by 2015. The pronouncement adopted by the world conference on Education for All declares basic education to be the foundation for lifelong learning” (World Education Report, 2000, p 54).

It thought that poverty reduction would not be possible unless people who are marginalized from value-added economic activity are given the opportunity to learn skills and abilities that will allow them to make reasoned judgments. To increase the projections of attaining the world goal aligned to education for all, operative, strategic programs and good policies for quality education had to be in place. In response to this, many countries, both developed and developing countries, have established educational programs to accommodate issues of access, equity and quality.

The best performance education systems combine equity and quality. Their education policy provides equal opportunity for all children to receive a good education, and it offers recommendations to help all children to succeed in their schooling. The government should look at both system-wide and school-level policies to uphold equity and quality education.

The disappointing progress in overall education access, equity and quality is attributed to a number of factors, including the unwillingness of some governments to prioritize increased enrollments, real resource limitations, capacity and teacher supply bottlenecks, and challenges in translating the promises of external support into increased external assistance. These factors have resulted in poor school achievements in many developed countries.

Poor school achievements have a negative impact on social solidity and flexibility or changes, as well as increasing expenses for community budgets to address some societal moments, such as raising expenses on public health and other social service provision and increasing delinquency. For the majority of these motives, enhancing fairness in

education as well as lowering school underachievement must be a high precedence in education coverage plans. However, whereas most instruction services highlight the lessening of school disappointment as a need, many nations appear to have small consistency in their arrangements to boost poor-achieving schools. Challenges remain as to what sorts of approaches and practices work best and how to actualize them.

Despite global interventions, there are many other likely contextual problems in the education sector that need to be given attention, such as unsatisfactory school achievement in terms of test scores and exams (Damon et al., 2016). School achievement is largely determined by various factors for its effectiveness. Generally, it is determined by the arrangement and preparedness of the school administration in the entire process of instructional leadership.

Effective schools tend to be well prearranged, events and programs need to be well planned and properly executed, and above all, people devote mandated authority to lead those schools to acquire a participative management style, need to be more proactive and should have an influential educational vision (Shonubi, 2012). In line with Shonubi’s (2012) quotation, school achievement lies in the administrative body that is responsible for planning and organizing school teaching and learning activities. The school administration is responsible for instructional leadership, students’ personnel services, business and finance management, school community services and research and consultation.

According to Kiety et al. (2017), school administrative practices strongly influence students’ academic performance. The way school administrators plan to implement the instructional curriculum determines the school preparedness for their students’ achievements. According to Yousaf et al.’s (2018) study in India, school supervisory practices seemed to be very important, as they significantly contribute to the improvement in work performance in school.

In Europe, the school administrator needs to be equipped with knowledge of school leadership to culminate in effective administrative practices to improve students’ academic achievement. According to the European trade union committee for education (2012),

“National policies on recruitment in Europe do seem to prioritize teaching qualifications along with leadership and managerial qualifications under justification of combining the two are essential qualifications for school leaders. First, a leadership qualification provides school leaders with the necessary tools to

steer the school towards its aims. Second, the teaching qualification and experience ensure that a school leader has a solid foundation in, and knowledge of, the school system and pedagogy”, p 16.

As the main task is to supervise the instructional curriculum, one to be appointed a head of school needs to have leadership concepts and teaching knowledge technical skills. However, European education systems are not attractive in warranting that all students gain desirable skills. This is attributed to poor administrative practices in schools. It entails a lack of transparency and poor parental involvement in decision making.

This attribute is the most perfect necessity for more transparency on school issues and proceedings for which teachers’ and parents’ involvement in schools’ issue decision-making process prevails in the European school system (CULT Committee, 2022). This shows how school administrative effectiveness is still a riddle in Europe. There is a need to assess administrative effectiveness in promoting students’ academic achievements for better insight and reshuffling.

In Africa, secondary school effectiveness is still faced by the problem of poor management and leadership, with Tanzania being inclusive. According to Gakus (2008), African education sectors are still facing continuous serious poor learning outcomes and weak education system capacity challenges. This affects the motives of EFA and millennium goal attainment in Africa. Schools that perform better have strong managerial and instructional leadership. Based on Lena’s (2015) study in Kenyan schools, which performed well, head teachers practiced better managerial practices than those with low performance. School administrative practice effectiveness greatly influences school academic achievement.

In Tanzania, the government responded to these conventions (EFA and Millennium goals) through the establishment of community-based secondary schools throughout the country in 2000 under the Secondary Education Development Program (SEDP). This was an idealistic and education projection plan, and its implementation in 2010 meant that the nation should experience an increased primary to secondary school students’ transition rate (URT: 2004).

Despite the establishment of community secondary schools, their academic achievement has deteriorated compared to privately owned schools.

According to Mosenda (2021), community public secondary school achievement in national examinations (NECTA) has been a problem where public secondary schools perform poorly compared to private secondary

schools. Studies in Tanzania, such as Ngambi (2004), Emillio (2011), Mkalagala (2013) and Jonathan et al. (2014), have been conducted on factors contributing to poor achievements in community public schools, such as teaching and learning inputs, parental involvement, and conducive teaching and learning environments, although the problem remains unsolved.

A comparative survey by Kivenule (2015) between private and public secondary school achievements in Tanzania revealed that eighty percent (80%) of teachers and parents participated in the study, showing that private schools are performing better than public secondary schools due to the excellent control of the school administrative system and team arrangement in private schools. This reveals the influence of school administrative practice effectiveness on students’ achievements. Through these experiences, in Tanzania, studies on the effectiveness of public school administrative practices in promoting students’ achievement are obvious.

The study conducted by Mwombeki (2013) in the Kagera region on the performance of school board members in managing community secondary schools revealed that school board members are not proficiently, confidently and comfortably performing their school managerial and administrative roles. The study dedicated itself to only school board members who are a small part of school administration and normally stay out of school surroundings. This could not reflect the reality of day-to-day school administrative practice effectiveness in promoting students’ academic achievements.

According to NECTA form four results data, community secondary schools in the Kagera region have been performing poorly, which in turn ended up contributing to the ten last poor performing secondary schools in 2017 and 2018 consecutively. One of the ten poor performing schools involved in 2018 was from Missenyi district, namely, “A” community secondary schools. Additionally, in the following year, another community secondary school in Missenyi district, “B” secondary school, showed a drastic drop in performance, dropping 400 NECTA school positions from 3755/5413 schools in 2019 to 4155/5413 in 2020 (see appendix ix). This deteriorating community secondary school students’ academic achievement in Missenyi district raised concerns about school administrative effectiveness. However, no study has been conducted in the Missenyi community secondary school to ascertain administrative effectiveness; hence, little is known. Therefore, this study seeks to assess the administrative effectiveness in promoting students’ academic achievement in community secondary schools in Missenyi District, Kagera region.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Students' academic achievement at a given school depends on school administration effectiveness in executing administrative practices. According to Kiety et al. (2017), school administrative practices strongly influence students' academic achievements. It involves effective instructional leadership, school climate, and a clear line of communication framework within the school. In Tanzania, community secondary schools have been performing poorly in four national examinations, with ten poor last performing secondary schools in 2017 to 2021. Within those poor last performing community secondary schools in 2018, one was from the Missenyi district in the Kagera region. Additionally, in 2020, another community secondary school in the area dropped drastically 400 school positions in NECTA from 3755/5413 schools in 2019 to 4155/5413. This alarm for a great concern on school administrative effectiveness in Missenyi district community secondary schools. Whatever happens in schools, good or bad, administration is involved. The extent to which school administrators in community secondary schools play roles in executing administrative practices in integrating factors for student achievement is still unknown. However, through a literature review, no study has been conducted in Missenyi District that has tried to assess the effectiveness of administrative practices in promoting students' academic achievement in community secondary schools. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the effectiveness of administrative practices in promoting students' academic achievements in community secondary schools in Missenyi District. The study was guided by the following research objectives:

- i. To determine how school administration exercises instructional leadership in community secondary schools in Missenyi District.
- ii. To determine how school administration communicates instructional policies and decisions in community secondary schools in Missenyi District.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study adopted the instructional leadership model by Murphy (1990) and administrative theory (1916) by Henri Fayol concurrently to serve the purpose. Starting with Murphy's (1990) instructional leadership model, according to the model, school heads can provide a favorable school learning environment through teaching and learning processes by laying down progressive standards and expectations for staff members (teachers), preserving high

visibility, providing incentives for teachers and promoting teachers' professional development. Murphy's model provides a framework that consists of four basic dimensions of instructional leadership roles: developing vision, mission and objectives, supervising educational curriculum implementation in school, facilitating teaching and learning climate and developing a conducive work atmosphere.

The Murphy (1990) instructional leadership model is relevant to this study because it seeks to address the effective administrative school practices that render high students' academic achievement. Since the main function of educational administrators is instructional leadership, the model is relevant. Instructional leadership entails supervising the curriculum and the entire process of teaching and learning at school.

Again, by coining with another theory, administrative theory (1916) by Henri Fayol, Fayol proposed administrative principles. According to Fayol, more emphasis should be placed on organizational administration and human communicative and collaboration issues in the entire school administration. The theory is relevant to the study, as it proposes principles of administration that play part in administrative practices in the school context for the aim of increasing the efficiency of teaching and learning and eventually students' academic achievement realization.

As this study aimed to study school administrative practices' effectiveness in promoting students' academic achievements, both Murphy's (1990) instructional leadership model and Fayol's (1916) administrative theory served appropriately and complemented each other to address the study purpose for effective school admiration functions.

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive survey design under a mixed approach methodology. Descriptive survey research design, as used in explanatory studies, allows researchers to gather information, summarize present and interpret for clarification (Orodho, 2003). Descriptive survey research was intended to produce statistical and descriptive information on administrative practice effectiveness from ward educational officers (WEOs), school heads, academic masters/mistresses, teachers and students. The population of this study comprised all community secondary schools, heads of schools, students, teachers and ward education officers in the Missenyi district in the Kagera region. The sample was composed of four (4) purposively selected community secondary schools with consistent records of poor academic achievement with an average NECTA performance GPA of 4.0 and above in 2019 and 2020 and a GPA of 4.2 and above in 2021. Additionally, the four (4)

heads of schools, four (4) academic masters/mistresses, and 4 ward education officers were selected purposively, and 181 students and 44 teachers were selected through a random sampling technique. This study used questionnaire, interview, and documentary review guides for data collection. Both closed- and open-end questionnaires were used to collect data from teachers and students, while structured interview guides were used to collect data from heads of schools, academic masters/mistresses and ward education officers on the assessment of community school administrative effectiveness in the promotion of students' academic achievements. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, while content analysis was used for qualitative data.

V. FINDINGS

5.1 How school administration exercises instructional leadership in community secondary schools

The first objective aimed to determine how school administration exercises instructional leadership in

Table 1: Teachers' Responses on school administrative practices in the facilitation of instructional leadership

Administrative instructional leadership facilitation at school	1		2		3		4	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Monitoring students' academic progress and attendance	06	14	38	86	-	-	-	-
Creating conditions for effective teaching and learning by motivating both teachers and learners	05	11	08	18	30	68	01	03
Providing the necessary resources and support for teaching and learning for all classes	15	34	26	59	03	07	-	-
Allocating a large budget for effective teaching and learning	-	-	-	-	12	27	32	73
Communicating regularly with learners teachers and parents on teaching and learning process	-	-	5	11	36	82	3	7
Coordinating and evaluating effectively curriculum activities intern of teaching and continuous assessment	-	-	02	05	42	95	-	-
Designing system for effective teaching and learning in terms of school timetable, log book, scheme of work preparation, and lesson plan	04	09	40	91	-	-	-	-
Management by walking around to oversee the process of teaching and learning progress	02	05	02	05	31	70	09	20

(Source: Field data 2022)

Table 1 indicates that 44 (100%) teachers agreed on school administration to monitor students' academic progress and attendance. Again, 44 (100%) teachers agreed that the school administration should design a system for effective

community secondary schools. Data collection for this objective, questions items where posted in teachers' and students' questionnaires, heads of schools, academic masters/mistress and WEO's interviews and documentary analysis guides.

In teachers' questionnaires, question number three (see appendix I) required teachers to show their agreement on school administrative practices in facilitation of instructional leadership at school based on the four Likert scales. The scales range from 1-4 options, namely, 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree and 4=strongly disagree. Table 4.1 presents the findings, which show the frequencies and the correspondence percentages of teachers who responded to the given items. In this research, both "strongly agree" and "agree" responses are termed "agree"; likewise, "disagree" and "strongly disagree" are termed "disagree".

teaching and learning in terms of school timetables, log books, work preparation schemes, and lesson plans. Additionally, 41 (93%) teachers admitted the administration

to provide the necessary resources and support for teaching and learning for all classes.

In contrast, 42 (95%) teachers disagreed on the school administration’s ability to effectively coordinate and evaluate curriculum activities in teaching and continuous assessment, and 31 (71%) teachers disagreed on the administration’s ability to create conditions for effective teaching and learning by motivating both teachers and learners. Additionally, 44 (100%) admitted insufficient budget allocation for effective teaching and learning activities. Furthermore, interviews with WEOs reported the following:

“Headmaster is not in good term curriculum coordination and in turn have caused the divergence between staff members”

Additionally, the WEO added that:

“Some heads of school have moderate capacity to lead and supervise instruction in schools and have not received training before appointments, and some lack knowledge about some subjects taught in secondary schools, which complicates technical skills.”

Again, through open-ended item student questionnaires on the cause of poor school performance, students reported the following:

“Some teachers cause students failure in NECTA exams as when a teacher is/are not knowledgeable on a certain topic he/she leaves it; there are teachers who are not dedicated themselves to teaching and some do not accomplish the syllabus, although the school administration does not care about it”.

Additionally, through the students’ questionnaire, question number one items i-xii (see appendix II) required students to show their agreement or disagreement on how school administration facilitates instructional leadership. The scales range from 1-4 options, namely, 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree and 4=strongly disagree. Table 4.2 presents students’ responses on school administrative practices exercised during instructional leadership at school. Both “strongly agree” and “agree” responses are termed “agree”; likewise, “disagree” and “strongly disagree” are termed “disagree”. It shows frequencies and the corresponding percentages of students who responded to items pertaining to instructional leadership exercise at their school(s)

Table 2: Students’ Responses on school administrative practices in exercising instructional leadership at school

Administrative practices in exercising instructional leadership at school	1		2		3		4	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Teachers follow clearly the classroom teaching timetable	16	09	43	24	102	56	20	11
Teachers gives enough exercise and assignment on the taught lesson	07	04	10	06	140	77	24	13
Teachers gives relevant exercises and assignments on the taught lesson	09	05	172	95	-	-	-	-
Feedback on performance provided timely and corrections are given	20	11	26	14	103	57	32	18
The school has an adequate Teaching and learning material (library, laboratories, equipment and teaching aids in class)	32	18	64	35	85	47	-	-
The school involve students in setting expectation on form four exam and giving reward for better achievements	13	07	42	23	126	70	-	-
There is a good communication relationship between teachers, student and parents on students’ academic issues	10	05	59	33	108	60	04	02
Academic assessment and student progress report/feedback are provided timely	12	07	18	10	150	83	01	0.5

The school have a timetable for monthly test for whole school continuously	02	01	32	18	142	78	05	03
The school have a timetable for monthly test continuously for only National examination candidate classes (form two and four)	176	97	05	03	-	-	-	-
School academic timetable is followed and class journal are filled by teachers properly	19	11	64	35	98	54	-	-
The school have a regularly meeting with students and parents on discussing issues of students' academic achievements	27	15	52	29	102	56	-	-

(Source: Field data 2022)

Table 2 indicates that 122 (67%) students disagreed with teachers clearly following the classroom teaching timetable, and 181 (100%) students agreed that the school has a timetable for continuous monthly testing for only national examination candidate classes (Form two and four).

Again, documentary review sessions in some subjects, primarily in science subjects' class journals, are not filled properly. Even some teachers who teach arts subjects do not properly attend classroom sessions as stipulated in the academic class timetable. The study findings revealed that school heads lack knowledge on instructional leadership in community secondary schools. This concur with Neumerski's (2013) study in the USA, which pointed to inadequate knowledge on school instructional school leadership and the need to understand what scholars do not know about instructional leadership to shape future instructional leadership to address existing shortcomings in schools. This indicates that school heads are not accountable for performing instructional supervision at school, as they fail to supervise curriculum and instruction implementation effectively in terms of classroom teaching timetables.

This finding is in line with Moswela's (2010) study in Botswana, which was conducted to determine how instructional supervision is carried out in schools that identified the hostile and intimidating environment to teachers and recommended instructional supervision to fully benefit schools and the need for rearrangement so that the educators and the head of schools play a more significant and operative role. It must be acknowledged that

the school's primary function is teaching and learning and that of the head of school is to provide instructional leadership (Wambui, 2015). For increased student academic achievement, the head of school should enhance instructional leadership methods.

The effectiveness of instructional leadership determines whether a school's academic performance is successful or unsuccessful in the long run for its students. In a community secondary school, the head of school serves as both the administrative center and the person in control of all operational aspects, whether they are academic or administrative. Additionally, teaching evaluation processes are not properly monitored, as monthly tests should not only focus on national examination candidate classes but should also be applicable to the whole school. It is the role of the head of school to oversee assessment procedures if they reflect the achievement of a school core goal, primarily students' academic achievement in national examination(s). Although it is obvious that the head of school serves in both instructional and administrative capacities, it should be noted that teaching and learning is a school's primary function.

The study was also interested in investigating the extent to which school administration enhances school climate in community secondary schools. Teacher participants were required to show their agreement or disagreement on how the school head tried to enhance the school climate to support teaching and learning improvement at this school. See Table 2.

Table 3: Teachers' responses on school climate enhancement for supporting teaching and learning at school

Enhancement of school climate for supporting teaching and learning at school	1		2		3		4	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
The school has a well-established norms, goals, values that are practiced and articulated by all staff members	05	11	35	80	04	09	-	-

The school has a well-established positive school climate that is ready to take on whatever it takes attitude on work for school achievement	04	09	06	14	32	73	02	05
Managing learners discipline for conducive learning and teaching effectiveness	06	14	32	72	06	14	-	-
The school has a supportive learning environment that is safe, healthy and parent involvement	06	14	08	18	29	66	01	02
Designed system for effective teaching and learning in terms of school timetable, log book, scheme of work preparation, and lesson plan	02	05	36	81	06	14	-	-
At school there is high level of communication and collaboration in the process of teaching and learning as well as students' discipline management	30	68	12	27	02	05	-	-

(Source: Field data 2022)

Table 2 indicates that 40 (91%) teachers agreed that schools have well-established norms, goals, and values that are practiced and articulated by all staff members. Additionally, 38 (86%) teachers agreed that the school manages learners' discipline for conducive learning and teaching effectiveness, and 38 (86%) teachers agreed with the school being designed system for effective teaching and learning in terms of school timetable, log book, scheme of work preparation, and lesson plan.

In contrast, 34 (78%) teachers disagreed on school having a well-established positive school climate that is ready to take on whatever it takes attitude on work for school achievement, and 30 (68%) teachers disagreed on school having a supportive learning environment that is safe, healthy and involves parents.

Again, all academic masters and mistress interviewed pointed to the poor teaching and learning environment in terms of inadequate instructional materials and poor students' health promotion, as one of them pointed out:

“At our school, there is an insufficient library, and laboratory equipment and chemicals, also no hostels. Students walk a long distance from home to school and have no lunch meal at school. These affect students' academic performance at our school.”

On the one hand, this indicates that the administration tried to establish a positive in-classroom learning climate in terms of student discipline management. This implies that they fulfil the teaching role in classroom management. According to Burden's (2020, p.3) theoretical view, classroom management involves teachers' actions to create

a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation. On the other hand, it indicates that the school administration fails to create a school-conducive teaching and learning environment, which results in a hostile working environment for teachers and in turn results in workplace conflicts and teacher demotivation as well as poor parental involvement.

This concurs with Lafaele and Hornby's (2011) study in the United Kingdom, which identified the gap between rhetoric and reality in school matter collaboration at the parent, child, parent-teacher and societal levels, which act as barriers to school performance. It is crucial to provide students with a supportive learning atmosphere that encourages them to enjoy the entire learning process.

5.2 How school administration communicates instructional policies and decisions in community secondary schools

The third objective aimed to determine how school administrations communicate instructional policies and decisions in community secondary schools. Data collection for this objective were posted in teachers' questionnaires, heads of schools, academic masters/mistresses and WEO interviews and documentary analysis guides.

In the teachers' questionnaire, question number five aimed to explore the perception of teachers on how school administration executes instructional and policy decisions and communication procedures. Teachers were required to indicate YES or NO on if the school administration had fairly instructional and policy decision involvement. Table 4 presents the findings from respondents.

Table 4: Teachers' responses on school administration practices on instructional and policy decision involvement and communication

YES		NO	
F	%	F	%
04	09	40	91

(Source: Field data)

The findings in Table 4 indicate that 40 (91%) disagreed that school administration had fairly instructional and policy decision involvement. The communication pattern seemed to exist in many public schools and community schools, inclusively in a top-down communication direction where policies are decided at the central level with exclusivity of implementers (teachers). Additionally, sometimes external pressure contradicts the situation noted by all school heads, as one of them said:

“Sometimes there is a political interference between school administration decision and local government authorities and the ruling political leaders at local level, this brings confusion on policy communication as well as implementations of some decision at community school level”

This was complemented by heads of schools, as one of them said:

“.....as during the launching of free education policy, as school heads were not contacted despite of required to burn all contribution from students. This brought confusion among school

administrators and parents on what cost the parents should incur as a result of the school located in a low-income community suffering school resource problems. This brings hardness in curriculum implementation”.

Another head of school added,

“.....even during the implementation of students' discipline management guideline at school on the administration of corporal punishment of 2022, we as key implementers were not concerted for opinions; rather, it was brought from central. This confuses teachers and parents in managing students' discipline. In real in our schools, policy communication is a problem”.

Again, in the students' questionnaire, questions three and four (closed- and open-ended questions) were posted to determine their agreement or disagreement on the presence of fair procedures on policies and decisions on matters concerning teaching and learning processes and how they communicated to students and parents. Table 5 presents the findings.

Table 5: Students' responses to school administration policies and decision involvement and communication

YES		NO	
F	%	F	%
72	40	109	60

(Source: Field data)

From Table 5, 109 (60%) students revealed that at school, there is no fair procedure for policies and decisions on matters concerning teaching and learning processes and that they are not well communicated to students and parents. Additionally, through open questions, students identified the lack of fair procedures for policy communication, as they pointed out:

“There is no clear understanding of parental involvement in matters concerning their health, especially in

regard to issues of meal provision and supervision for day students. The government and parents are not in good term on food provision after barn of cost contribution at school during the launching of free education policy.”

Additionally, some instructional policies and decisions are not well communicated to students and parents, which was revealed through interviews with WEOs, as one of them pointed out:

“At our school, there is a poor quality of communication on valuable school information. Teachers and many parents left out of the policy making process, which brings confusion in regard to implementation at schools that need parental involvement.”

This indicates poor communication and policy decision involvement in community secondary schools. The study findings revealed poor communication procedures in community secondary schools, where the top-down system dominates the entire communication process and policy decision procedures. This means that teachers do not collaborate during instructional policy decisions. This opposes Ball's (2011) micropolitical theory in school institutions, which rejects a prescriptive 'top down' approach decision and communication that affect organizational control in schools and directly addresses the interest and concerns of teachers and current problems facing schools.

Despite teachers being at the implementation level, the communication network does not encourage them to give opinions. Sometimes school efforts are weakened by external forces/pressures. It depicts poor collaboration between government, teachers and parents in regard to matters affecting students' learning at school. The situation contradicts Schleicher's (2016) study, which examined education policies and practices and identified the importance of involving all stakeholders, especially teachers, in the process of education reform decisions.

This means that there is poor instructional policy decisions and communication in community secondary schools. They are in contrast with Valentine and Prater's (2011) study in the USA on school instruction, management and administration, which advocated the need for school administration in cultivating collaborative decision-making processes as well as effective communication network schools. This affects the efficiency of school administration and curriculum implementation. According to Schneider and Mack (2022), individuals such as school stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process in regard to school-based decisions. Generally, the purpose of school-based decision-making is to empower school employees by giving them the power, autonomy, and resources to address the teaching and learning issues unique to their schools.

VI. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that heads of community secondary schools lack instructional leadership knowledge of performing instructional supervision effectively and fail to create a conducive teaching and learning environment,

which results in a hostile working environment for teachers and in turn results in workplace conflicts and teacher demotivation as well as poor parental involvement. Top-down communication direction dominates instructional policy decisions and is exercised at the central level with exclusivity of implementers (teachers) at the local level.

Additionally, school administrators are challenged by external pressure, and politics influence contradictions in regard to the implementation of educational policies at school, which in turn affect instructional policy decisions and implementation in community secondary schools. These factors affect the efficiency and effectiveness of school administration and curriculum implementation in community secondary schools.

In regard to the study conclusion, the Ministry and policy makers need to restructure the criteria for heads of school appointments based on technical knowledge of educational administration or leadership. Additionally, the communication network should be restated to allow educational stakeholders to collaborate in policy decisions and communication. Furthermore, the ministry should set guidelines to identify the line of authority and communication chain in local government authorities (LGAs) to separate technical and political issues in schools in regard to curriculum implementation. The school community should avoid conflicts and misunderstanding among teachers, teachers and school heads, teachers and parents and build teamwork in curriculum implementation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ball, S.J. (2011). *The micropolitics of the school: Toward a theory of school organization*. United Kingdom. Rout ledge library Edition.
- [2] Burden, P. R. (2020). *Classroom management: Creating a successful K-12 learning community*. United Kingdom. John Wiley & Sons
- [3] Emillio, K,F (2011). *Factors influencing academic performance of students in community and government built secondary schools in Mbeya municipality, Tanzania*. Sokoine Univerity. Tanzania. <http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/363>
- [4] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th Ed.). London. Taylor & Francis Group.
- [5] Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd.
- [6] <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.13518/page/n5/mode/2up?q=elements>
- [7] Jonathan, W.T.Y., Komba,C.K. & Hisza,E.L. (2014). Factors influencing academic performance of ward secondary school: A case of selected school in Moshi municipality and Moshi District , Tanzania. *Educational journal*, 2(1). <https://docplayer.net/93430981>
- [8] Kiety, J. M, Maithya, R. & Mulwa, D.M. (2017). Influence of administrative practices on students' academic Performnce in

- Public secondary schools in Matungulu Sub- County, Kenya. *International Journal of education and Research*, 5(1).
- [9] Kivenule, G. (2015). *School performance: A comparative study between public and private secondary schools in Kinondoni Municipal Council*. Master of science in human resource management. Mzumbe University. <http://scholar.mzumbe.ac.tz>
- [10] Lafaele, R & Hornby, G. (2011). Barriers to parental involvements in education: An explanatory model. *Educational review Journal*. 63(1), 37-52
- [11] Mkalagala, V. (2013). *The poor performance of students in community secondary school in Tanzania: A case of Temeke District* (Master Thesis), Mzumbe University. <http://hdl.handle.net/11192/651>
- [12] Mligo, E. S et al (2018). *Community Secondary Schools in Tanzania: Challenges and Prospects* Kindle Edition. Resource Publications, an Imprint of Wipf and Stock Publishers. Retrieved from <https://www.amazon.com/Community-Secondary-Schools-Tanzania-Challenges-ebook/dp/B079GBC4DS>
- [13] Mosenda, J. (2021, January 17). NECTA names Top 10 schools in 2020, as private schools dominate. Tanzania. *The Citizen Newspaper*, 1. <https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/tanzania/news/necta-names-top-10-schools-in-2020-as-private-schools-dominate-3258170>
- [14] Moswela, B. (2010). Instructional Supervision in Botswana Secondary Schools: An Investigation. *Educational Management administration and Leadership Journal*, 38 (1)
- [15] Mugenda, O.M. & Mugenda, A.G. (2003). *Research Methods, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. ACT, Nairobi.
- [16] Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration, Changing perspectives on the school Journal*, 1, 163-200
- [17] NECTA report. (2022). Explanation on rating school performance quality based on examination GPA. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/lifeofmshaba/status/1485325985805438976>
- [18] Neumarski, C.M. (2013). Rethinking Instructional Leadership, a Review: What Do We Know About Principal, Teacher, and Coach Instructional Leadership, and Where Should We Go From Here? *Educational Administration Journal*, 49 (2).
- [19] Ngambi, G.H (2014). Factors leading to poor academic performance in certificate of secondary education examination for community secondary school in Urambo district, Tanzania. (Master Dissertation). Open university of Tanzania. <http://repository.out.ac.tz>
- [20] Orodho, A. J. (2003). *Essentials of Educational and Social Sciences Research Method*. Nairobi. Masola publishers
- [21] Schleicher, A. (2016). *Teaching Excellence through Professional Learning and Policy Reform: Lessons from around the World*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264252059-en>
- [22] URT. (2004). *Secondary Education Development Plan (SEDP) 2004-2009*. Ministry of education and culture
- [23] URT. (2015a). *Waraka wa Elimu Namba 5 wa Mwaka2015, Kufuta Ada Kwa Elimu Ya Sekondari Kidato Cha Kwanza Mpaka Cha Nne Kwa Shule za Umma na Michango Yote Katika Elimu Msingi*. Dar es Salaam: Wizara ya Elimu, Sayansi na Teknologia, 21 November 2015. (Free education policy wiping direct costs in secondary school from form one to four)
- [24] World Educational Report (2000). *The right to education: Towards education for all throughout life*. UNESCO.