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Abstract. In ensuring that TVET colleges achieve their mandate of academic excellence, the role of leaders as instructional leaders becomes critical and relevant. This study explores challenges experienced in implementing instructional leadership practices within selected TVET colleges of South Africa. In addressing this objective, a qualitative approach was employed. About three campus managers, six heads of departments and six lecturers participated in the study. These participants were drawn from four colleges that were purposively sampled. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, focusing on practices of instructional leadership by campus managers and challenges experienced thereof. The collected data were analysed, using thematic analytical approach. This was to identify and categorise participants’ responses from interviews and generated key themes were then interpreted. Results showed that externally, campus managers faced challenges related to lack of time, work overload and lack of rewards or incentives. Internally, campus managers had limited skills and knowledge on instructional leadership. The study, therefore, recommended that campus managers be trained on instructional leadership and develop a culture of delegating mainly administrative duties than instructional duties to their immediate subordinates. This would allow campus managers to have more time to monitor teaching and learning as part of their instructional leadership practices.
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1. Introduction
Historically, technical or vocational education had formed an important aspect of the economy of the country from as early as the 1920s (Hlatjwayo, Yalezo & Mutambara, 2022; Smit & Bester, 2022). Hlatjwayo et al. (2022) and Smit and Bester (2022) further note that the aim of the technical or vocational education was to provide theoretical learning alongside with practical training. This means that
learners would be able to integrate theory learned in class, with practice. The
significance of technical or vocational education led to the establishment of
Further Education and Training (FET) colleges in South Africa, which offered
technical or vocational education formally (Nkau, 2020; Delubom, Marongwe &
Buka, 2020). However, Ajayi (2021) and Nkau (2020) argue that these FET colleges
had negative images under apartheid regime, being characterised by numerous
factors, such as unequal access to learning opportunities based on race, unequal
allocation of funds between white institutions, described as state-aided and black
institutions that were regarded as state colleges. According to Ajayi (2021) and
Sithole, Wissink and Chiwawa (2022), 1997 saw the rebirth of FET colleges that
were aimed at redressing the past negative images. These FET colleges were later
renamed Technical, Vocational Education and Training (TVET) colleges in 2015.
The main aim of these TVET colleges was to provide young school leavers with
skills, knowledge and attitude aimed at preparing them for the workplace and
employment or job markets (Ajayi, 2021). This would then benefit the country, as
it would respond by improving learner development and progress to meet human
resource needs and further promotion of personal, civic and socio-economic
development in the country (Ajayi, 2021; Sithole et al., 2022).

According to Nkau (2020) and Sithole et al. (2022), the shift and new
organisational arrangement in TVET colleges resulted in new leadership roles and
responsibilities for managers. Nkau (2020) further argues that leadership and
management were compromised, and this had a negative impact in the
performance of TVET colleges. Additionally, Ajayi (2021) in his study on campus
managers’ leadership, revealed that campus managers who could not practise
instructional leadership in their campuses experienced poor performance and
their instructional leadership was not clearly defined. According to Maseko (2022)
and Norbu and Lhabu (2021), instructional leadership is a TVET colleges’
leadership, in which campus managers collaborate with lecturers in providing
support and guidance to develop teaching practices that are best. In instructional
leadership, campus managers should be able to develop effective communication
skills to work together with their staff in setting clear goals for students’ academic
performance (Maseko, 2022). When campus managers as instructional leaders,
focus their influence on the learning, better relationships with lecturers in the
teaching and learning process, students’ academic performance is likely to be
influenced positively.

Coupled with the above, Ajayi (2021) and Mathobela (2023) note that the use
of instructional leadership can play a significant role in raising the standard of
teaching and learning. Therefore, campus managers as leaders are a significant
figure in TVET colleges’ campus leadership, especially in encouraging
collaborations that are focused on students’ learning. Several studies on
instructional leadership in South African TVET colleges revealed that there is still
a compromise of effective instructional leadership in Technical, Vocational
Education and Training colleges. This has a negative impact on TVET colleges’
students’ academic performance. Moreover, a study by Ojera, Simatwa and Ndolo
(2021) on instructional leadership, showed that principals or campus managers as
instructional leaders, play a huge role in enhancing effective teaching and
learning. However, several studies examined the role of principals as instructional leaders in various types of schools such as secondary and primary categorised schools, but very little in TVET colleges, especially on roles of campus managers as instructional leaders. Moreover, studies which explored challenges and obstacles faced by TVET colleges’ campus managers in implementing instructional leadership are considered under-researched or received little attention in the context of the South African educational system.

**Study objectives**

Based on the afore-mentioned issues in the introductory section of the study, it can be concluded that more intensive research needs to be done and recommendations be outlined on campus managers ‘instructional leadership. This could assist policy makers and experts when developing laws that are intended to address instructional leadership and how campus managers can best play instructional leadership roles in TVET colleges. This is but one of the studies in the study area, which will add knowledge in the literature, considering that there were no prior research findings on challenges that campus managers face, when practising instructional leadership in studied TVET colleges. Therefore, this study sought to explore the barriers and challenges faced by TVET colleges’ campus managers with the purpose of preparing them to counter the challenges that they faced as instructional leaders in their campuses. In bridging the gap relating to TVET colleges campus managers’ instructional leadership challenges, this qualitative study attempted to explore and understand the challenges that may hamper the effectiveness of instructional leadership, within selected TVET colleges in South Africa. The study investigated both the internal and external factors contributing to the difficulty of implementing instructional leadership amongst campus managers.

**Research questions**

The following research questions guided the investigation:

1. What are the internal barriers and challenges faced by TVET colleges’ campus managers, while practising instructional leadership on campuses?

2. What are the external barriers and challenges faced by TVET colleges’ campus managers while practising the instructional leadership on campuses?

**2. Literature review**

**Instructional leadership practice in South African TVET colleges**

In terms of the hierarchy, TVET colleges have three levels of leadership, that is, a higher level that includes the college principal; the middle level that includes deputy principals; and a lower level, with campus managers (Ajayi, 2021; Cabrero, 2023; Pretorius, 2021). All these leaders play different leadership roles to ensure that colleges perform at their best. According to Basi (2021) and Maponya (2020), campus managers fall under the last level of TVET college leadership level. Therefore, Hlatjwayo et al. (2022) and Pretorius (2021) agree that campus managers in the last level play a huge instructional leadership as campuses are teaching and learning delivery sites. Therefore, for the quality delivery of education and student satisfaction, campus managers are key role players. Campus managers execute their instructional leadership roles daily by leading
and managing small groups (campuses) and other external stakeholders. These groups include students, lecturers, parents and other campus administrative staff members (Ayele, 2022; Basi, 2021). In short, campus managers’ roles as instructional leaders in campuses include capacitating and motivating lecturers, as well as, ensuring that the campus climate is conducive for improved teaching and learning.

As mentioned earlier, TVET colleges are teaching and learning delivery sites (Kaisara, 2021; Maseko, 2022). Campus managers as leaders in those TVET colleges’ campuses are expected to be instructional leaders. According to Kaisara (2021), instructional leadership as a concept, has been researched extensively in educational leadership. Therefore, various researchers define it differently, but similarly. Sithole et al. (2022) define instructional leadership as a role of a learning institution’s leader and or actions of leading it. These roles and or actions are reflected in activities that are curriculum development, values of teaching and learning and qualification related (Kaisara, 2021; Sithole et al., 2022). Ajayi (2021) and Nogcantsi (2022) view instructional leadership as attitudes that instructional leaders have towards teaching and learning process in their institutions. In short, both definitions of instructional leadership express common ideas on instructional leadership, which are, leading learning and positive outcomes. One influential research that explored the concepts of instructional leadership and students’ academic performance was conducted by Khan, Asimiram, Bin, Kadir, Alias, Bularafa and Rehman (2020) and titled “How instructional leadership impacts student academic performance by enhancing the organization’s capacity in terms of a teacher by their commitment to the organization’s goals?” This study highlighted the importance of principals’ active involvement in instructional leadership and its positive impact on students’ academic performance. Hence, schools with higher instructional leadership levels had better teachers, commitment to school, teaching work, motivation and ultimately, higher students’ academic performances.

Campus managers’ instructional leadership in TVET colleges’ context, requires the involvement of all campus stakeholders and the community at large. This means that the campus managers, campus level stakeholders and the community should work collaboratively. Moreover, Khan et al. (2020) and Kedo (2021) state that it is important for campus managers’ instructional leadership to include shared leadership, transformative leadership and distributive leadership in their practices. According to Basi (2021) and Norbu and Lhabu (2021), campus managers cannot act alone anymore, and instructional leadership administration should allow collaborative effort in creating a professional culture that is cohesive. Therefore, the outcomes of instructional leadership practices are not only the responsibility of campus managers but should be open to the wider community and campus level stakeholders. This, according to Basi (2021), can be through staff and parents’ meetings, students’ meetings, prize giving, or awards events.

It is against the above background that in the South African context, a campus manager who possesses instructional leadership qualities is expected to create a conducive environment for the smooth process of teaching and learning. Furthermore, Sithole et al. (2022) state that campus managers should be goal-
oriented and focus on the improved academic performance and be culture builders who instil high academic standards amongst students and lecturers. Moreover, Muresherwa and Jita (2021) and Ojera et al. (2021) argue that, even in other countries such as the United Kingdom, United States of America, Zimbabwe and Ethiopia, campus managers as instructional leaders, promote learning, motivate lecturers, provide guidance to lecturers and create attractive and positive environment for teaching and learning. Precisely, campus managers who are instructional leaders are concerned about teaching and ultimately improve students’ academic performance.

3. Challenges in practising instructional leadership in TVET colleges.

Ajayi (2021) describes instructional leadership as leadership that focuses mainly on teaching and learning as a priority. This is considered as a priority to improve students’ learning. However, Kaisara (2021), Maponya (2020) and Mbatha (2021) note that instructional leadership is the key component in leading the college on having smooth process of teaching and learning, but most college campus managers do not achieve this goal because they cannot practise instructional leadership effectively. In fact, several factors have a negative impact on campus managers’ instructional leadership (Kaisara, 2021). These factors according to Feyisa and Edosa (2023) are categorised into two major elements: the internal and the external challenges. Internal factors are those factors that cannot be controlled as they always come from within and are mainly influenced by feelings and thoughts (Feyisa & Edosa, 2023). Additionally, external factors are those that stem from the surroundings. Therefore, internally, campus managers are facing heavy challenges, which are related to their own weakness such as lack of knowledge and skills to be effective instructional leaders, and poor communication. Externally, lack of time, workload and incentives are the notable challenges faced by campus managers in practising instructional leadership effectively.

4. External challenges

4.1 Time and workload

Feyisa and Edosa (2023) argue that campus managers spend most of their time mainly on administrative work of the college. They even leave their offices earlier than they should, forgetting to execute their duties as instructional leaders. Feyisa and Edosa (2023) and Sithole et al. (2022) argue that campus managers who do not spend more of their time on instructional activities are considered as average. The study by Khan, Bukar and Masood (2020) showed that leaders who spend less of their time on instructional leadership are normally regarded as less effective in improving students’ academic performance. Such leaders, according to Khan, Bukar and Masood (2020), are not misplaced at all, but rather time allocation or just behavioural patterns are poor. Additionally, leaders spend little or no time in the classroom and even less with lecturers in analysing instruction (Feyisa & Edosa, 2023). In other words, most leaders spend more time in administration than on instruction. As mentioned earlier, campus managers’ time might be insufficient for running the campus since they are employed both as managers and instructional leaders. They have multiple roles and responsibilities such as having to write reports, being involved in other activities, doing management work such as solving problems and crisis, and they are also expected to monitor teaching and learning at the same time. This, therefore, in the end
compromises the role of a campus manager as an instructional leader (Feyisa & Edosa, 2023).

Norbu and Lhabu (2021) confirm that the workload of leaders hinders effective instructional leadership. This workload factor normally prevails because of lecturers being overloaded and therefore making it difficult for a campus manager to observe all the lecturers in classes and give feedback after observation to all overexerted lecturers (Rahman, Tahir & Ali, 2020; Norbu & Lhabu, 2021). In short, lack of feedback means no change, and this can lead to poor student academic performance. Therefore, an effective instructional leader should always provide feedback despite their heavy workload.

4.2 Lack of incentives
Feyisa and Edosa (2023) and Kaisara (2021) mention that lack of rewards or incentives has a negative impact on campus managers’ effective instructional leadership. Most campus managers provide services that are not in line with their remuneration. There is no correlation between what campus managers receive as salaries and the amount of work they do (Kaisara, 2021). According to Huong (2020), lecturers who run college programmes make more money than campus managers and most campus managers do not have enough assistants, as a result, they feel so overwhelmed. However, Huong (2020) states that the remuneration for campus managers are based on other factors, the least of which is based on their ability to be instructional leaders. In the end, this discourages campus managers, and they end up not seeing the need to go an extra mile, which affects students’ academic performance as mentioned.

4.3 Internal challenges Lack of skills and ability to be effective instructional leaders
Rahman et al. (2020) state that a lack of ability among college leaders is a constraint that hinders instructional leadership. According to Ajayi (2021), campus managers might not all be instructional leaders, because immediately there is a lack of a particular skill, they may be excellent and good managers, but not leaders. One of those skills is credibility which, according to Rahman et al. (2020) and Ajayi (2021), is a factor that has a negative impact on instructional leadership and compromises the leader’s ability and skill. Therefore, Rahman et al. (2020) suggest that a campus manager does not need to take a long time returning to class, as they must at least demonstrate competency in one subject area. In essence, an instructional leader needs to function as a generalist, guiding the whole, not demonstrating their expertise in all fields.

Confusion on what leaders are expected to do or what instructional leadership is to them, is identified by Feyisa and Edosa (2023) as an obstacle for effective instructional leadership. This is why Feyisa and Edosa (2023) highlight that the lack of adequate training of campus managers is a barrier to effective instructional leadership. However, Rahman et al. (2020) and Ajayi (2021), further argue that most college leaders are not trained as instructional leaders, but managers and only a few programmes are offered to them on instructional leadership. Therefore, meeting a goal of being an instructional leader becomes a challenge for them.
4.4 Poor or lack of communication
Rahman et al. (2020) and Kaisara (2021) note that a lack of communication can be a barrier to instructional leadership. Instructional leaders should be visionaries, to ensure that all college stakeholders know and support the college’s vision. If the campus manager does not communicate the vision they have in mind and the mission of the college, everyone would do as they wish and realising the college’s goal would be highly impossible (Kaisara, 2021). Moreover, Rahman et al. (2020) emphasise that a campus manager who does not communicate properly, fails to discuss goals with lecturers and this ultimately affects teaching and learning.

The following section outlines the research methodology that the study used.

5. Research methodology
A qualitative research approach was relevant to this study, mainly because it attempted to examine an incident in an unusual location, where the focus was on understanding the social incidents as a whole and holistically. Ajayi (2021) confirms the above statement by arguing that qualitative research approach enables the researcher to collect data with descriptions that are rich, in respect of a particular phenomenon for a better understanding of what is being studied. This is based on how people perceive the phenomenon in study. Therefore, the qualitative research approach assisted in yielding factors that hinder campus managers in executing their instructional leadership roles in TVET colleges. The study used face-to-face interviews, which provided the researcher with evidence of what campus managers face every day as hinderances in their instructional leadership roles.

The data that was used in this study emerged from interviews with three campus managers, six heads of departments and six lecturers. These participants were drawn from four TVET colleges that were purposively sampled in the study. They are South West Gauteng TVET College and Tshwane South TVET College in Gauteng Province and Ehlanzeni TVET College and Gert Sibande TVET College in Mpumalanga Province. These participants constituted the analysis unit for this case study. Furthermore, campus managers, heads of departments and lecturers in TVET colleges are all involved in the teaching and learning at campuses, and they all have roles that they play in influencing learning and students’ academic performance. Most importantly, campus managers are responsible for instructional leadership in these TVET colleges’ campuses. Therefore, their knowledge, view and perceptions on instructional leadership practices and challenges are used in this study as qualitative datasets. The participation and the generation of rich narratives were sustained during face-to-face interviews, as the researcher designed a set of semistructured questions for participants. These questions focused on the instructional leadership of campus managers, practices and challenges thereof. The interviews for each participant, took about 45-60 minutes.

Immediately after each interview session, data were transcribed verbatim. At the end of the course, the researcher used a thematic analytical approach. This approach was used to identify and categorise participants’ interview responses into key themes. The datasets were later interpreted through the lens of...
predetermined concepts, such as instructional leadership practices and challenges. This approach assisted in avoiding generalisation about TVET colleges’ campus managers’ instructional leadership practices and challenges encountered when practicing instructional leadership. Furthermore, this approach made it easier to access and make meaning from the subjective perspectives of participants on instructional leadership and challenges experienced in TVET colleges. During the analysis and interpretation of the personalised experiences, it was revealed that most campus managers are unable to practise instructional leadership effectively, due to numerous factors, which some of them are lack of time and workload. Consequently, campus managers could not achieve the instructional leadership objectives, resulting in campus managers delegating most of their instructional leadership practices to their subordinates. Concluding from the above main finding, the section that follows has used internal and external challenges as frames to analyse, interpret and make meaning from the data collected from the participants.

To use participants’ responses as research data, ethical clearance from the University was obtained. This ethical clearance granted the researcher permission to conduct the study in the selected TVET colleges and participants. Therefore, in line with the ethical clearance, all participants were informed about the study prior to the interviews. They were also provided with consent forms to sign to confirm that they agree to willingly participate in the study. Moreover, the anonymity of the participants and confidentiality were highly maintained. Direct quotations from the interviews are cited verbatim (in italics) in this study as participants’ responses. They are put inside the quotation marks (“”). Table 1 below provides a summary of the research sample.

Table 1: Research sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TVET college</th>
<th>Campus manager</th>
<th>Head of Department (HOD)</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College A (CA)</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>HODA</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B (CB)</td>
<td>CMB</td>
<td>HODB</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College C (CC)</td>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>HODC</td>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College D (CD)</td>
<td>CMD</td>
<td>HODD</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Findings

From the data collected through interviews with three campus managers, six heads of departments and six lecturers, their responses were manually analysed. Key themes emerged and they were categorised into internal and external factors. Each major theme was further divided into sub-themes. Internally, the subtheme that emerged was the campus manager’s lack of knowledge and skills while
externally it was lack of time and workload. In the section below, each theme and sub-theme regarding the challenges that hinder instructional leadership practices by campus managers are described.

**Theme 1: Lack of skills and ability**

Data from interviews with campus managers, heads of departments and lecturers, highlighted lack of knowledge and skills as an internal factor affecting the instructional leadership practices of campus managers. The findings of this study showed that campus managers understand their role in the process of teaching and learning, which includes monitoring, supporting, training, developing and motivating staff.

Campus managers C stated:

“I sometimes go to classes just to check if students and lecturers are early, especially in the morning, just to have a feel.”

Campus manager A shared similar sentiments with campus manager C,

“In the campus, we do have planned and surprise class visits. But what I do, I just go to the class anytime to see what is happening but also to support the lecturers and not to find mistakes. I go to a class and sit for about five minutes to check if lecturers use technological resources or not.”

The statements above, from campus managers A and C, showed that campus managers know that they are expected to monitor teaching and learning and to offer support to lecturers as instructional leaders. But data revealed that they only do class visits to check attendance and use of resources. This is supported by the statement from the response of the HOD regarding the role that campus managers play in the monitoring of teaching and learning as instructional leaders. She added:

“For me, what I have observed is that our campus manager is not really concerned about teaching and learning but he does it only for compliance. Thorough class visits where monitoring of teaching and learning for support and development are done by us, as HoDs but campus managers only rely on our reports and these reports are then submitted at the Head Office.”

In essence, one can conclude that campus managers are dependent on their subordinates, particularly, the HODs for the monitoring of teaching and learning. However, campus managers are expected to play that role as instructional leaders. Therefore, the findings revealed that campus managers do not really understand their roles in the process of teaching and learning, as instructional leaders on campus and the significance thereof. Precisely, TVET colleges’ campus managers lack skills and abilities of being fully involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning through class visits and providing necessary support, development and motivation to both students and lecturers for the improvement of instruction and ultimately for a better students’ academic performance. Moreover, very few studies were done on instructional leadership. A study by Norbu and Lhabu (2021) on factors affecting instructional leadership practices of school principals, revealed that instructional leadership practices of the school leaders were found to be inadequate, due to numerous roles and responsibilities given to these
leaders, inadequate instructional responsibilities and lack of time and leadership training.

**Theme 2: Lack of time and work overload**

On external factors, campus managers mentioned that time and workload are a challenge to them in practising instructional leadership. Campus managers as instructional leaders in TVET colleges’ campuses are expected to do their administrative tasks and monitor instruction at the same time. Rahman et al. (2020) mention that campus managers as instructional leaders tend to struggle to find balance between administrative tasks and instruction, as they mostly lack time, and their workload is often heavy. This factor emerged during data collection, revealing that campus managers feel so overwhelmed by having to do administrative work that includes report writing, attending endless meetings away from campuses, having to solve campus issues and being expected to be involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning. Campus manager C had this to say:

“yeah…, as campus managers, we oversee almost all activities in the campus. I do not know whether you noticed that I was not here for the past two to three hours. I was running around the campus, dealing with the water pipe burst that happened in the campus. So, just like I said, it is very difficult to balance both departments. I can try to do class visits, but while I am there, there can be electricity or water pipe problem, I would therefore have to stop that class visit and attend to the problem.”

Sharing the same view, Campus manager B remarked as follows:

“There are so many things that I need to do as the campus manager. For instance, there is a college plan that we need to keep up with, such as meeting deadlines, submission of reports, so, all these need me to sign and declare that all these are done.”

Rahman et al. (2020) assert that in most cases, campus managers’ time might be insufficient because for the campus to run, they are needed as managers, while on the other hand, as instructional leaders, they are needed to monitor that teaching and learning is effective. Campus managers are currently expected to fulfil multiple roles and responsibilities at the same time for them to be polyvalent. It was, therefore, evident from the collected data that campus managers could not balance the administrative tasks and instruction equally, but rather focused more on administrative tasks due to insufficient time and heavy work overload.

**7. Discussion**

According to Ajayi (2021), Chabalala and Naidoo (2021) and Maseko (2022), in instructional leadership, a campus manager is expected to establish a very strong ground for students’ future learning, hence this kind of leadership focuses more on teaching and learning and students’ performance. An instructional leader should guide, direct, conduct and influence followers, that is, lecturers and students in a college setting. Ajayi (2021) highlights that the effectiveness of instructional leadership practices in campuses is dependent on the campus managers practising and implementing instructional leadership. This is because they are trusted and are responsible for the improvement, success and effectiveness of teaching and learning in TVET colleges’ campuses. However,
being instructional leaders is not smooth sailing, as there are challenges that emerge and these mostly hinder campus managers from executing their instructional leadership practices (Rahman et al., 2020). These challenges or obstacles are often seen as the main hurdle for campus managers’ effective roles as instructional leaders. In the findings from the qualitative interviews, campus managers highlighted two main challenges that may have impacted their effectiveness in practising instructional leadership in TVET colleges’ campuses. These are divided into two categories, that is, internal and external challenges. In the internal factors, the study discovered factors that related to lack of skills and knowledge and externally, time and workload. Generally, the findings of this study are like those of Rahman et al. (2020) on exploring challenges in practising instructional leadership, which pointed out that managers were challenged with their limited experience and knowledge on instructional leadership that lessen their roles as resource people to all lecturers and as instructional leaders.

In terms of lack of skills and knowledge, the study revealed that campus managers are not fully involved in the monitoring of effective teaching and learning as instructional leaders. Whenever they monitor teaching and learning, they only do it for compliance and reporting to higher offices. Campus managers acknowledged that they only do class visits to check attendance and others do not do it at all. They delegate the monitoring to HODs. Therefore, this lack of skills and knowledge on instructional leadership remained a barrier to campus managers in practising instructional leadership. Consequently, campus managers become less confident to practise instructional leadership when leading their TVET colleges’ campuses. Despite the internal factor, which is, lack of skills and knowledge as a challenge, admittedly, there are external factors that campus managers are faced with, in executing their instructional leadership. During interviews, campus managers, HODs and lecturers mentioned that campus managers encounter lack of time and workload. It is noted by Norbu and Lhabu (2021) that managers in a learning institution are expected to execute both management functions and instruction, simultaneously. Campus managers highlighted that they do not get time to supervise and monitor teaching and learning thoroughly, but only focus on other administrative tasks. They further mentioned that they have least time to practise their instructional leadership, due to their busy schedules and endless meetings they attend at the head offices. Therefore, notably, the study showed that on instruction, campus managers are solely dependent on the reports that HODs submit to them concerning the monitoring of teaching and learning.

8. Conclusion and recommendations
Instructional leadership focuses on the leader’s role in coordinating, controlling, supervising and developing curriculum and instruction in the school. But monitoring of instruction through proper class visits would assist in ensuring that there is smooth process of teaching and learning. Moreover, these unexpected class visits are to check if lecturers deliver quality instruction in the classes and to identify some gaps, to be able to close them by developing lecturers in all their areas of needs concerning teaching and learning. If a campus manager does not do class visits, they would not know where to assist, train and develop lecturers.
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for the benefit of students’ academic performance. As the study’s findings revealed that campus managers do not do class visits thoroughly and with purpose, it is recommended that campus managers be trained on what role they should play as instructional leaders in campuses. Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) and TVET colleges head offices should organise refresher courses, workshops, trainings or seminars to enhance the instructional leadership concept among campus managers. This would assist in developing instructional leadership skills in campus managers. Additionally, these skills would assist campus managers to know that there are instructional leadership roles that cannot be delegated to HODs and senior lecturers.

To address the issue of lack of time and work overload, it is recommended that campus managers as instructional leaders spend more time on monitoring teaching and learning instead of consuming too much time on administrative tasks. Campus managers may rather delegate routine administrative tasks to their subordinates (Heads of administration, HOs and senior lecturers). This would give campus managers more time to engage lecturers and to offer more support and motivation, to improve students’ academic achievement. Additionally, at least once per term, campus managers should do proper class visits, using their specific tools for reporting. Alternatively, to further address the issue of lack of time and work overload of campus managers, the DHET can revisit and revise the job description of campus managers and try to reduce a more administrative load, by creating posts for personnel that would be fully focused on all administrative tasks, except a few that would need the direct attention of the campus manager. More time would be created for campus managers to focus more on teaching and learning.

9. Suggestions for future research
As the study focused on or was limited to only four TVET colleges out of 50 TVET colleges in the country, maybe it would be wise for other researchers to extend the research to cover more colleges. This could assist in generalising the findings. As a result, this study serves as a springboard for future research and knowledge contribution. Also, further research options would be to establish strategies that campus managers could employ in TVET colleges to support lecturers and to enhance effective teaching and learning.
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