

Linking Instructional Leadership Behaviour to Job Performance of Lecturers at Public Universities

Kofi Nkonkonya Mpuangnan
Department of Curriculum and Instructional Studies, University of Zululand
Evans Ennin Dickson
Department of Educational Leadership, University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development
Samantha Govender
Department of Curriculum and Instructional Studies, University of Zululand

ABSTRACT. The relationship between instructional leadership behaviours and lecturers' job performance is important in higher education. Understanding this relationship can help academic leaders support lecturers and improve teaching, research, and academic development. Therefore, this study determines how instructional leadership behaviour of heads of departments (HoDs) influences lecturers' job performance at the major public universities in Kumasi, Ghana. A cross-sectional survey design was employed to collect data from lecturers in public universities at a single point in time. The sample includes public university lecturers. A stratified random sampling technique was used to select 155 lecturers to provide quantitative data. Data were collected using a questionnaire and analyzed with both descriptive and inferential statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, along with the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The findings indicate that HoDs demonstrate active involvement in setting institutional direction, monitoring instruction, and supporting staff development. However, the findings reveal insufficient mentorship to support lecturers' professional learning and performance. This lack of mentorship

could limit opportunities for developing leadership potential among teachers and supporting their career growth. Lecturers displayed effectiveness in their teaching practices. The statistical results confirmed a significant effect of instructional leadership behaviours on lecture delivery ($F(4,98) = 20.382$, $p < 0.01$). It was recommended that HoDs should communicate departmental goals clearly and ensure that lecturers understand their teaching, assessment, research, and administrative responsibilities. Additionally, the strong positive correlation between the communication of institutional objectives and lecturer effectiveness highlights the need for university goals, teaching expectations, and performance standards to be communicated clearly across departments. Keywords: Instructional leadership, Higher education, Professional development, Teaching effectiveness, effective communication.

INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership plays an important role in improving teaching and learning in higher education. These leaders are university academic staff members who guide lecturers and oversee the implementation of teaching and learning practices. In Ghanaian public universities, their roles are carried out within governance and management structures established by legislation and institutional statutes (University of Ghana Act, 2010, Act 806). The Governing Council provides institutional oversight and guides strategic direction. The Chancellor serves as the ceremonial head, while the Vice-Chancellor provides academic and administrative leadership (University of Ghana Act, 2010, Act 806). Pro-Vice-Chancellors and principal officers, including the Registrar, support institutional management (University of Ghana Act, 2010, Act 806). Provosts, Deans, and Directors manage academic units, while Heads of Department (HoDs) oversee departmental activities and academic programmes (DeWitt, 2020; Mpuangnan & Roboji, 2024). Lecturers undertake teaching, research, student supervision, and community engagement. The Academic Board contributes to academic governance and the regulation of teaching and examinations (University of Ghana Act, 2010, Act 806). Effective instructional leadership therefore requires coordination across management levels, clear communication, accountability, and adequate professional support for lecturers.

These perspectives highlight that successful instructional leadership requires an appropriate management structure and effective implementation of leadership responsibilities to strengthen lecturers' professional practices and teaching performance. In line with this, Ertem (2021) explains that instructional leadership involves setting institutional goals, managing instructional programmes, and creating a positive institutional environment.

In this regard, academic leaders should provide clear direction and establish conditions that support effective teaching and learning. Similarly, McCaffery (2019) emphasises the importance of developing effective instructional processes, suggesting that academic leaders should establish practices that support the delivery and monitoring of teaching activities. Furthermore, Tan et al. (2020) highlight the value of professional relationships, staff development, and institutional goal achievement, indicating that HoDs should strengthen collaboration and build lecturers' professional capabilities. Along these lines, Fullan (2012) highlights the importance of leadership behaviours in managing institutional responsibilities, suggesting that HoDs' actions and decisions shape how departmental responsibilities are carried out. Similarly, Slaven (2020) emphasises the need for a supportive teaching environment and appropriate instructional guidance, meaning that HoDs should provide direction and create conditions that enable lecturers to teach effectively. Kaplan and Owings (2022) highlight mentoring, training, and workshops as ways to strengthen teaching effectiveness, demonstrating the importance of continuous professional development in improving lecturers' instructional practices.

The insight from the above paragraphs indicate that effective instructional leadership requires HoDs to provide clear direction, maintain accountability, create a supportive teaching environment, and strengthen lecturers' professional development to improve teaching quality and job performance. However, Alsaleh (2019) identifies concerns about instructional leadership practices in Ghanaian universities, while Salifu (2023) highlights inadequate feedback, mentoring, and professional support for lecturers. Mpuangnan (2024) further raises concerns about the gap between the instructional support provided by academic leaders and the expectations placed on lecturers. These concerns suggest that lecturers face difficulties maintaining teaching quality without adequate guidance. The study therefore examines HoDs' instructional leadership behaviours and their relationship with lecturers' job performance in Ghanaian public universities. The findings seek to guide leadership development, strengthen professional support, and improve academic performance. The study also contributes to Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) by generating evidence that can support quality teaching, effective educational practices, and improved learning outcomes in higher education.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What instructional leadership behaviours do HoDs in public universities employ to support teaching and learning?

2. How do instructional leadership behaviours influence the effectiveness of lecturers in public universities?

3. What is the relationship between the instructional leadership behaviours of HoDs and the effectiveness of lecturers in public universities?

LITERATURE REVIEW

CONCEPT OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS (ILB)

Instructional leadership emerged in the 1980s through the effective school's movement. It emphasises the importance of leadership in improving educational outcomes and creating supportive teaching and learning environments (Campbell et al., 2019). Instructional leadership refers to the actions and practices of educational leaders aimed at improving instructional quality and supporting educators in fulfilling their professional responsibilities. These practices also include setting clear academic goals, supervising instruction, coordinating curriculum activities, monitoring learner progress, and supporting educators' professional development. Cobonaglu and Yurek (2018) observe that instructional leadership practices include guiding, motivating, and supporting educators to improve their teaching practices. These practices place instructional leadership as an important aspect of educational management that connects institutional objectives with the daily work of educators.

Moreover, instructional leadership behaviours involve several related practices that guide and support teaching and learning. Cansoy and Polatcan (2018) identify key dimensions of instructional leadership which include defining and communicating educational goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, promoting professional development, and providing mentorship to staff. Establishing clear goals helps educators understand institutional expectations and direct their efforts towards shared academic objectives. Supervising and evaluating instruction enables leaders to identify teaching challenges and provide constructive feedback. Professional development opportunities help educators strengthen their knowledge and teaching skills, while mentoring provides individual guidance to address specific professional needs. These practices demonstrate that instructional leadership requires both strategic direction and practical support for educators.

The study of instructional leadership behaviours is important because the practices of academic leaders may influence how lecturers approach their teaching responsibilities and perform their academic duties. In public universities, HoDs are expected to provide academic direction, monitor instructional activities, support professional development, and create conditions that enable lecturers to perform effectively (DeWitt, 2020). Examining these behaviours can help establish which leadership practices are associated with lecturers' job performance. Such evidence is particularly

relevant in Ghanaian public universities, where further investigation is needed into the relationship between instructional leadership and lecturers' teaching, research, student supervision, and other academic responsibilities. The findings may help universities identify areas where academic leadership requires improvement and develop appropriate strategies for strengthening lecturers' performance. Research on instructional leadership behaviours is therefore important for understanding how departmental leadership practices relate to academic performance and for informing leadership development in higher education.

ROLES OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

COMMUNICATE SCHOOL GOALS

Heads of institutions communicate institutional objectives in a variety of ways including the use of faculty and department chair meetings (Cansoy & Polatcan, 2018). Individual meetings, like follow-up conferences and classroom observations, are how they convey them. Lecturers believe that heads are effective instructional leaders when they interact with them in the classroom, are available to discuss instructional issues, encourage them to try new teaching methods by letting them know that taking chances is okay, and clearly convey the school's vision (Law, Tulip, Stringer 2019). The willingness of a lecturer to experiment with different and novel teaching methods is known as classroom innovation (Eggert, Dodderer & Fu kink 2020). Sheppard discovered that the biggest source of variation in classroom innovativeness at the high school level was the heads' communication of the school's objectives. The author found that 57% of the variation in classroom innovativeness could be explained by a combination of professional development, school goal framing, and communication. Sharing school objectives, instructors are encouraged to reflect more may result in them modifying their teaching methods to meeting the various learning requirements of their students (Nordberg, 2019).

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

Supervision plays a crucial role in how HoDs monitor and support instructional practices within educational institutions. According to Jimerson and Quebec-Fuentes (2019), HoDs visit classrooms to make sure lectures complement the educational objectives of the institution. Because of their active participation, they are able to watch teaching methods up close, learning about the lecturers' methods and evaluating their overall efficacy. HoDs gather important data regarding the caliber of instruction through informal visits and classroom observations. This data can be shared with

lecturers to encourage enhancements and guarantee alignment with curriculum goals (Cansoy & Polatcan, 2018). Accordingly, supervision includes all activities that are intended to monitor and improve lecturer performance (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2018). These activities include instructional conferences, classroom observations, and the planning of professional development activities that are intended to improve teaching methods.

Particularly effective are one-on-one instructional conferences, which give HoDs a chance to talk about classroom goals, provide feedback, and experiment with different teaching strategies with lecturers. These gatherings give HoDs the chance to encourage and push instructors to think critically about their methods and come up with fresh ideas. According to Zepeda (2017), lecturers view successful HoDs as those who employ a range of techniques during instructional conferences. These strategies include recommending ways to improve instruction, offering feedback based on observations made in the classroom, exemplifying best practices, employing inquiry to comprehend the viewpoints of lecturers, and aggressively seeking their input. A thoughtful and dynamic learning environment is created by this cooperative approach, which motivates lecturers to use cutting-edge teaching strategies.

PROMOTING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Providing lecturers with the skills and techniques they need to enhance their instruction and adjust to the changing demands of education requires professional development. Giving lecturers access to professional development opportunities is crucial, according to Del Gaizo and Laudermith (2021), since these have a direct impact on the caliber of instruction that students receive. Research has demonstrated that encouraging professional development has a positive impact on teaching quality, making it one of the main ways that school administrators influence classroom instruction (Coady, 2020). According to Friedman and Afitska (2023), school administrators are essential in guaranteeing that instructors have access to worthwhile professional development opportunities. In addition to encouraging lecturers to participate in professional development, school heads facilitate this by planning focused in-service training that is in line with particular learning objectives (World Economic Forum [WEF], 2020). Teachers make sure that professional development is a part of the school environment by cultivating a culture of lifelong learning.

Heads of schools support a variety of growth opportunities in order to make professional development both effective and accessible. In addition to offering lecturers time for independent study and reflection, they use the experience of supervisors and seasoned colleagues to conduct training

sessions on instructional strategies. They also link instructors to outside resources like district-level workshops, college courses, and expert consultants (Walport & Leunig, 2017). Lecturers can investigate novel teaching methods and approaches that are most pertinent to their teaching environments thanks to this range of professional development opportunities. Higher-order instructional strategies are used more frequently when school heads support professional development, especially when lecturers receive specialized training, according to a UNESCO report from 2022. By using these techniques, instructors can help students develop their critical thinking and problem-solving abilities, which enhances classroom experiences and improves learning results.

PROVISION OF MENTORSHIP

In the educational field, mentoring is a structured relationship intended to offer professional advice and support, promoting confidence and growth (Ashburn & Mann, 2017). Mentoring serves as a means for department heads to impart their expertise to instructors, fostering a cooperative learning atmosphere (Hobson & Maxwell, 2020). By assisting lecturers in improving their teaching skills and navigating the challenges of their positions, this interaction gives them more authority.

There are many benefits to mentoring, especially for lecturers just starting out in their careers. According to Frackenpohl, Hillenbrand, and Kube (2016), mentorship frequently boosts lecturers' self-esteem in their professional skills. It enables them to improve their communication skills, take on leadership responsibilities from more seasoned colleagues, grow a sense of community in their new positions, and close the gap between theoretical knowledge and real-world classroom application. This all-encompassing assistance aids instructors in developing the fundamental abilities required for professional success. The transformational power of mentorship is demonstrated by research by Deng, Gulseren, and Turner (2022), which shows that lecturers who receive mentoring from seasoned department heads report gains in their practical knowledge, social integration in their field, and self-confidence. These instructors also have access to a wider professional network, which helps them collaborate with colleagues and offers ongoing support.

In addition to improving professional skills, mentoring has inherent advantages that affect lecturers' motivation and long-term job satisfaction. According to Dasí et al. (2017), mentoring increases motivation, career satisfaction, and access to opportunities for advancement. Lecturers who receive mentoring acquire new viewpoints, problem-solving techniques, and

insightful knowledge about their field. Department heads also have a significant impact on lecturers' assimilation into the teaching profession by fostering their confidence and assisting them in creating supportive networks. Lecturers are better equipped to enhance their teaching methods with frequent, helpful criticism from their mentors, which eventually benefits both their professional growth and the students they instruct.

UNDERSTANDING OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Leadership effectiveness in education concerns the extent to which leaders achieve institutional goals and support effective teaching and learning. Frackenpohl et al. (2016) associate effectiveness with achieving positive outcomes through appropriate actions and processes. In higher education, leadership effectiveness also includes providing academic direction, supporting lecturers' professional development, promoting teaching quality, and creating conditions that enable academic staff to perform their responsibilities effectively (Florian & Camedda, 2020). Therefore, effective academic leaders communicate institutional expectations, encourage professional growth, and provide the support required to achieve academic objectives.

Moreover, Darling-Hammond (2020) observe that leadership effectiveness includes clear communication between instructional leader and students for understanding of complex concepts and course expectations. Effective lecturers explain learning objectives, communicate assessment requirements, and use appropriate teaching methods to address students' learning needs. Hill et al. (2021) also emphasise the importance of encouraging independent learning, establishing clear goals, and adapting instructional approaches to meet different student needs. These practices can support student engagement and academic development. Spooner-Lane (2017) further identifies subject knowledge, enthusiasm, and professional responsibility as important elements of effective teaching. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2022) highlight student engagement, learner-centred approaches, varied instructional methods, and clear explanations as important features of effective instruction. These perspectives suggest that lecturers' effectiveness depends on both their professional capabilities and the conditions within which they perform their academic duties.

Effective instructional leadership also requires appropriate classroom management and the creation of a supportive learning environment. Ma et al. (2023) emphasise the importance of establishing an organised classroom environment and communicating expectations clearly. This suggests that lecturers should plan their lessons, explain course requirements, and

establish clear guidelines for student participation. Such practices help students understand their responsibilities and create an environment that supports effective teaching and learning. Mausolus and Baran (2021) highlight the need for lecturers to anticipate students' needs and plan teaching activities, assessments, and classroom procedures. Careful planning enables lecturers to respond to students' needs and manage their academic responsibilities more effectively. Kraft et al. (2018) similarly emphasise practices that promote participation, mutual respect, and a productive learning environment. A supportive learning environment can strengthen student engagement and improve classroom interactions. These practices also demonstrate the importance of providing lecturers with appropriate institutional support to maintain effective teaching and learning environments.

Existing studies provide useful insights into effective teaching practices. However, university lecturers work within different institutional structures and academic expectations, which requires further examination of teaching effectiveness in higher education. Much of the discussion focuses on lecturers' teaching competencies, classroom practices, and student engagement. These aspects provide limited understanding of how the leadership practices of HoDs relate to lecturers' performance in teaching, research, postgraduate supervision, and academic service. University lecturers also operate within institutional environments where academic autonomy, research expectations, administrative responsibilities, and professional development influence their work. It is therefore important to investigate leadership effectiveness within this specific context rather than assume that findings from school-based studies apply directly to universities.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS AND LECTURERS' EFFECTIVENESS

Instructional leadership behaviours play an important role in supporting lecturers' effectiveness by providing academic guidance, professional development, and instructional support. Balwant (2017) highlights the value of instructional leaders participating in curriculum-related seminars and workshops with lecturers. Such participation can help academic leaders understand instructional challenges and support lecturers in improving their teaching practices. When HoDs engage in professional development activities, they can also create opportunities for sharing knowledge, discussing curriculum concerns, and identifying appropriate approaches to improving instructional delivery. Bush (2017) highlights the influence of departmental leadership practices on lecturers' professional behaviour and instructional effectiveness. This suggests that the guidance and support provided by HoDs may shape how lecturers approach their teaching responsibilities. Similarly,

Dopson et al. (2019) emphasise the contribution of instructional leadership to creating a supportive learning environment. Collaboration among academic leaders, lecturers, students, and relevant stakeholders can help identify teaching challenges and develop strategies to improve learning. These practices indicate that instructional leadership involves more than supervising academic activities; it also requires leaders to establish conditions that support effective teaching and learning.

Ersozlu and Saklan (2016) associate strong instructional leadership behaviours with improved lecturer effectiveness and participation in institutional initiatives, including school-based assessment. This suggests that instructional leadership encourages lecturers to participate actively in academic programmes and fulfil their instructional responsibilities. According to McCaffery (2019), there is a positive relationship between leadership practices and lecturers' commitment to teaching and assessment. Such findings highlight the importance of academic leaders providing clear expectations, constructive feedback, and appropriate professional support. DeWitt (2020) further connects effective instructional leadership with classroom teaching quality and student achievement. These contributions suggest that instructional leadership supports lecturers' effectiveness by strengthening their professional commitment and improving the conditions in which teaching takes place.

Alsaleh (2019) also highlights the influence of instructional leadership on lecturers' teaching practices and students' learning experiences. Similarly, Cobanoglu and Yurek (2018) associate instructional leadership practices with lecturers' teaching effectiveness and the quality of student learning. These findings reinforce the importance of academic leaders in supporting instructional improvement. However, the relationship between instructional leadership and lecturers' effectiveness should not be assumed to be the same across all educational contexts. Differences in institutional structures, academic responsibilities, available resources, and leadership practices may influence how lecturers experience and respond to instructional support.

Nevertheless, in this study the authors explore evidence to understand how lecturers perceive the instructional support provided by HoDs and how these perceptions relate to their professional performance. Investigating this relationship can help identify effective leadership practices and areas requiring improvement. The findings can inform leadership development programmes and guide universities in strengthening departmental support for lecturers.

METHODOLOGY

To answer the research questions, this study used a cross-sectional survey design. This quantitative research design was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to collect data from lecturers in public universities at a single point in time. The design also facilitated statistical analysis to identify patterns, relationships, and variations in respondents' perceptions of instructional leadership behaviours and lecturers' job performance.

The study targeted lecturers in public universities in Kumasi, Ghana. A sample of 155 lecturers was selected from two major public universities using a stratified random sampling technique. This technique was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to divide the population into distinct subgroups and select participants from each group, thereby improving representation across the relevant academic disciplines (Creswell, 2018). The population was divided into strata based on faculties, including Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET), Education, Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities. A random selection of lecturers from each faculty was intended to ensure that the different academic areas were represented in the study. The sampling approach was suitable for examining lecturers' perceptions of the instructional leadership behaviours of HoDs and their relationship with lecturers' job performance.

The study used a questionnaire with close-ended items to collect data from the lecturers. The questionnaire was designed to gather information on the instructional leadership behaviours of HoDs, lecturers' job performance, and the relationship between these variables. A Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree was used to measure respondents' views on the questionnaire items. Questionnaire was considered suitable because it enabled the researchers to collect standardised data from a relatively large number of respondents and allowed participants sufficient time to consider their answers (Flick, 2018).

A pilot study was conducted at a university that was not included in the main study to assess the questionnaire's validity and reliability. The initial Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.71, indicating acceptable internal consistency. However, some items recorded reliability values of 0.40, which fell below the expected threshold. These items were reviewed, revised, and retested. The revised instrument achieved a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.73, indicating an improvement in internal consistency and an acceptable level of reliability for the study, consistent with the reliability standards discussed by Moon et al. (2018).

The collected data were coded, organised, and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequencies and percentages were used to summarise

respondents' demographic characteristics and describe response patterns. Pearson's correlation coefficient was applied to examine the direction and strength of the relationship between instructional leadership behaviours and lecturers' job performance. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the extent to which instructional leadership behaviours were associated with lecturers' job performance. These statistical techniques enabled the researcher to examine the study variables and address the research questions.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

This section presents the demographic characteristics of respondents. These include; gender, age, educational qualification, and years of experience.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Categories	Responses	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	86	83.5
	Female	17	16.5
Educational qualification	Masters degree	45	43.7
	PhD	58	56.3
Years of lecturing at the current institution	1-5years	10	9.7
	6-10years	92	89.3
	11years and above	1	1.0

The data in Table 1 reveals a gender distribution among university lecturers, showing that a significant majority (83.5%) are male, while only 16.5% are female. This indicates that male lecturers overwhelmingly outnumber their female counterparts in this study's sample. In terms of academic qualifications, more than half (56.3%) of the lecturers hold a Ph.D., while 43.7% have a master's degree. This trend suggests that doctorate holders form the majority at the university level, likely due to a policy in public tertiary institutions requiring lecturers to have a PhD to qualify for teaching roles. Looking at years of experience in their current institution, a small percentage (9.7%) of lecturers have been teaching for 1-5 years, while a substantial 89.3% have been in their roles for 6-10 years. Notably, only one lecturer (1%) has worked for over 11 years. This distribution indicates that most lecturers have between 6-10 years of experience, suggesting that they bring substantial experience to their roles. Their extended tenure at the

institution likely provides them with a deep understanding of instructional leadership practices within the university.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS EMPLOYED BY HODS

To evaluate the instructional leadership behaviours practised by HoDs, responses were gathered across four main instructional leadership behaviour scales. These scales included communication of school goals, supervision of instruction, promotion of professional development, and provision of mentorship. The total responses from each scale were analyzed and means and standard deviations were calculated. Table 2 presents the findings.

Table 2: Responses on Instructional Leadership Behaviour employed

Variables	N	Mean Score	Std. Dev.
Communicate goals	103	3.24	.348
Supervised instruction	103	3.21	.412
Promoting professional Development	103	3.09	.424
Provision of mentorship	103	1.72	.463
Grand mean	103	2.82	.412

The findings presented in Table 2 reveal that heads of departments are rated highly in their ability to communicate school goals, which received the highest mean score of 3.24, with a standard deviation of .348. This suggests that setting and sharing school goals is a well-established practice among department heads. Supervision of instruction also ranked prominently, with a mean score of 3.21 and a standard deviation of .412, indicating that overseeing classroom instruction is another key focus. Promotion of professional development follows closely with a mean score of 3.09 and a standard deviation of .463, reflecting an emphasis on providing growth opportunities for lecturers. However, mentorship received the lowest rating, with a mean score of only 1.72 and a standard deviation of .463. This low rating for mentorship highlights that HoDs rarely engage in mentoring practices, potentially hindering the professional growth and performance of lecturers and affecting their ability to meet teaching expectations. With an overall average mean score of 2.82, the results suggest limited instructional leadership support from department heads. However, it can be concluded that while communicating school goals, supervising instruction, and promoting professional development are prioritized by heads, there is a noticeable gap in mentorship practices. These findings indicate that while certain aspects of instructional leadership are actively practised, the absence of mentorship

may be an area in need of significant improvement to fully support lecturers' effectiveness in public universities.

EFFECTIVENESS OF LECTURERS IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

In addressing the effectiveness of lecturers to ensure the realisation of university goals, were elicited from respondents and analysed. Means and standard deviation were computed from the responses. Results are provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Lecturers Effectiveness

Lecturers Effectiveness	N	Means	Std. dev.
Subject matter competency	103	3.14	0.812
Use effective instructional strategies	103	3.12	1.322
Communicate effectively with students	103	3.11	1.521
Set high goals for lecturing	103	3.13	1.312
Use strategies to help students become self-motivated	103	3.12	1.521
Share ideas with experienced lecturers	103	3.10	1.122
Grand mean	103	3.12	1.268

Table 3 shows the assessment of lecturer effectiveness in public universities reveals significant strengths across various domains. One notable area of excellence is their expertise in subject matter, which achieved a mean score of 3.14 (SD = 0.812). This high level of proficiency ensures that lecturers deliver content with accuracy and depth, contributing positively to learners' understanding and academic success. Additionally, lecturers demonstrate effective instructional strategies, as reflected by a mean score of 3.12 (SD = 1.322). This shows a dedication to using a variety of instructional strategies that meet the needs of the students and improve understanding and participation in the classroom. Another strength is effective communication with students, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.11 (SD = 1.521). The ability of lecturers to effectively communicate concepts and address students' questions creates a helpful and engaging learning environment, both of which are essential for students' success. With a mean score of 3.13 (SD = 1.312), lecturers also demonstrate a strong commitment to establishing high instructional standards. Their commitment to goal-setting propels their professional growth and synchronizes their instructional strategies with the institution's more general academic goals. Furthermore, with a mean score of 3.12 (SD = 1.521), lecturers actively support student autonomy by implementing strategies that support self-directed learning. This method

fosters critical thinking and self-reliance in students, giving them the tools they need to succeed academically and pursue lifelong learning.

Furthermore, a mean score of 3.10 (SD = 1.122) for exchanging ideas with more seasoned colleagues indicates that lecturers work well together. By exchanging ideas and tactics, the institution's teaching quality is improved and a supportive professional community is created. With an average mean score of 3.12 across these indicators, lecturers in public universities demonstrate effectiveness in their roles. This collective effectiveness not only supports students' educational experiences but also contributes to achieving the broader goals of the universities.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS AND LECTURERS 'EFFECTIVENESS

Correlation Analysis

A correlation analysis of the four instructional leadership behaviours was conducted to find out whether significant influence on lecturers' effectiveness. Table 4 presents the results.

Table 4: Pearson Correlation analysis

S/n	Construct	1	2	3	4	5
1	Lecturer Effectiveness	1				
2	Communicate goals	.537*	1			
3	Supervised instruction	.348*	.130	1		
4	Promoting professional development	.552*	.432*	.353**	1	
5	Provision of Mentorship	-.107	.019	-.149	.043	1

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed testing).

As shown in Table 4, effectiveness and communication school goals correlated significantly. The correlation coefficient was .537. The significant level of .000 was lower than the alpha level 05 (.537, P ≤ .01). The finding revealed a statistically significant, high, and positive relationship between effectiveness and communication of school goals. Again, a statistically significant and positive association was found between lecturers' effectiveness and supervised instruction. The relationship was significant at .000, which was less than the .05 alpha level. The correlation coefficient of .348 indicated a moderate relationship (.348, P ≤ .01). Also, Table 4 indicated a high, positive and significant association between lecturers' effectiveness and promoting professional development by heads. The correlation coefficient was. 552. The significant level of .000 was lower than the .05 alpha level therefore, the

relationship was statistically significant (.552, P ≤.01). However, there was a negative relationship between lecturers' effectiveness and the provision of mentorship with a low correlation coefficient of -107. The relationship was found to be insignificant at a .282 significant level, which was more than the alpha level of .05 (-107, P ≥ .05). This means that there was no relationship between the provision of mentorship and lecturers 'effectiveness.

Regression Analyses

Regression analyses were conducted to find out the extent of the relationship between instructional leadership behaviours and lecturers 'effectiveness. As to how much of the variance in overall instructional leadership behaviours is explained by the scores on each of the independent variables, the multiple regression equation was performed. Both dependent and independent variables were put into the equation. The results are presented in Table 5 to Table 7.

Table 5: Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change			Sig. F
1	.674	.454	.432	.632	.454	20.382			.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Provision of Mentorship, communication school goal, Supervised instruction, Promoting professional development

b. Dependent variable: Effectiveness

From Table 5, in the model summary, R^2 was .454. The F change was 20.382, adjusted R^2 was .432 and a significance level of .000 showed that the model was significant. The R^2 of .454 means that 45.4% of the variance in lecturers' effectiveness is accounted for by instructional leadership behaviour. A unit change in the independent variables will improve the use of instructional leadership practice by an average of 45.4%. ANOVA test on instructional leadership behaviours variables was further analysed. Details are provided in Table 6.

Table 6: ANOVA Results of Leadership Behaviours and Effectiveness

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	32.574	4	8.143	20.382	.000b
	Residual	39.154	98	.400		
	Total	71.728	102			
Dependent Variable: Effectiveness						

Predictors: (Constant), Provision of Mentorship, communication of school goals, Supervised instruction, Promoting professional development

Table 6 presents the output from the ANOVA test showed that the value of 'F' statistics was 20.382 and the degree of freedom had 98 groups. The significance value was .000 which was above below .01. The test showed that the model was significant at .01 (F (4,98) = 20.382, P≤ .01). It could be concluded that instructional leadership behaviours have an influence on the effectiveness of lecturers. Table 5 presents the results on coefficients. The findings are shown below in Table 7.

Table 7: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	Constant (Y)	.326	.433		.753	.453
	Communicate school goals (X1)	.491	.109	.372	4.488	.000
	Supervised instruction (X2)	.162	.079	.166	2.042	.044
	Promoting professional development (X3)	.314	.082	.337	3.823	.000
	Provision of Mentorship (X4)	-.087	.063	-.104	-1.369	.174

P <. 01, P < .05

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

b. Predictors: (Constant), Provision of Mentorship, communication of university goals, Supervised instruction, Promoting professional development

The Predictors in Table 7 were determined by using multiple regression analysis with significance levels of .000, .044, .000. It is evident that only the coefficient of communicating school goals (β=.491), supervised instruction (β=.162), promoting professional development (β=.314), are significant. However, the coefficient value of the provision of mentorship (β=-.087) was an insignificant contribution to the prediction. This means that when all predictors were considered only three were found to contribute significantly to the regression equation.

DISCUSSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine how instructional leadership behaviours of HoDs influence job performance of lecturers at selected public

universities in Ghana. The findings indicate that while HoDs prioritize certain leadership functions such as communicating school goals, supervising instruction, and promoting professional development there is a distinct lack of mentorship. These results justify the assertion made by Cansoy and Polatcan's (2018) that instructional leadership behaviours cover a variety of aspects that are essential to creating a successful learning environment. Since mentorship is crucial for promoting professional development, the mentorship gap in the study indicates an area that needs to be improved in order to increase lecturers' effectiveness. Nonetheless, public university lecturers are remarkably effective in their teaching positions. Their contributions greatly enhance students' educational experiences and advance the institutions' main objectives. The observation agrees with Hill et al. (2021), who emphasise the importance of continuous knowledge development and the improvement of teaching strategies among university lecturers. Additionally, the results support the viewpoint of Spooner-Lane (2017), who observes that instructors foster an environment of mutual respect and encouragement while giving each student's academic progress top priority.

The findings indicate that instructional leadership behaviours demonstrated by HoDs are significantly associated with lecturers' effectiveness. This suggests that the guidance, supervision, feedback, and professional support provided by departmental leaders may help lecturers fulfil their academic responsibilities more effectively. The findings are consistent with Bush (2017) and Ersozlu and Saklan (2016), who emphasise the importance of leadership practices in shaping educators' professional behaviour and instructional effectiveness. These studies support the view that academic leaders have an important role in creating conditions that enable lecturers to improve their teaching practices and achieve institutional goals. Dopson et al. (2019) further support the importance of instructional leadership by highlighting the contribution of leaders' active involvement to a supportive teaching and learning environment. Similarly, McCaffery (2019) associates effective leadership practices with lecturers' commitment to their teaching and assessment responsibilities. Evidence from Namutebi (2019), found that instructional leadership was a positive and significant predictor of lecturers' job performance, particularly through the provision of instructional resources, supervision, and monitoring. Nelly et al. (2024), however, found that the direct effect of transformational leadership on lecturer performance was not statistically significant, suggesting that leadership may improve performance indirectly by strengthening lecturers' competencies.

This difference indicates that the relationship between leadership and lecturer effectiveness depend on the leadership approach and the

mechanisms through which it operates. A different perspective is presented by Mpuangnan et al. (2024), whose findings highlight the importance of participative leadership, employee motivation, and job satisfaction in explaining employee performance in public universities. This suggests that leadership contribute to improved performance through job satisfaction rather than through leadership practices alone. Additionally, Mpuangnan (2026) found that servant leadership did not directly influence work engagement, while job satisfaction played a mediating role in the relationship between servant leadership and selected employee outcomes. These findings offer a different perspective from the present study because they emphasise employee well-being, job satisfaction, and the organisational environment rather than instructional leadership. The difference suggests that lecturers' effectiveness depends on a combination of leadership behaviours and workplace conditions. Therefore, university leaders should not only provide instructional guidance and supervision but also promote job satisfaction, supportive working relationships, and a conducive academic environment.

The findings indicate a strong positive correlation between lecturer effectiveness and the clear communication of institutional objectives. This suggests that lecturers perform more effectively when Heads of Department communicate institutional goals and expectations clearly. The finding supports Cansoy (2019) who argue that effective leadership behaviours can improve educators' job satisfaction and performance. A moderate positive relationship was also found between lecturer effectiveness and instructional supervision. This finding is consistent with Ross and Cozzens (2016), who emphasise the importance of instructional leadership in creating a supportive environment for educators. Regular supervision and constructive feedback help lecturers identify areas for improvement and strengthen their teaching practices.

The strong positive correlation between professional development programmes and lecturer effectiveness highlights the importance of continuous staff development. This finding supports Kilag and Sasan's (2023) view that professional development is a key component of instructional leadership. Opportunities for professional learning help lecturers improve their knowledge, teaching skills, and professional competence. However, the study found a weak negative correlation between lecturer effectiveness and the availability of mentorship. This finding differs from Black's (2015) argument that mentoring plays an important role in effective leadership in higher education. The result suggests that the availability of mentorship alone is not sufficient to enhance lecturer effectiveness. The quality, relevance, and implementation of mentoring may also matter. As McCaffery (2018) highlights, effective leadership in higher education requires coordinated

support for academic staff. Mentorship can therefore be more beneficial when combined with clear institutional objectives, effective instructional supervision, and relevant professional development opportunities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

i. Heads of Departments should communicate departmental goals clearly and ensure that lecturers understand their teaching, assessment, research, and administrative responsibilities.

ii. The strong positive correlation between the communication of institutional objectives and lecturer effectiveness highlights the need for university goals, teaching expectations, and performance standards to be communicated clearly across departments.

iii. universities should introduce structured mentorship programmes that support lecturers' professional growth, particularly where mentorship is limited or ineffective. These programmes should have clear objectives, suitable mentors, and regular assessments to determine whether they meet lecturers' needs.

iv. Mentorship should be based on lecturers' professional needs, with clear expectations, suitable mentor–mentee relationships, and regular monitoring.

v. Students should actively participate in improving the quality of teaching and learning by providing constructive feedback on lecturers' teaching methods, communication, assessment practices, and academic support. Student feedback should be respectful, evidence-based, and directed towards improving learning experiences.

vi. Future researchers should investigate the relationship between instructional leadership behaviours and lecturer job performance in a wider range of public universities in Ghana. Studies involving larger and more diverse samples may help establish whether the findings apply across different institutions, faculties, and academic disciplines.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge all the participants for dedicating their valuable time to providing the data used in this study. We also express our sincere gratitude to the experts who generously devoted their time to validating the research instruments, thereby ensuring their suitability for data collection

Limitation

The study found a weak negative correlation between lecturer effectiveness and the availability of mentorship. This result requires careful interpretation because the correlation does not establish that mentorship reduces lecturer effectiveness. The study may not have captured the quality, frequency,

relevance, or implementation of mentoring practices. Further research is needed to understand the factors that may explain this relationship.

CONCLUSIONS

The study examined the relationship between HoDs instructional leadership behaviours and lecturers' job performance at selected public universities in Ghana. The findings show strong positive correlations between lecturer effectiveness and the clear communication of institutional objectives and professional development programmes. Instructional supervision also showed a moderate positive relationship with lecturer effectiveness. These findings highlight the importance of clear goals, constructive supervision, and continuous professional development in supporting lecturers' academic responsibilities. However, the study identified a weak negative correlation between mentorship and lecturer effectiveness.

This finding highlights the need to examine the quality, relevance, and implementation of mentoring programmes rather than assume that mentorship negatively affects lecturer performance. The findings suggest that effective instructional leadership requires a combination of clear communication, appropriate supervision, relevant professional development, and effective academic support. The findings can guide university management in developing policies and leadership practices that strengthen communication, instructional supervision, professional development, and mentorship to improve teaching and learning.

The Ethical Committee Approval

The Ethical Committee of the University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Ghana has granted approval for this study on 8th June 2022 (Ref. No: AAMUSTED05).

REFERENCES

Alsaleh, A. (2019). Investigating instructional leadership in Kuwait's educational reform context: School leaders' perspectives. School Leadership & Management, 96–120.

Balwant, P. T. (2018). The meaning of student engagement and disengagement in the classroom context: Lessons from organisational behaviour. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 42, 1–13.

Black, S. A. (2015). Qualities of effective leadership in higher education. Open Journal of Leadership, 4(2), 54.

Bush, T. (2018). Leadership and context: Why one size does not fit all. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46(1), 3–4.

Campbell, P., Chaseling, M., Boyd, W., & Shipway, B. (2019). The effective instructional leader. Professional Development in Education, 276–290.

Cansoy, R. (2019). The relationship between school principals' leadership behaviours and teachers' job satisfaction: A systematic review. International Education Studies, 12(1), 37–52.

Cansoy, R., & Polatcan, M. (2018). Examination of instructional leadership research in Turkey. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 10(1), 276–291.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Coady, M. (2020). Continuing professional education. In T. S. Rocco, M. C. Smith, R. C. Mizzi, L. R. Merriweather, & J. D. Hawley (Eds.), The handbook of adult and continuing education (pp. 257–265). Stylus Publishing.

Dasí, À., Pedersen, T., Gooderham, P. N., Elter, F., & Hildrum, J. (2017). The effect of organizational separation on individuals' knowledge sharing in MNCs. Journal of World Business, 52(3), 431–446.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2020). Accountability in teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 60–71.

DeWitt, P. M. (2020). Instructional leadership: Creating practice out of theory. Corwin.

Deng, C., Gulseren, D., & Turner, N. (2022). How to match mentors and protégés for successful mentorship programs: A review of the evidence and recommendations for practitioners. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 43(3), 386–403.

Del Gaizo, E., & Laudermith, A. (2021). Professionals as lifelong learners. In M. London (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of lifelong learning (pp. 367–388). Oxford University Press.

Dopson, S., Ferlie, E., McGivern, G., Fischer, M. D., Mitra, M., Ledger, J., & Behrens, S. (2019). Leadership development in higher education: A literature review and implications for programme redesign. Higher Education Quarterly, 73(2), 218–234.

Egert, F., Dederer, V., & Fukkink, R. G. (2020). The impact of in-service professional development on the quality of teacher–child interactions in early education and care: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 29, Article 100309.

Ersozlu, A., & Saklan, E. (2016). Instructional leadership in higher education: How does it work? British Journal of Education, 4(5), 1–15.

Ertem, H. Y. (2021). Relationship of school leadership with school outcomes: A meta-analysis study. International Education Studies, 14(5), 31–41.

Flick, U. (2018). Triangulation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Frackenpohl, G., Hillenbrand, A., & Kube, S. (2016). Leadership effectiveness and institutional frames. Experimental Economics, 19(4), 842–863.

Friedman, A. L., & Afitska, N. (2023). Professional bodies. Journal of Professions and Organization, 10, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/joad001

Florian, L., & Camedda, D. (2020). Enhancing teacher education for inclusion. European Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 4–8.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2018). Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach (10th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Hill, H., Mancenido, Z., & Loeb, S. (2021). Effectiveness research for teacher education (EdWorkingPaper No. 21-252). Annenberg Institute at Brown University.

Hobson, A. J., & Maxwell, B. (2020). Mentoring substructures and superstructures: An extension and reconceptualization of the architecture for teacher mentoring. Journal of Education for Teaching, 46(2), 184–206.

Hompashe, D. M. (2024). Does instructional leadership drive educational improvement in South Africa? Evidence from Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition analysis. Development Southern Africa, 41(2), 404–426. https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2024.2309455

Jimerson, J., & Quebec-Fuentes, S. (2019). Instructional leadership in the content areas: Case studies for leading curriculum and instruction. UCEA and Routledge.

Juanjuan, G., & Mohd Yusoff, N. (2022). The shared features of effective improvement programmes for teachers' assessment literacy. Pedagogies: An International Journal, 1–18.

Kilag, O. K. T., & Sasan, J. M. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. Advanced Qualitative Research, 1(1), 63–73.

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. Review of Educational Research, 88, 547–588.

Lai, Q., Alias, B. S., & Hamid, A. H. A. (2025). The effect of instructional leadership on job satisfaction and burnout in English lecturers: The mediating role of self-efficacy. SAGE Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251400980

Law, J., Tulip, J., & Stringer, H. (2019). Teachers observing classroom communication: An application of the communicating supporting classroom observation tool for children aged 4–7 years. Child Language Teaching and Therapy, 35(3), 203–220.

Ma, K., Zhang, J., Chutiyami, M., Liang, L., & Dong, J. (2023). Effectiveness of blended teaching in preservice teacher education: A meta-analysis. Distance Education, 44, 495–521.

McCaffery, P. (2018). The higher education manager's handbook: Effective leadership and management in universities and colleges. Routledge.

McCaffery, P. (2019). The higher education manager's handbook: Effective leadership and management in universities and colleges (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Mesutoglu, C., & Baran, E. (2021). Integration of engineering into K–12 education: A systematic review of teacher professional development programs. Research in Science & Technological Education, 39, 328–346.

Mpuangnan, K. N. (2024). Teacher preparedness and professional development needs for successful technology integration in teacher education. Cogent Education, 11(1), Article 2408837.

Mpuangnan, K. N. (2026). Influence of servant leadership on organisational commitment, work engagement and job performance in teacher education. Cogent Education, 13(1), Article 2640676.

Mpuangnan, K. N., Govender, S., Mhlongo, H. R., & Osei, F. S. (2024). Impact of motivation and participative leadership style on employee performance: Mediating the role of job satisfaction. International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies, 7(3), 1088–1098.

Mpuangnan, K. N., & Roboji, Z. (2024). Transforming educational leadership in higher education with innovative administrative strategies. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, 5(2), 27–56. https://doi.org/10.53378/353054

Namutebi, E. (2019). Instructional leadership and lecturers' job performance in public universities in Uganda. Makerere Journal of Higher Education.

Nelly, N., Prabowo, H., Bandur, A., & Elidjen, E. (2024). The mediating role of competency in the effect of transformational leadership on lecturer performance. International Journal of Educational Management, 38(2), 333–354. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-06-2023-0275

Nordberg, A. (2019). Support of language and communication in the "tambour situation" in Swedish preschools. Early Child Development and Care, 191(5), 699–712.

Ross, D. J., & Cozzens, J. A. (2016). The principalship: Essential core competencies for instructional leadership and its impact on school climate. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4(9), 162–176.

Sabeng, D. A., & Mensah, J. V. (2023). Job satisfaction and characteristics among staff of public higher educational institutions in Ghana. Cogent Education, 10(2), Article 2226457. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2226457

Salifu, I. (2023). Leading, but are there followers? Exploring the influence of heads of departments on staff and students in Ghanaian higher education institutions. Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 22(2), 349–366.

Slavin, R. E. (2020). Educational psychology: Theory and practice (12th ed.). Pearson.

Spooner-Lane, R. (2017). Mentoring beginning teachers in primary schools: Research review. Professional Development in Education, 43(2), 253–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2016.1148624

Tamhane, A. R., Westfall, A. O., Burkholder, G. A., & Cutter, G. R. (2016). Prevalence odds ratio versus prevalence ratio: Choice comes with consequences. Statistics in Medicine, 35(30), 5730–5735.

Tan, C. Y., Gao, L., & Shi, M. (2020). Second-order meta-analysis synthesizing the evidence on associations between school leadership and different school outcomes. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 1–22.

UNESCO. (2022). 5th global report on adult learning and education: Citizenship education: Empowering adults for change. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

University of Ghana. (2010). University of Ghana Act, 2010 (Act 806). https://www.ug.edu.gh/pad/sites/pad/files/2025-

Wang, X., & Cheng, Z. (2020). Cross-sectional studies: Strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. Chest, 158(1), S65–S71.

Walport, M., & Leunig, T. (2017). Future of skills and lifelong learning. Government Office for Science.

World Economic Forum. (2020). Schools of the future: Defining new models of education for the fourth industrial revolution. World Economic Forum.

Zepeda, S. (2017). Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts (4th ed.). Eye on Education.

Zhang, J., Zhou, M., & Zhang, X. (2022). Interventions to promote teachers' perceptions about STEM education: A meta-analysis. Education and Information Technologies, 28, 7355–7390.