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Abstract
This study examines how ethical guidance affects academic staff teaching performance in Tanzania's Public Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs). Among 4863 academic staff members from Tanzania's public higher learning institutions, 350 respondents were selected using a stratified simple random selection technique. Public HLIs were chosen because staff members are required to enhance their teaching abilities to offer a high-quality educational service. Additionally, staff members are directed by moral principles and codes of conduct. Nonetheless, it is not clear how much ethical guidance influences academic staff’s teaching performance. A self-administered questionnaire of closed-ended questions was used to collect the data. Descriptive Statistics and Regression Analysis were used for data analysis. The results demonstrate that providing ethical guidance has a favorable impact on teaching performance. Consequently, this study adds to the body of knowledge by shedding light on the relationship between HLI leaders' moral leadership behaviors and the academic staff’s performance in HLIs. The research facilitates the government's understanding of ethical guidance and allows researchers to investigate new aspects of ethical guidance in HLIs for possible future study topics.
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1. Introduction

The educational system of any nation is the foundation for its ability to progress, and academic staff are expected to play a major role in this process (Shaheen et al., 2013). It is impossible to exaggerate the role played by academic personnel in the progress, prosperity, and development of the nation. This is because academic staff members are responsible for doing research and consulting, providing students with academic advice and counseling, developing curricula continuously and executing effective classroom instruction (Palamarchuk, 2018). Universities, like any other business entity, depend on the performance of their academic staff. However, there are allegations of unethical activities among academics, despite the fact that ethical instruction is crucial for academic workers. Unethical conducts such as engaging in sexual activities under inappropriate circumstances (PCCB, 2019), lying on exams (Yildirim et al., 2016), dressing unethically (Lawrent, 2022) and alcoholism (Mfaume & Bilinga, 2017) are widespread among academic staff. According to Mfaume and Bilinga (2017), misconduct is becoming more common among academic staff. Lameck (2018) asserted further that a high prevalence of unethical behavior exists among public servants. If this issue is not resolved, it could jeopardize the government's well-meaning attempts to bolster the nation's educational system and develop a committed teaching workforce.

Academic staff is essential in implementing HLIs' core functions: teaching, research, and community services. The performance of employees in Tanzanian High Learning Institutions (HLIs) is one of the most significant factors (Mgaiwa, 2021). To better achieve HLI aims and provide better education services for social, economic, and political development, Tanzanian HLI personnel's performance must be improved (Tanzania Commission for Universities, 2019). The performance of academic staff in HLIs is measured by teaching, research, and consultancy services (Muriisa, 2015). Evidence indicates that Tanzania produces a great deal less research and teaching than other African nations (Sangeda & Lwoga, 2017; Confraria & Godinho, 2015; Fussy, 2019). For example, 64% of the region's 2014 World Future Council (WFC) was accounted for by South Africa, with Egypt, Kenya, Algeria, and Tunisia following (Sangeda & Lwoga, 2017). According to nearly identical results from another study, South Africa, Egypt, Tunisia, and Nigeria were the top five nations in terms of research outputs (Confraria & Godinho, 2015). The literature suggests that academic staff performance is impacted by upholding ethical values (Muya & Tundui, 2020; Katundano, 2019). However, ethical guidance has not been studied much as a predictor for academic staff teaching performance.
Tanzania Commission for Universities (TCU) mandates that all its academic staff members uphold the highest standards of academic integrity, ethics, and transparency in all of their teaching, learning, research endeavors, and community engagement (TCU, 2019). Ethical guidance is defined as rules or principles for moral decision-making and behavior in a certain context or domain, based on the Social Learning Theory (SLT). Such rules work as a moral compass, directing people or groups of people to behave morally and according to ideals. Through the establishment of norms of conduct, the promotion of justice, the defense of rights, and the reduction of harm, ethical guidelines aid in ensuring responsible and ethical action.

HLI leaders can enhance employees’ teaching performance and deliver better services by adhering to ethical guidelines, treating participants fairly, allowing them to participate in decision-making, outlining roles, objectives, and performance goals, making morally right decisions, and encouraging appropriate behavior (Katundano, 2019). Studies examining the connection between ethical guidance and employees’ performance in HLIs are still scarce. To address this gap, the study investigated how ethical guidance influences academic staff’s teaching performance in HLIs. In a nutshell, the current study intends to examine the following research questions: What is the performance of academic staff in teaching activities in public HLIs? What are the ethical guidance practices in public HLIs? and to what extent does ethical guidance influence academic staff’s teaching performance in public HLIs in Tanzania? To answer these research questions, the main objective of the study is to examine the effects of ethical guidance on academic staff’s teaching performance in public HLIs in Tanzania.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Employee’s Performance

Various scholars have contended that the concept of employees’ performance places a greater focus on the aim, quality, and outcome delivered, and less emphasis on the economic components of efficiency and effectiveness. According to Tahir et al. (2014), employees’ performance is the accomplishment of goals set out by the organization within a specified time frame. According to Pradhan and Jena (2017), achieving the goals that were assigned to an individual within an organization is considered as employees’ performance. Performance, in this view, is the outcome of a comparison between the outcome and the target rather than just a finding of an outcome. According to Ibrahim et al. (2012), employees’ performance ought to
consider how well a business operates in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Both qualitative and quantitative expressions are possible for this quantification. Performance is directly related to efficacy and efficiency. According to Zeb et al. (2018), an employee's performance is determined by his or her ability to accomplish goals at predetermined times. Concerning this viewpoint, performance is evaluated objectively. Many organizations use outcomes to evaluate employees’ performance. Vuong and Nguyen (2022), for instance, suggested that goals and outcomes that have been attained should be used to gauge the employees’ success. According to other research (Pradhan & Jena, 2017; Tahir et al., 2014; Zeb et al., 2018), employees’ performance is evaluated based on standards established by the company, efficiency, effectiveness, goals achieved within a given time frame, and profitability. The achievement of HLIs’ objectives by academic staff in public HLIs in teaching activities within a certain timeframe is referred to as academic staff’s teaching performance for this study. Teaching performance, in this study, is defined as conducting scheduled instructional tasks such as timely attendance to lectures, research supervision, marking, and submitting results on time, attending to students' inquiries, and answering students' questions.

2.2. Social Exchange Theory

The Social Exchange Theory (SET) is a social behavior theory. This theory views ethical leadership as a form of social trade. This theory's basic idea is that followers can respond to a high-quality relationship based on who they interact with, how they interact with them, and their experiences with them (Walumbwa et al., 2011). The idea of reciprocity underpins this notion. Reciprocity is a kind and unkind action in which individuals reward good behaviors and penalize harsh actions. The theory holds that one is repaid what one has received from others (Su et al., 2021). According to Social Exchange Theory, reciprocal action is portrayed as the behavioral response to an unkind or kind deed. It means that when self-interested parties exchange with other parties, the exchange connection ends when the two parties discover that the exchange is not reciprocal. People, typically, strive to form social interactions based on positive interpersonal communication as well as reciprocal standards, according to the positive reciprocity principle (Su et al., 2021). Brown et al. (2005) demonstrated the connection between the Social Exchange Theory and ethical leadership. Employees regard ethical leaders as amazing individuals who can be trusted and believed in.
As a result, this study employs Social Learning Theory, which has been validated in a variety of contexts, as the theoretical foundation for understanding the mechanism of ethical leaders in HLIs’ impact on teaching performance. According to this study, ethical guidance predicts employees’ performance because ethical guidance conduct promotes high-quality social reciprocity with followers. Academic staff’s teaching performance is improved as a result of high-quality social reciprocity.

2.3. Ethical Practices and Teaching Performance

Communicating about ethics, outlining ethical guidance, encouraging, and rewarding ethical behavior in subordinates are all part of ethical guidance (Yukl et al., 2013; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005). Leaders establish norms, principles, and codes of conduct that serve as standards for moral behavior (Yukl et al., 2013). Through communication, leaders bring such rules to the attention of their subordinates. Reward and punishment systems are used by moral leaders to make their followers accountable for their deeds (Treviño et al., 2003). According to Social Exchange Theory (SET), employees are presumed to learn not only from firsthand experience but also from witnessing the acts of others and the results of those activities. This suggests that leaders provide an example for others to follow, drawing attention to their moral behavior and standards for making decisions. As a result, followers copy their leaders and ethical behavior spreads throughout the firm. Furthermore, Brown et al. (2005) contended that moral leaders should establish moral guidelines, honor moral behavior, and penalize noncompliant behavior.

Previous studies (Brown et al., 2005; Hassan & Umar, 2016; Su et al., 2021) have demonstrated that ethical leadership improves workers' performance through exchange relationships. Numerous researchers select this claim. Krasikova et al. (2013), for instance, show that workers tend to modify their ethical inclinations in response to what they see in their leaders. These results suggest that managers should model moral behavior for their staff and set normative standards for them to follow, which will encourage moral behavior that benefits the firm. As a result, when there is a lack of ethical behavior inside an organization, people perform poorly because they are not given any advice. Brown et al. (2005) claim that moral leaders help followers make decisions and resolve moral conundrums. This argument leads us to the research hypothesis, which states that employees’ teaching performance in Tanzanian HLIs is not positively correlated with ethical guidance.
2.4. Role of University Leaders in Influencing Academic Staff's Performance

A leader influences others by persuading them to act in a particular way. This process is known as leadership. A leader is thought to have an impact on others' behavior to achieve objectives (Kelloway & Barling, 2010). The Vice Chancellors, Deputy Vice Chancellors, Deans, and Directors of HLIs are in charge of overseeing the efficient operation of HLIs and making sure that staff members are raising their game and achieving the organization's objectives. Since leadership entails influencing, HLIs leaders are accountable for influencing workers’ performance to accomplish HLIs' objectives (teaching, research, and community services). To be able to influence others, leaders need to exhibit effective traits and behaviors (Brown et al., 2005). A leader can impact the performance of their subordinates by modeling ethical behavior. This is known as ethical guidance.

HLI leaders are in charge of providing direction and leadership in research by creating policies and procedures that facilitate research activity. In addition, they bear the responsibility of furnishing guidance, materials, and supervision to guarantee the effective execution of established protocols and guidelines for investigative endeavors. They are also in charge of informing and educating academic staff members about the rules and procedures that have been developed (TCU, 2019). Vice Chancellors and Deputy Vice Chancellors are in charge of creating and carrying out excellent research projects as well as creating and upholding an environment of compliance among academic employees. Similarly, leaders of HLIs are in charge of arranging funds and seeking out sources of funding for research projects. They also must ensure that academic staff members follow research guidelines and protocols. They anticipate areas of research and encourage academic staff to pursue them (Muriisa, 2015).

HLIs leaders are in charge of organizing, creating, planning, leading and assessing academic programs, rules, processes, and guidelines when it comes to teaching. They are responsible for initiating, taking part in and overseeing academic planning. They also plan and design curricula, organize lesson plans, and make necessary plans for relevant teaching facilities such as lecture hall adequacy and ICT equipment, monitoring the progress of the lesson to ensure that all sessions are attended, and quality control is followed. Implementing the fundamental operations of HLIs is a requirement for academic staff members (URT, 2019). It is mandatory for all academic staff members to enhance the learning environment by means of teaching, research, and scholarly activities and by offering services that align with HLIs' aims. It is a fundamental tenet that all academic staff members, regardless of status, should always be held responsible for competently and effectively carrying out their duties and workload demands and fostering cooperative relationships with supervisors, other students, and HLIs.
Academic staff members in HLIs are expected to participate in HLI governance by offering suggestions on curriculum creation, serving on committees, attending lectures and tutorials, offering academic advice and counseling to students, doing research, and performing community duties. Effective leadership is necessary for academic personnel to perform their responsibilities in an efficient manner (Muriisa, 2015). For HLIs to carry out their tasks in an ethical, just, transparent, and good manner, their leadership must adhere to certain standards (URT, 2019). Research by Haski-Leventhal (2020) and Jones & Hughes (2011) have demonstrated that HLI leaders are important in guiding because they facilitate interagency cooperation and mutual understanding, advance role and responsibility understanding, and build academic staff collaborations and teamwork. By promoting staff dedication and performance enhancement, HLI leadership also helps academicians effectively fulfill their jobs.

HLI leaders are expected to establish academic freedom, which is defined as academic staff members' freedom to teach, do research, and publish without interference from the HLIs they work for (Vrielink & Parmentier, 2011). Academic freedom gives faculty members the ability to design curricula, modify existing ones, conduct research, and publish papers, present, and discuss materials in the classroom, alter pedagogy and structure the content of their expertise (Owusu-Ansah, 2015). Academic staff and other stakeholders must be included in the decision-making process when it comes to matters that impact HLIs according to HLI leaders. Leaders have to foster an environment of open communication and regular discussion of matters impacting academic personnel. Academic staff members are given the authority and responsibility to perform their jobs to the best of their ability by HLI leaders who involve them in decision-making processes and inspire followers through a shared future vision (Vrielink & Parmentier, 2011).

Chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, and directors of HLIs are ethical leaders who have a duty to inform their subordinates (academic staffs) of the necessary ethical standards. When subordinates in hierarchical learning environments are informed about ethical standards, they will act with greater credibility; facilitate better decision-making and foster trust between leaders and subordinates, all of which will increase performance. According to Wang et al. (2015) and Eisenbeiss et al. (2015), ethical leaders must treat others with respect and dignity and view them as goals rather than as means to an aim. Academic staff members must be treated with decency and respect by HLI officials in Tanzania, including chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, directors, and heads of department. When academic staff members are treated with decency and consideration, a nurturing and understanding of work environment is established, and employees' rights and welfare are acknowledged; this fosters a pleasant psychological state in workers that increase dedication and engagement at work (Barrick et al., 2015).
3. Methodology

3.1. Study Design and Approach

This study looked at the possible association between academic ethical guidance and staff performance using a quantitative survey design. Standardized scales were employed to gather numerical data on the study's primary variables. This design allows us to explain our hypothesized relationships, drawing a cause-effect relationship.

3.2. Population and Sample

This research was carried out in Tanzanian public HLIs—because they play a significant role in shaping individuals' personalities and preparing people for social, economic, and political growth. The public HLIs were chosen based on three criteria: nature of ownership, accreditation status, and experience in providing services. The study chose accredited HLIs, because they meet the criteria for offering services as full-fledged HLIs (TCU, 2019). The researcher chose public HLIs based on ownership criteria because workers in these institutions are guided by ethical codes of conduct and ethical values, and workers in these institutions are mandated to improve performance to provide quality teaching services to the community. Experience in providing service is considered to ensure employees' long-term performance. Based on these standards, all eleven (11) fully operational public HLIs in Tanzania were selected for the survey. The study population consisted of 4863 academic staff members from 11 public HLIs. A sample size of 350 participants was determined using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula (Bukhari, 2020). This ensured that the information gathered was relevant to the study and the respondents were able to provide answers with increased accuracy and confidence.

3.3. Procedure

The list of academic employees at each of the HLIs was made available to the researchers to do this. The selection process in the faculties, schools and colleges involved two stages of sampling. Twenty-two faculties, schools or colleges were chosen in the first step. Two (2) faculties, schools or colleges were chosen at random from each of the 11 HLIs. In the second step, a total of 44 departments were selected, with two departments chosen at random from each Faculty, Department or College. Each department's professors, assistant lecturers, lecturers, tutorial assistants and senior lecturers made up the five strata of the population. Each member of the academic staff in each stratum was then given a number between 1 and a predetermined number. At the end, there were five lists from each group, one for
every designation category. By using the fishbowl method in combination with basic random sampling, one academic staff member from each stratum was chosen. 350 academic staff members from eleven (11) public HLIs in Tanzania completed a self-administered questionnaire that was used in the study.

Since the study examines the casual relationship between variables, the closed-ended questionnaire with attitude scale was used with 5-points Likert Scale. The researcher used ethical guidance items from Kalshoven et al. (2011) Ethical Leadership Work (ELW) questionnaire to measure ethical guidance. Furthermore, in measuring teaching, the researcher adopted a measure which was previously used by Moreno-Murcia et al. (2015); the measure contained a 5-Point-Likert-Scale response format (1= strongly disagree (SD), 2= disagree (D), 3= neutral (N), 4= agree (A), 5= strongly agree (SA)). These metrics were chosen because they, more explicitly, quantify teaching than other metrics. The study employed the benchmark for Siswaningsih et al. (2017) to ensure the questionnaire's reliability. This benchmark suggests that the following criteria for Cronbach's Alpha are used to establish internal consistency reliability: excellent ($\alpha>0.9$), good ($0.7<\alpha<0.9$), acceptable ($0.6<\alpha<0.7$), poor ($0.5<\alpha<0.6$), and unacceptable ($\alpha<0.5$). The pilot study's analysis of Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for the questionnaire constructs shows that the questionnaire was deemed reliable based on the values of 0.923 for ethical guidance and 0.944 for academic staff’s teaching performance.

### 3.4. Data Analysis

To make the data analysis for the study easier, IBM's Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) version 21 was used. Three different analyses were then conducted. It means that the study employed three primary statistical methods: 1) descriptive statistics to provide a description of data and frequencies; 2) Pearson “r” to analyze the correlation between the study's important variables; and 3) standard multiple regression to identify the major predictors of research performance. The significance of the study’s hypothesis was fixed at 0.05 level of analysis. The following hypothesis served as the basis for the multiple regression: Academic staff’s teaching performance in Tanzania's public HLIs is not influenced by ethical guidance.
4. Analysis and Discussion

The data analysis and discussion in this section start with a descriptive analysis of the sample's demographics, the ethical leadership variable (ethical guidance) and the employees’ teaching performance variables. This part concludes with a multiple regression analysis comparing employees’ teaching performance to ethical guidance, along with conclusions and recommendations.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

About 64.9% of respondents were males compared to female who were 35.1% in total. The distribution of sample by designation varied with 10.3% tutorial assistant, 36.9% assistant lecturer, 30.9% lecturer, 13.7% senior lecturer, 5.7% associate professors and 2.6% full professors. Also, 40.9% of the sample had work experience above 10 years while 22% had 4 to 6 years of working experience and 21% had 7 to 9 years of working experience, and the rest which is 15.4% had 3 years of working experience as summarized in Table 01 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic characteristics</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency and Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Tutorial Assistants</td>
<td>36 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>129 (36.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>108 (30.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>48 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>20 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>9 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Experience</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>54 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>77 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>76 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years and above</td>
<td>143 (40.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>227 (64.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>123 (35.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Analysis
4.2. Descriptive Analysis Concerning Ethical Guidance

This section presents descriptive results concerning ethical guidance. To begin 47.7%, 44.3%, 41.7%, 45.7% and 43.4% of respondents agreed that leaders often clearly explain integrity related codes of conduct, explains what is expected from employees in terms of behaving with integrity, clarifies integrity guidelines, ensures that employees follow codes of conducts, and elucidates the probable consequences of possible unethical behavior to subordinates respectively. In contrast, 36.6% agreed that, sometimes, leaders stimulate the discussion of code of conduct guideline issues among employees as summarized in Table 02.

Table 02: Descriptive analysis concerning ethical guidance (N=350)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explains integrity related codes of conduct.</td>
<td>6 (1.7)</td>
<td>33 (9.4)</td>
<td>83 (23.7)</td>
<td>167 (47.7)</td>
<td>61 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains what is expected from employees in terms of behaving with integrity.</td>
<td>6 (1.7)</td>
<td>18 (5.1)</td>
<td>95 (27.1)</td>
<td>155 (44.3)</td>
<td>76 (21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies integrity guidelines.</td>
<td>7 (2.0)</td>
<td>35 (10.0)</td>
<td>91 (26.0)</td>
<td>146 (41.7)</td>
<td>71 (20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures that employees follow codes of conduct.</td>
<td>4 (1.1)</td>
<td>22 (6.3)</td>
<td>109 (31.1)</td>
<td>160 (45.7)</td>
<td>55 (15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies the likely consequences of possible unethical behavior to subordinates.</td>
<td>4 (1.1)</td>
<td>21 (6.3)</td>
<td>116 (33.1)</td>
<td>152 (43.3)</td>
<td>57 (16.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate the discussion of code of conduct guideline issues among employees.</td>
<td>6 (1.7)</td>
<td>50 (14.3)</td>
<td>128 (36.6)</td>
<td>114 (32.6)</td>
<td>52 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliments employees who behave according to</td>
<td>18 (5.1)</td>
<td>47 (13.4)</td>
<td>106 (30.3)</td>
<td>127 (36.3)</td>
<td>52 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. Descriptive Analysis Concerning Employee’s Teaching Performance

According to the survey, academic staff members in Tanzania’s public Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) have been encouraging students’ collaboration and individual growth during the past three years, as well as connecting instruction in the workplace. In addition, they have been attending to and answering queries from students, supporting interactions between students and lecturers, encouraging critical thinking and research, and providing assignment feedback by deadline. Nonetheless, a small percentage of respondents disagreed; and a smaller percentage strongly disagreed with these claims, as depicted in Table 03 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been providing clear, and scientific information for the last three years.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
<td>(43.4%)</td>
<td>(46.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been promoting individual and teamwork among students for the last three years.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(50.6%)</td>
<td>(41.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been relating teaching to the professional environment for the last three years.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
<td>(45.4%)</td>
<td>(46.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been attending and responding to students’ questions asked in class for the last three years.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
<td>(39.4%)</td>
<td>(54.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been facilitating student-student and student-lecturer interactions for the last three years.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.1%)</td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(43.4%)</td>
<td>(49.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been fostering research and critical spirit for the last three years.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
<td>(3.1%)</td>
<td>(8.6%)</td>
<td>(51.1%)</td>
<td>(35.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have been easily accessible and available for students regarding teaching activities for the last three years.

I have been meeting deadline in giving feedback for whatever assignments (i.e. supervising research, marking and providing results) for the last three years.

Source: Data Analysis

4.4. Correlation

The correlation between the predictor variable (ethical guidance) and the teaching performance of the employees is displayed in Table 04. The correlation results show that there is a statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.718$, $p<0.01$) between ethical guidance and teaching performance.

Table 04: Correlation table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Performance</th>
<th>Ethical Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.718**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Guidance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.718**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: Data Analysis

4.5. Regression

The findings in the Table 05 indicate that the coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.515$ for teaching performance, at significance level of 0.00. This implies that, 51.5% of the total variations in teaching performance is influenced by ethical guidance. This implies that, there is a positive contribution of ethical guidance by 51.5%, on influencing teaching performance in public HLIs in Tanzania.
Table 05: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Guidance</td>
<td>.718a</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.36604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Teaching Performance
Independent variable: Ethical Guidance

Source: Data Analysis

The overall findings of regression analysis between the ethical guidance and academic staff’s teaching performance were utilized to examine incidental relationships. According to Table 06, academic staff’s teaching performance and ethical guidance have a substantial and favorable link (Beta=0.487, t=19.229, p<0.00). The more ethical guidance academic staff members receive; the better they perform in teaching.

Table 06: Multiple Linear Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.124</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Guidance</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>19.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Teaching Performance
Independent variable: Ethical Guidance

Source: Data Analysis

The study concludes that employees’ teaching performance is influenced by ethical guidance based on the variability of workers' teaching performance supplied by ethical guidance. This suggests that a leader's moral governance affects followers' behavior in the classroom. In addition, the study by Muya and Tundui (2020) on the strategies for improving the performance of HLIs in Tanzania stated that HLI staff members must observe ethical values for better employee teaching performance. These findings are in line with the study by Katundano (2019) on Rebuilding Ethical Leadership in African Universities, which revealed that ethical principles are key principles for universities promoting staff’s performance in teaching, research, and consultancy.
Social Exchange Theory (SET) highlights the significance of ethical instruction. According to the two ideas, when leaders prioritize moral principles and objectives during the decision-making process, it has a favorable impact on performance (Obicci, 2015). Furthermore, SET contends that managers should reward and penalize employees in a way that ensures they follow ethical principles and standards of conduct. This suggests that leaders establish norms, principles and codes of conduct that serve as standards for moral behavior. Through communication, leaders bring such rules to the attention of their subordinates. Reward and punishment systems are used by moral leaders to make their followers accountable for their deeds. By doing this, leaders set an example for workers, drawing their attention to their moral behavior and standards for making decisions. As a result, followers imitate their leaders and ethical behavior proliferates throughout the company. Employees adapt their ethical orientations to the behavior they witness in their leaders when they are guided in an ethical manner.

Many organizations use outcomes to evaluate employees’ performance. Vuong & Nguyen (2022), for instance, suggested that goals and outcomes that have been attained should be used to gauge employees’ success. According to other researchers (Tahir et al., 2014; Zeb et al., 2018), employees’ performance is evaluated based on standards established by the company, efficiency, effectiveness, goals achieved within a given time frame and profitability. Additionally, Kelidbari et al., (2016) found that ethical guidance had an impact on employees’ performance at Guilan University of Medical Sciences. Lameck (2022) found that ethical guidance had an impact on the provision of agricultural advisory services by Tanzanian local government authorities in Tanzania.

As stated by Jones and Hughes (2011) ethical guidance in the HLI "builds support for the university and establishes an environment that is conducive to success". These findings agree with the studies conducted by Choi et al. (2020) and Caza et al. (2015), which found that moral leadership enhances workers' role performance by fostering a sense of trust in their supervisor, which, in turn, boosts workers' role performance. Additionally, the Rahim et al. (2020) study discovered that workers who believe that their leaders are moral role-models receive significantly clearer communication from them, which improves their understanding of expectations and increases their likelihood of demonstrating those expectations in role performance. According to research by Iqbal et al. (2015), employees' performance is directly impacted by their fair task distribution and treatment, which, also, has a positive impact on their desired attitudes and behaviors. Krishnan et al. (2018) also demonstrate that treating employees fairly, treating them with respect and dignity and providing them with correct information about matters that are important to them in a timely and honest manner increase employees’ performance.
5. Conclusion and Recommendations

To improve employees’ teaching effectiveness, this study makes the case that HLI leaders must restore ethical practices among HLI executives and personnel. Academic employees are influenced by ethical leadership to produce the expected academic results, which include dedication to teaching. Teaching performance cannot take place in a vacuum. It is bifurcated. The leadership of HLI must arm itself with essential ethical principles that are molded in selflessness for the good of the university and staff members in their respective fields of expertise, among other things. By abiding by laws and regulations, the leadership of HLI should take the lead in fostering ethical leadership among its employees (codes of ethics). Since codes of ethics are the fundamental guidelines that govern how members of a particular profession should behave, HLI leaders have a responsibility to set a good example for the entire HLI community by treating employees fairly, allocating all activities fairly and making morally sound decisions among academic staff. While unethical behavior results in subpar performance, HLI leaders who act morally and exhibit good leadership ethics can create a lasting impact on employees' teaching performance. The leaders of HLIs must establish a morally sound workplace to improve the teaching performance of academic staff members.

To improve employees’ teaching performance in HLIs, it is recommended that HLI leadership adopts ethical guidance as human values and put them into practice. Employees in HLIs need to feel listened, respected, involved, appreciated, and directed on ethical values.

6. Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study investigated the relationship between ethical guidance and employees’ performance in public HLIs in Tanzania. Surveying public HLIs only could not somehow depict variations in leadership and culture. Public HLIs’ culture is different from private HLIs’ culture. Therefore, future researchers can cover private HLIs in Tanzania. Also, this study focused on academic staff employee only; other supporting staff were not studied; studying about academic staff with other supporting staff will accommodate and depict the variation of respondents in specialization. Future research can cover academic and other supporting staff in HLIs as well.
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