

**PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF INSTRUCTIONAL  
LEADERSHIP IN SELECTED PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF  
HADIYA ZONE, SNNPRS**

**BY: ADDISU CHONDE**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE  
STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL  
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL  
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

**ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA**

**PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF INSTRUCTIONAL  
LEADERSHIP IN SELECTED PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF  
HADIYA ZONE, SNNPRS**

**BY: ADDISU CHONDE**

**Approved By Examining Board**

**Department Head Hussen Kedir (PhD)      Signature..... Date .....**

**Internal Examiner Temesgen Ferega (PhD)      Signature.....Date.....**

**External Examiner Getnet Tizazu (PhD)      Signature..... Date.....**

**Advisor Ato Kenennisa Dabi      Signature..... Date.....**

## **Acknowledgements**

In the very beginning “God is great” who brought me to this level. I greatly acknowledge the time, commitment, unfailing encouragement, valuable guidance, constructive comments, patience and useful suggestions of my advisor Ato Kenennisa Dabi to carry out this research.

My deep gratitude is also goes to teachers, principals, vice principals, school supervisors, and Wereda Education Office heads and experts of Hadiya Zone who devoted a substantial part of their time in completing the survey instruments and in providing the necessary information . Without their generous participation, this study would not have been realized.

Next, my heartfelt gratitude also goes to Ato Yohannes Desta for his supporting of how to enter the data in to SPSS and providing me with laptop for the accomplishment of this research work.

I am also grateful to Ato Eyesu Mekebo (PhD student at AAU), Ato Mahari Biruk, Ato Markos Yohannes, Ato Markos Mekebo, Ato Sibside Tekilu, Ato Deribe Hussen, Ato Deribe Yohannes, Ato Daniel Dutiso, from Hadiya Zone for their assistance in provision of the necessary documents; duplicating/copying the questionnaire and the support they made to carry out this research.

I am also greatly indebted to the school of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University for its sponsorship to carry out the study. Not only the sponsorship, but also the chance given to me to study at graduate level, it is the first time for me AAU admitted to study in this precious University and taken as a centre of excellence in Ethiopia. Wow, I never forget AAU in my life times. Thank you very much.

My heartfelt thanks rendered to my wife : Bogalech Desta , for my sons Mekokina Addisu and Hanani Addisu , to my best friends Tesfahun Metwos,Tesfaye Debaro,Abebe Hadaro,Abera Abriham, Elias Wolansa, Afework Alaro and Dimo Didana for their diligent support and encouragement throughout my graduate studies and this research work.

Finally I am very much grateful to Meerab Badawacho Woreda Administration for their permission to attend this master’s degree programme in Addis Ababa University.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	vi
Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	vii
Abstract.....	viii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	7
1.3.1. General objectives of the study .....	7
1.3.2. Specific objectives of the study .....	7
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	7
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	8
1.6 Limitation of the Study .....	8
1.7 Operational definition of key Terms.....	9
1.8 Ethical Consideration.....	10
1.9 Organization of the Study .....	10
CHAPTER TWO.....	12
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	12
Introduction .....	12
2.1 The Concept of School Leadership.....	12
2.2 Conceptual Definitions of Instructional Leadership.....	13
2.3 What makes Instructional Leadership Different from other leadership?.....	14
2.4 The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Leadership .....	15
2.4.1 The Roles of Instructional Leadership .....	15
2.4.2 Responsibilities of Instructional Leaders .....	17
2.4.3 The Roles and Responsibilities of Principal as Instructional Leader .....	18
2.4.4 The Roles and Responsibilities of Teachers as Instructional Leaders .....	19

2.4.5	The Roles and Responsibilities of Department Heads as Instructional Leaders	21
2.4.6	The Roles and responsibilities of Supervisors as Instructional leaders.....	22
2.5	Supervisory Skills of Instructional Leaders.....	23
2.6	Approaches to Instructional Supervision.....	25
2.7	Practice of Instructional Leadership .....	27
2.7.1	Setting School Vision and Defining the School Mission .....	27
2.7.2	Managing Curriculum and Instruction .....	31
2.7.3	Supervising and Evaluating Instruction .....	31
2.7.4	Monitoring Instructional Program.....	32
2.7.5	Creating Conducive and Healthy School Environment .....	32
2.8	Teaching-Learning roles Instructional Leadership.....	34
2.8.1	Promoting Professional Skill Development .....	35
2.8.2	Building Effective Relationship in Schools .....	38
2.8.3	Conflict Management role of instructional leaders in school.....	38
2.8.4	Instructional Leadership and School Climate .....	39
2.9	Overview of Instructional Leadership in Ethiopia.....	42
2.10	Challenges for Instructional Leadership Effectiveness .....	44_Toc391396183
CHAPTER THREE.....		47
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....		47
Introduction .....		47
3.1	Design of the study .....	47
3.2	Research	
Methodology.....		43
3.3	Sources of Data.....	48
3.4	Sample Population and Sampling Techniques .....	48
3.5	Data Gathering Instruments.....	52
3.5.1	Questionnaire.....	52
3.5.2	Interview.....	52
3.5.3	Document Analysis .....	53
3.6	Validity and Reliability of the Instruments .....	53
3.5.1	Pilot Test .....	53

3.5.2	Validity of the Study .....	53
3.6	Procedures of Data Collection .....	54
3.7	Method of Data Analysis .....	54
CHAPTER FOUR .....		56
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA.....		56
4.1	Characteristics of Respondents.....	58
4.2	Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data Gathered through Questionnaires and Interview .....	61
4.2.1	Dimensions of Instructional Leadership.....	62
4.3	Teaching- Learning Roles of Instructional Leadership .....	78
4.3.1	Professional Skill Development .....	78
4.3.3	Supportive Roles of Instructional Leaders .....	85
4.3.4	Directive Roles of Instructional Leaders .....	87
4.3.5	Conflict Management Roles of Instructional Leaders.....	89
4.4	Challenges to Instructional Leadership Effectiveness .....	91
4.4.1	Lack of Skill and Training.....	92
4.4.2	Lack of Cooperation and Commitment for instructional improvement of Stakeholders .....	94
4.4.3	Lack of Resources Availability and Allocation .....	97
4.4.4	Lack of Vision, Will and Courage.....	99
CHAPTER FIVE.....		102
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FINDINGS .....		102
5.1	Summary of Major Findings.....	102
5.2	Conclusions.....	112
5.3	Recommendations.....	114
References.....		
Appendices		

## List of Tables

	<b>Page</b>
Table 1: Sampling population and Techniques.....	47
Table 2: Characteristic of Respondents.....	54
Table 3: Developing Vision and Mission.....	58
Table 4: Managing Curriculum and Instruction.....	62
Table 5: Supervising and Evaluating Instructions.....	64
Table 6: Monitoring Instructional Program.....	67
Table 7: Promoting a Conducive School Learning Climate.....	69
Table 8: Professional skill Development.....	71
Table 9: Building Effective Relationship in School.....	73
Table 10: Supportive role of Instructional Leaders.....	75
Table 11: Directive role of instructional leaders.....	77
Table 12: Conflict management role of instructional leaders.....	79
Table 13: Lack of Training and Skills.....	81
Table 14: Lack of resources Availability.....	83
Table 15: Lack of Cooperation and Commitment of School Stakeholders.....	85
Table 16: Lack of Knowledge, Will and Courage.....	87

## **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

ESDP: Education Sector Development Program

ETP: Education and Training Policy

GEQIP: General Education Quality Improvement Program

MoE: Ministry of Education

NGO: Non-Governmental Organization

SEDL: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

SNNPRS: Southern Nations, Nationalities and People Regional State.

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

TGE: Transitional Government of Ethiopia

WEO: Woreda Education Office

## ABSTRACT

*The purpose of this study was to investigate instructional leadership practices and challenges in the preparatory schools of the Hadiya Zone. The study reviewed the related literature on leadership aspects, dimensions of instructional leadership, teaching- learning roles of instructional leadership, and attempts were also made to identify factors that affect the effectiveness of instructional leadership. In order to meet the objectives of the study descriptive survey research method was employed. Five “Woredas”, namely: Mesirak Badawacho woreda, Meerab Badawacho woreda, Soro woreda, Shashogo woreda and Hossana town administration were addressed by this study. The researcher incorporated 49% (126) of the sample populations as respondents. Fifty instructional leaders (main and vice principals and department heads) in the schools, 66 teachers, 5 Woreda Education Office Heads and 5 woreda supervisors were primary sources of data. Questionnaires, interviews and document analyses were used for the purpose of collecting relevant data. Data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed using statistical tools like mean, average mean, standard deviation, an independent sample t-test and spearman correlation coefficient. Moreover, data gathered through interview and document analysis were considered to complement the questionnaires in narrative form. The finding of this study revealed that almost all (89%) instructional leaders were subject specialists, lacks skill and training, and lacks commitment and moral to accomplish their tasks and severe shortage of finance. Based on the findings, it was concluded that: Schools were to some extent incapable of enhancing teachers’ professional skill development and improving the quality of education. The stated vision and defined mission in the school did not command the ownership of its potential stakeholders since it was not supported by its potential stakeholders. Instructional leaders did not possess the required skill, knowledge and attitude through training. In line with the above findings and conclusions it was recommended that: to equip instructional leaderships with necessary knowledge, attitude and skills the Region, Zone and Woreda Education Officials may arrange workshops, seminars, short and long term training in collaboration with different universities, colleges and NGO’s and schools need to think of their own income generating sources on top of government budget through improving their relationship with local NGO’s and school communities by preparing project proposal and submit to international donors.*

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **Introduction**

This chapter deals with the overview of the background, the statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study, limitation of the study, ethical consideration of the study, organization of the study and operational definition of the study were treated in this part of the study.

### **1.1 Background of the Study**

Schools are basically consisted of people: community, students, teachers and support staff and administrators. Although all these people have their own objectives to attain by being in school, the core task of schools is teaching and learning. Thus, the effectiveness and success of a school is measured in terms of its success on the key business of teaching and learning and its effects on students' academic and overall achievement (Phillips, 2011).

Educational researchers (Hollinger, 2009; Horng & Loeb, 2010; & Mendel, 2012) provide a long list of factors as important determinants of the success of schools and that of students attending their education in schools. Although the lists vary along with the writers, the principals' leadership practice is commonly raised by all as prominent factor. In their study of "How leaders Influence Students Learning", the authors (Leith wood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), asserted that leadership was the second most important school-based factor in children's academic achievement.

Schools depend on leadership to shape their productive future (Senge et.al, 1999). When we say leadership, one need to distinguish between the traditional and modern view of the term. The traditional view of leadership emphasized on hierarchical and procedural notions and assumed that leadership is the sole responsibility of school principals. And it was also advocated that the major duties of principals were teachers' evaluation, budgeting, scheduling and facility maintaining (SEDL, 2005; Noonan & Hellsten, 2013; Blase & Blase, 1999). Educational researches undertaken later on confirmed that these roles of principals did not bring the type of results expected from schools. This may be because these roles are more of managerial in their focus and have little relation with the key tasks of schools i.e. teaching

and learning (Goodwin, et al., 2003; Noonan & Hellsten, 2013; Goddard & Miller, 2010). Thus, there was persistent demand and interest from educators the roles of principals be further extended. Accordingly, instructional leadership was added to be one of the major duties of principals in addition to the various traditional responsibilities (Goodwin, et al., 2003; Hallinger, 2009; Horng & Loeb, 2010)

The term instructional leadership has been prevalent in educational leadership literature for the past two to three decades (Goddard & Miller, 2010; Southworth, 2002). During this period instructional leadership theorists have developed different frame works that guide the functions of educational leaders as instructional leadership. Hallinger and Murphy (1985), for example, developed a framework consisting of three elements: a) defining the school mission, b) managing the instructional program, and c) creating a positive school climate. According to them, the instructional leaders are required to frame school goals, communicate, supervise and coordinate curriculum, monitor progress, and support the learning culture in order to make their schools effective.

Hopkins (2001), on the other hand, emphasizes on the collective roles of principals while defining the term and suggesting his framework. For him, instructional leadership is the collegial practice of working together with teachers and others in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools. The other theorist, Snyder (1983), for instance, conceptualized instructional leadership in terms of planning, staff and program development and evaluation. This framework relates the tasks of instructional leadership with administrative responsibilities. Unlike Snyder, Day et al. (2007) developed a conceptual framework much focuses on instruction. According to them, setting directions, developing people, engaging in collaboration, and using data and research are primary components of instructional leadership.

A more refined and elaborated framework was developed by Wallace Foundation (2012, P. 54) based on the research works of others. Accordingly, the following five elements were considered as the central components of instructional leadership functions: Shaping a vision of academic success for all students, creating a climate hospitable to education, cultivating leadership in others, improving instruction to enable teachers to teach at their best and

students to learn at their utmost; and managing people, data and processes to foster school improvement. Thus, by combining the views of various theorists Flath (1989 P.59) concludes in short that “instructional leadership are those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning”. According to him the instructional leader makes instructional quality the first priority of the school and attempts to realize that vision.

Although the practices of instructional leadership vary according to the country, the conceptual frameworks developed by different leadership theorists can be implemented in different countries with different rate. In Ethiopia, especially, after the downfall of the Derg regime, education has been given due attention and direction with an education and training policy declared during transitional government of Ethiopia (TGE, 1994). As clearly stated in the ETP document (1994, p.29), educational management would be decentralized specially at institutional level and schools become autonomous in their internal administration. This means that the role of managing the schools and teaching and learning carried out in schools distributed to all individuals involving in school activity, not limited only to principals.

As result, different measures were taken by the government and MoE in line with the policy. Among these measures some include the education system was decentralized, different individuals were allowed to involve in the education decision making affairs and leadership and managerial trainings were provided to those on leadership positions and others. Still educational leadership and management will be the focus of the system as indicated in the ESDP IV (2010, P.14).

With regard to SNNPR and the Zone in which this study was conducted, the practices showed that there were some attempts to involve the various practitioners in leadership activity and practicing instructional leadership both at primary and secondary schools levels. At regional level, as the information obtained from the regional education bureau, many principals were sent to higher education to attend their leadership trainings at in-service program. Special training was also provided to leaders and other stakeholders in relation to instructional leadership in combination with MOE experts while introducing GEQIP and its implementation.

However, the changes observed and the results obtained in schools were very low. This can be verified from the 2011/12 education annual statistical abstract of the region. As indicated in the abstract, the promotion rates of Grade 10 and 12 students was much lower than average. Although there might be various reasons for this low achievement of students, many raise the instructional leadership practices as one major problem. Since it is one component of the region, the trained in Hadiya Zone is quite similar with the other Zones in the region. The problem of effectively implementing instructional leadership was still one of the several challenges in the zone according to the Zonal Education Department. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to investigate the practices and challenges of instructional leadership in preparatory schools of Hadiya Zone.

Geographically, Hadiya Zone is located 230 kilometers away from the capital Addis Ababa to south west of Ethiopia. It is one of the 14 zones in southern nation nationalities people region. It is 155 kilometers away from the regions capital Hawassa. It is located in the tropical region with an altitude 900-2700m above sea level and with maximum rainfall (1800-2200 mm). It has ten woredas and one town administration. Namely, they are: Mierab Badawacho woreda, Mesirak Badawacho, Analemo woreda, Lemo woreda, Shashogo Woreda, Gibe Woreda, Duna Woreda, Gombora Woreda, Misha Woreda, Soro Woreda and Hossana town administration. The major cash products in the zone are wheat, maize, and teff. All the “Woredas” and administrative town in the zone have the facilities like road transportation, telecommunication, and hydro electric power. There are eight government preparatory schools in the study area. The capital of the Hadiya zone is Hossana (Efrem, 2001:12)

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

As explained time and again in the preceding section, the major objective of any instructional leadership activity is to enhance the effectiveness of teaching and learning program being carried out by creating conducive learning environment. A strong instructional leadership is mandatory in order to create effective school that makes a difference to both teachers and students through their skills as instructional leader (Dimmock, 1993).

In most cases the problem with instructional leadership is related to the fact that many schools leaders are not educational experts. Moreover, there are some school leaders who

perceive their role to be administrative and, as such, they purposely distance themselves from the classroom environment. Similarly, Hallinger (2003) suggest that in many cases school leaders have less expertise than teachers they supervise. This notion is further complicated by the fact that the school leaders' authority is severely limited as he/she occupies a middle management position.

Traditionally, the instructional roles of principals included several dimensions of administrative responsibilities (Hollinger; Lashway, 2002). According to this model, the principals were primarily responsible for managing all instructional and non instructional processes in schools. In current practice, however, principals have been expected to share their leadership responsibilities with teachers and collaborate with them on curriculum, instruction, and assessment in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning (Marks and Printy, 2003).

With regard to the relation between instructional leadership and students' achievement, various researchers who have conducted investigations on the issue identified positive relation (Hornig and Loeb, 2010; Mendels, 2012; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; & Leithwood and Jantzi, 2008). That is, the higher the involvement of the principals on instructional related activities, the higher will be the probability of students' achievement and progress.

However, the problem is that the instructional leadership practices were not effectively implemented across in the schools, i.e. the shift from principals as managers to principals as instructional leaders has not been effectively occurred internationally. This is due to several challenges including change in political and social situations of the countries, paradigm shifts, the complexity of the nature of the tasks and other human and non-human factors (Goodwin et al., 2003).

Regarding Ethiopia, there are some evidences that verify that the instructional leadership practice was not effective. Various studies (e.g., Tesfaye Nigussie, 2010; Alemayehu Tesema, 2011) have been conducted nationally on issues related to practice and challenges of instructional leadership. However, most of them are different in numerous ways from the current study. For example, a study by Tesfaye Nigussie (2010) entitled as "the role of

instructional leadership in building organizational climate of secondary schools of Bale Zone” and by Alemayehu Tesema (2011) entitled as “a comparative study of instructional leadership roles of principal in some selected government and Catholic secondary schools in AddisAbaba” are the two prominent studies, in two different regions, Oromia and Amhara respectively, certify that the practice was not effective. The two researchers indicated above generally identified the following four factors, namely teacher resistance to change; pressure from none instructional jobs; lack of instructional feedback and lack of staff cohesiveness, lack of training and inefficiency in administration are the major hindrances for unsuccessful implementation of instructional leadership in the secondary schools. However, they are different from this study in two different ways. Firstly, they focused on the role of instructional leadership but they did not say anything about the practice and challenges played by instructional leaders. Secondly, the methodology they emphasized was quantitative, whereas, this study is both qualitative and quantitative. This study is also different in that its focus is on the practice and challenges of instructional leaders could play in minimizing challenges that has spread in the preparatory schools whereas, they focus on grade nine and ten.

Regarding the practices in the preparatory schools of Hadiya Zone, since the researcher himself has been working in some of the secondary schools as teacher, department head and school principal, he has faced a lot of challenges of instructional leadership. In addition, there was a bitter complain from educational officials at the Woreda and Zonal levels regarding the poor performance of principals in relation to their leadership responsibilities, lack of training and inefficiency and lack of commitment. However, to the best of my knowledge, no studies were identified that show the degree of the problems and the challenges prevalent in the schools. This by itself initiates the researcher to undertake this study in order to identify the major challenges in the implementation of instructional leadership and recommend some remedies that could better address the problems. In the process of the study the researcher would attempt to answer the following basic questions:

1. What are the instructional leadership practices in the preparatory schools of Hadiya zone?
2. To what extent do the school leaders perform different dimensions of instructional leadership effectively?

3. To what extent have the current instructional leadership roles affect the teaching learning process?
4. What are the major challenges that faced the instructional leadership practices in the schools?

### **1.3. Objectives of the Study**

#### **1.3.1. General objectives of the study**

The main objective of this study was to investigate the current practices and challenges of instructional leadership and its implementation in the preparatory schools of Hadiya zone.

#### **1.3.2. Specific objectives of the study**

1. To examine the current practices of instructional leadership in the schools.
2. To assess if leaders in the study schools are effectively practicing the instructional leadership roles.
3. To identify the major instructional leadership challenges that hinders the effectiveness of school leaders.

### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

The results of this study would help to create awareness among preparatory schools instructional leaders by revealing what sort of instructional leadership competences do they lack while they were leading their schools and how should they fill these gaps in order to bring changes in their respective preparatory schools. Therefore, the researcher strongly believes that the findings of this study report and recommendations would have the following contributions:

- 1 It would help to create awareness on the part of the school leaders about the different roles of instructional leaders and the challenges they will face in their real world.
2. It will also serve as information source for educational officials at different levels of the education hierarchy to identify the gaps existed in relation to the instructional leadership and address the problems in the future.

3. It will serve as stepping-stone for those who want to carry out in-depth research on the topic in the study area.
4. It will also provide valuable information to the schools about how do they practice instructional leadership roles and enable them to take corrective actions for the major challenges they faced.

### **1.5. Delimitation of the Study**

The research could be more comprehensive and reliable, if it could have included all government and non government, urban and rural, primary and secondary schools, school leaders and teachers of preparatory schools (11-12) in Hadiya Zone. However, due to shortage of finance and time resources, the research was delimited to five government preparatory schools in the zone. The selection of the zone as a setting for the study is based on the researcher experience as a teacher, department head and a principal in the zone that helped him to sense the problem.

Instructional leadership deals with diversified dimensions. Including all dimensions would be beyond the researcher's resources capacity. Therefore, the scope of the study is delimited to five dimensions of instructional leadership consisting of setting the school vision and mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising and evaluating of instruction, monitoring instructional program and promoting conducive school climate of the preparatory schools.

In line with this, it also included the teaching-learning roles of instructional leaders namely; professional skill development, building effective relationship in schools with stake holders, directive, supportive and conflict management roles were treated in the study.

### **1.6 Limitation of the Study**

This study has a number of its own limitations. The first important limitation was lack of relevant local review literature on practice of instructional leadership. The researcher feels that, had it been possible to access these literatures. It would have been possible to substantiate, the practice and challenges of instructional leadership more, and come up with

better work. The second limitation was lack of the research limited to only five preparatory schools as the result it may affect generalization of the findings to all schools in the Zone. Other important constraints of this study was failure to incorporate school unit leaders, Parent Teacher Association and Kebele Education and Training Board members as data sources who are important stakeholders of education system and who are believed to have some information regarding overall process of instructional leadership. This exclusion was due to shortage of time to collect data from this source. As the result of these above mentioned limitations, the outcomes of the study were not as completed as it was initially anticipated.

### **1.7 Operational definition of key Terms**

**Classroom supervision:** Refers to instructional support from Woreda supervisors, principals and seniors' teachers given to teachers to enhance the teaching-learning process (Signal and Metal, 1996).

**Instructional leadership dimension:** Refers to the main pillars or frame works of responsibilities, competence and the roles that instructional leaders performs to achieve improved inputs (Krug, 1992)

**Instructional leadership Effectiveness:** Frequency of leaders' engagement in the role behaviour (or practices) used to represent the five instructional leadership dimensions (Hollinger and Murphy, 1987, p.98).

**Instructional leadership:** Refers to role behaviour (or practices) of school leaders in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and Instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning, monitoring student progress and promoting learning climate (krug,1992,p.56).

**Leadership:** The process of influencing the activities of an individual or group in effort towards goal achievement in a given situation (Krug, 1992)

**School Climate:** refers to the set of internal characteristics such as the way people interact, treat and respect one another and distinguishes one school from another and influences the behaviours of its members (Demoze Degafa, 2007).

**School leader:** Refers to instructional leaders namely, principals, supervisors, department heads, unit leaders, and senior teachers that take part in the leadership of the teaching-learning and management (Sergiovanni, 2001)

### **1.8 Ethical Consideration**

Efforts were made to make the research process professional and ethical. To this end, the researcher was try to clearly inform to the respondents about the purpose of the study i.e., purely for academic. As he introduces its purpose in the introduction part of the questionnaire and interview guide to the respondents, he shall confirm to subjects, confidentiality was protected. The participants made to understand what were explained and be given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered by the researcher. The informed consent document must be written in lay language, avoiding any technical terminology.

The participant's consent to participate in the research must be voluntary, free of any coercion or promises of benefits unlikely to result from participation and no group should be disadvantaged by being excluded from consideration. In doing so, first the researcher go with official letter written from Addis Ababa University Educational Planning and Management Department to the Woreda Education Office and sample preparatory schools. Then the researcher explains the purpose of the study to the WEO and school principals to get permission to accomplish the work. Finally to start the study the researcher was introduced the objective and advantage of the study to the respondents to obtain their voluntarily participation; and also informed the information gained from the respondent, data obtained from the document and others will be kept confidential.

### **1.9 Organization of the Study**

This study was organized in to five chapters. Chapter one deals with the introductory part that includes background and statement of the problem, objectives, significance of the study, delimitation, and limitation of the study and definition of key terms. It was provide with an overview of the study and offer rationale around the topic, particularly the reasons why the topic is worth exploring. Chapter two is about review of related literature, in this chapter the research questions begin to clarify, using literature review as the vehicle. It was assisted in giving a clear picture of what to expect in the investigation. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to give a clear understanding of the nature of the problem being investigated which

is practice and challenges of instructional leadership in selected preparatory schools. Whereas chapter three discusses the design and methodology under which, design of the study, the research method, data sources, sample population and sampling techniques; the type of instrument and data analysis techniques used were discussed. Chapter four provides presentation, analysis and interpretation of the gathered data by discussing the sample population and its characteristics in order to understand the nature of the research findings. It is also relevant to show the significance and/or conclusions that relate to the literature in this instance and describe the main data obtained from the empirical investigation. And in the last chapter the whole research project is considered. In this regard the researcher gives the summaries, conclusions and recommendation of the study. Finally, lists of reference materials used in the study, questionnaires and interview guides were attached to the research document.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **Introduction**

Demands for improving student learning and performance is increasing and educational leaders are being urged to focus their effort on the core business of schooling-teaching and learning (Marx,2006).Instructional leadership can be conceptualized as a major part of a total operation of a school geared to bring about improvement in teaching-learning process. In the complex field of modern educational administration and management, the instructional leader acts as an essential means of expression for improving instruction and developing teacher's initiative, responsibility, creative, internal commitment and motivation. It has a pivotal position in improving quality of education and student growth.

Therefore, the purpose of this review of related literature is to provide conceptual framework on the concepts of school leadership, conceptual definition of instructional leadership, what make instructional leadership different from others, roles and responsibilities of instructional leaders, supervisory skills of instructional leadership, practices of instructional leadership, teaching- learning roles of instructional leadership, approaches of instructional supervision, the major challenges that affect the practices of instructional leadership and the overview of instructional leadership development in Ethiopia.

#### **2.1 The Concept of School Leadership**

Leadership is a broader concept where authority to lead does not reside only in one person, but can be distributed among different people within and beyond the school. School leadership can encompass people occupying various roles and functions such as principals, and assistant principals, supervisors, leadership teams, school governing boards and school level staff involved in leadership tasks (Pont et al., 2008).

As Bush and Glover (cited in Pont et al., 2008) depending on country contexts, the term school leadership is often used interchangeably with school management and school administration. Although the three concepts overlap, they are used with a difference in emphasis. While leadership involves steering organizations by shaping other people attitudes,

motivations and behaviors, management is more closely associated with maintenances of current operations.

Dimmock provides one of the few distinctions amongst these concepts whilst also acknowledging that there are competing definitions:

*School leaders [experience] tensions between competing elements of leadership, management and administration. Irrespective of how these terms are defined, school leaders experience difficulty in deciding the balance between higher order tasks designed to improve staff, student and school performance (leadership), and routine maintenance of present operations (management) and lower order duties (administration) (Dimmock, 1999: 442).*

Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989) defined that leadership is viewed as a process that includes influencing the task objective and strategies of a group or organization; influencing people in the organization to implement the strategies and achieve the objectives, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of the organization.

They emphasize:

*Outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of outstanding schools. There can no longer be doubt that those seeking quality in education must ensure its presence and that the development of potential leaders must be given high priority. (Beare, Caldwell & Millikan 1989:99).*

Hence, school leadership is a process that involves influencing the school societies that is, teachers, parents, community, students and other by one person or group of peoples(school leaders) for the overall school effectiveness and achievement of the school goals.

## **2.2 Conceptual Definitions of Instructional Leadership**

Fundamentally instructional leadership has no uniform definition that satisfies every one (Kruger, 2002). Different authors defined instructional leadership is perceived as the behaviors and actions taken by the principal so as to enhance learners achievement growth (Leithwood,1999 ).These actions include the provision of resource, staff development and

support, supervision and evaluation of instruction, protection of instruction time, and creation of an environment that is conducive for effective teaching and learning (Blasé and Blase,2000 and Hopkins,2001).The above definitions implies that instructional leadership means the behaviors of and actions taken by the principal towards ensuring effective teaching and learning, as well as the development and achievement of all learners. In doing so, the principal makes sure that the environment is conducive and positive for improved learner's achievement in the school. However, Conley (cited in Kruger, 2002) define instructional leadership as specific part of educational managers' function that is carried out by the school leaders to help and provide service to teachers both as individuals and group to improve instruction and there by improve student learning. All those involved in improving instructions for the purpose of promoting student achievement that can be assumed as the role of instructional leadership.

The role of school principals has been twisted as instructional leaders play a great role in giving direction, allocating resources, supporting teachers to improve school performance in the learning outcome rather than focusing on administrative issues (McEwen 2001:1). Moreover, as Blasé(1999) indicated effective instructional leaders who posses both managerial and instructional leadership qualities to create conducive learning environment; help teachers to improve classroom performance; maintain academic standards and stimulates students for higher academic achievements. Still Bennett and Anderson(2003:15-23),and Fullan (2001:145) extending the definition state that instructional leadership as function that emphasizes: goal and high students achievement; allocation of adequate resources for learning improvement; organization and coordination for effective and efficient outcome; and maintaining effective human relation to create collaboration and commitment among school members.

### **2.3 What makes Instructional Leadership Different from other leadership?**

The concept of instructional leadership to the role behavior of school leaders that give high priority for students improved learning and school's success in achieving their educational goals more clearly, it also can be attributed to the dimensions or practices of the leaders they play in: improving students and staff learning, setting and applying standard of excellence,

managing curriculum and instruction building strong school culture, creating conducive climate using data to identify and apply instruction improvement and sharing school responsibilities with concerned stake holders.

Instructional leadership as to McEwen (2001:61) is different from non-instructional leadership. Instructional leaders demonstrate two qualities i.e. symbolize leadership quality directly related to instruction and curriculum, and possess the ability of inducing people towards shared educational goals. Educational administrators, unlike instructional leaders, deal with both administrative routine and instructional issues focusing more on academic process. Therefore, instructional leaders unlike administrators are servant leaders that minister the need of school community and their environment. By ministering as Sergiovanni (2001:357) says, instructional leaders share values and purpose to school community; and encourage followers to leaders that end over to achieve common educational goals.

The management of educational institution is unique as compared to corporate organizations. The authorities like Chambel and others 1962, Bush, and others 1980, and Graft and Street 1995, cited in Ayallew (1991) assert that school organizations have educational objectives and value system difficult to define easily. Because, schools have human beings as their inputs that cannot be processed, staff that have similar training and qualification that makes evaluation difficult, above all, unlike non-educational organizations, school goals achievement is not easy to measure with respect to changes observed on student's behaviors. So, the unique features aforementioned and others characteristics differ school instructional leadership and responsibilities from non- educational organizations (Ayallew, 1991:6).

## **2.4 The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Leadership**

### **2.4.1 The Roles of Instructional Leadership**

Regarding to this idea, George E.Pawlos and Peter F.Oliver (2008) states that, the instructional leaders have to play the following important roles in the schools. These roles of instructional leadership are as follows: program coordination, program evaluation, direct assistance, action research, curriculum development.

**Program coordination:** In the role of program coordination instructional leaders coordinate program, groups, materials and reports. Since it is assumed that the instructional leaders is

knowledgeable about the details of the teaching-learning process to guide and direct teachers (Glickman,2004).In order to promote the professional growth of the staff, the instructional leader has to plan, organize, evaluate and conduct in service programs for teachers in consultation with the school management and teachers.

**Program evaluation:** In the role of evaluator the instructional leaders help teaching staff to address important issues of teaching-learning in the classroom and ensure the conditions for effective learning in the school. As evaluators, he/she helps teachers to identify, analyze, and solve learning problems, provide timely and constructive feedback, assessing teachers to identify strengths and weakness to guide them on the path for improvement (Hollinger and Murphy, 1985).

**Direct Assistance:** It can be used to gather classroom data on the extent to which moral principals are present in the classroom. Leaders can work with teachers to develop observational tools to describe classroom culture reflect on current conditions and engage in the classroom based improvement(McEwen,2003).The leaders gradually can increase teacher's decision making responsibility, empowering teachers and thus enhancing the teacher's capacity to empower students.

**Action Research:** It helps to gather data to assess the gap between the community vision of the school and current reality, plan for change aimed at bridging the gap, integrate the task of leadership to bring about change, evaluate results, and revise action plan in the cycle of continuous improvement (Glickman, 2004).

**Curriculum Development:** It can involve teachers by infusing moral principles throughout the curriculum. Teachers can design a curriculum that educates the whole child, teacher's compassion and justices including, all children in significant learning. As to (Weber, 1996) teachers can develop curriculum that can integrate learning within the school and connects academic learning with community service. Finally teachers can develop the curriculum that promote democratic community of learners in the present as well as in the future .Generally, the maintained above instructional leadership roles are used at the school level to improve students' learning, learning outcomes, teachers profession and produce a well educated citizens at all levels.

### **2.4.2 Responsibilities of Instructional Leaders**

A part from establishing a vision and setting goals, effective instructional leaders place high emphasis on achieving high level of student learning and provide resources towards the effort to improve the achievements and general well-being of the students (Waters et al., 2004). In practical, these leaders constantly encourage teachers and students to attain higher levels of academic achievements; adopt collaborative planning processes, problem solving and decision-making focus on school improvements while ensuring that all school development programs are geared to make all students learn. Other elements, emphasized by the instructional leaders in high-achieving school were: discussion of instructional issues including curriculum and instruction; classroom observations and feed back to teachers; support of teacher autonomy; and risk taking; provision of professional development opportunities together with recourse; protecting instructional time; monitoring student progress data for program improvements; and recognition and celebration of student and staff achievements (Waters, et al., 2004).

Research has shown that instructional leaders can make a difference in school and student performance if they are granted autonomy to make important decisions. However autonomy alone does not automatically lead to improvements unless it is well supported. In addition, it is important that the core responsibilities of instructional leaders be clearly defined and delimited. Instructional leadership responsibilities should be defined through an understanding of the practices most likely to improve teaching and learning.

Instructional leaders need time, capacity and support to focus on the practices most likely to improve learning. Greater degrees of autonomy should be coupled with new models of distributed leadership, new types of accountability, and training and development for instructional leadership. Instructional leadership frameworks can help provide guidance on the main characteristics, tasks and responsibilities of effective school leaders and signal the essential character of instructional leadership as leadership for learning. They can be a basis for consistent recruitment, training and appraisal of school leaders. Frameworks should clearly define the major domains of responsibility for school leaders and allow for

contextualization for local and school-level criteria. They should be developed with involvement by the profession.

#### **2.4.3 The Roles and Responsibilities of Principal as Instructional Leader**

As instructional leader, the principal is the pivotal point within the school who affects the quality of individual teacher instruction, the height of student achievement, and the degree of efficiency in school functioning. Responsibility and accountability for effective instructional outcome calls leaders to design better ways those students can learn and highest school outcome could be produced the role of the principal as instructional leaders through complex, over loaded and unclear in the past, now it is in the way of transition towards transformational leadership (Chell, 1991, p.311).

The role of principals as instructional leader is still in the state of transition from administrative emphasis to more instructional, democratic and participatory leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003). The pressure of globalization and social expectation is inducing principals take the lead in the instructional activities such as setting goals, leading academic programs, examining and evaluating teachers' performance.

According to, Heck (2006) "effective principals are expected to be effective instructional leaders . . . the principal must be knowledgeable about curriculum development, teacher and instructional effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development and teacher evaluation" 1987, p.217. Bryce (1983) and Fullan (1991) agree with this holistic view of the principal's role. However, Fullan expands this holistic definition of leadership and management to be: an active, collaborative form of leadership where the principal works "with teachers to shape the school as a workplace in relation to shared goals, teachers collaboration, teacher learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teacher commitment, and student learning" p.163. Bernd (1992) states that "increased teacher involvement in school decisions are effective tools for focusing the staff on student's outcomes". Hallinger (1989) speaks of leadership teams at the secondary level to help carry out the critical functions of curriculum and instructional coordination and supervision.

Therefore, the contemporary thinking of facilitative instructional leadership requires school leaders to have vision, quality and value to transforming their school towards envisioned

success. (Smith, 2003, p.321). Thus, elaborations of instructional leadership dimensions that support learning centered schools building can be tapped from the work of Dimmock (2000). The components include the following focus areas of the leader. Goal emphasis particularly towards students learning outcome, technical knowledge and management of effective teaching and learning, knowledge and management of technology, computer, internet and etc, knowledge and management of organization structure for service, capacity and willingness to desirable model behaviors, building organizational culture that value learning of all, leadership of human resource and management of other resource, monitoring and reviewing performance in the school accountability and strategies for organizational change and innovations that contribute for building learning centered School. (Brundret, Burton, & smith, 2003; p.12-13). Similarly, Weber (cited in Lashway, 2007, p.34) identified the following main functions that instructional leader, conducive learning climate, providing feedback of class and evaluation of instructional performances.

In addition to this, Fullan (1991) perceives the role of the principal, in models of the future, will be to encourage collaborative groupings of teachers to play a more central role in the instructional leadership of the school. This, however, will require active participation of the principal to facilitate change by motivating the staff and students, by reaching out to the community, and by continually improving the school. The assumption inherent, here, is that effective leaders manage and lead (Fullan, 1991; Moorthy, 1992). In contrast, Highsmith and Rallis (1986) appear to disagree with the above statements by stating that "school management and instructional leadership are two separate tasks that cannot be performed by a single individual" , but they strongly agree with the idea of teacher empowerment where teachers have significant input into decisions concerning instruction, arguing that well managed schools "enable real instructional leaders to empower teachers who can create the effective schools reformers are seeking" .

#### **2.4.4 The Roles and Responsibilities of Teachers as Instructional Leaders**

Several authors have provided definitions of teacher leadership that clearly delineate the differences with traditional leadership approaches. For example, Wasley (1991) defines

teacher leadership as ‘the ability to encourage colleagues to change, to do things they wouldn’t ordinarily consider without the influence of the leader’. In contrast to traditional notions of leadership, teacher leadership is characterized by a form of collective leadership in which teachers develop expertise by working collaboratively (Boles & Troen, 1994).

A number of different roles have been suggested for teacher leaders that further explain the distinctive nature of the leadership activity. Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) indicated that teacher leadership as having three main aspects: these are; leadership of students or other teachers, leadership of operational tasks and leadership through decision making or partnership. Leadership of students or other teachers: facilitator, coach, mentor, trainer, curriculum specialist, creating new approaches, leading study groups. Leadership of operational tasks: keeping the school organized and moving towards its goals, through roles as head of department, action researcher, member of task forces. Leadership through decision making or partnership: member of school improvement teams, member of committees, instigator of partnerships with business, higher education institutions and parent–teacher associations. In connection to this, Gehrke (1991) also identifies quite similar functions of teacher leaders such as continuously improving their own classroom teaching; organizing and leading reviews of school practice; providing curriculum development knowledge; participating in in-school decision making; giving in-service training to colleagues; and participating in the performance evaluation of teachers.

Furthermore, Harris (2002) suggests that there are four discernible and discrete dimensions of the teacher leadership role. The first dimension concerns the way in which teachers translate the principles of school improvement into the practices of individual classrooms. This brokering role remains a central responsibility for the teacher as leader. It ensures that links within schools are secure and that opportunities for meaningful development among teachers are maximized. A second dimension of the teacher leader role focuses upon participative leadership where all teachers feel part of the change or development and have a sense of ownership. Teacher leaders may assist other teachers to cohere around a particular development and to foster a more collaborative way of working (Blase & Anderson, 1995). They work with colleagues to shape school improvement efforts and take some lead in guiding teachers towards a collective goal. A third dimension of teacher leadership in school

improvement is the mediating role. Teacher leaders are important sources of expertise and information. They are able to draw critically upon additional resources and expertise if required and to seek external assistance. Finally, a fourth and possibly the most important dimension of the teacher leadership role are forging close relationships with individual teachers through which mutual learning takes place.

Finally, according to Ash and Persall (2000) teacher leadership roles have been identified as curriculum developers, bid writers, leaders of a school improvement team, mentors of new or less experienced staff, action researchers with a strong link to the classroom and spend most of their time in the classroom but take on different leadership roles at different times, following the principles of formative leadership.

Barth (1999) also sees teacher leadership extending beyond just collaborating or participating in decision making. He views teacher leadership as fulfilling some of the functions possibly undertaken by senior management, including: choosing textbooks and instructional materials; shaping the curriculum setting standards for pupil behaviour; deciding on tracking; designing staff development programs; setting promotion and retention policies; deciding school budgets; evaluating teacher performance; selecting new teachers; and selecting new administrators.

#### **2.4.5 The Roles and Responsibilities of Department Heads as Instructional Leaders**

It is increasingly the case that heads of departments, subject leaders and subject coordinators are expected to exercise leadership. Since 1998, there has been a radical shift in the role and responsibilities of curriculum subject and departmental leaders. The Subject Leader Standards represent a major redefinition of the role, expectations and performance of leaders at departmental and subject level. The standards highlight the importance of high-quality teaching and improved standards of achievement (Teacher Training Agency 1998). They also acknowledge the importance of ‘establishing high standards of teaching and learning in their subject as well as playing a major role in the development of school policy’.

Team leaders have a powerful influence over classroom practices and are important gatekeepers to change and development within their subject areas. The Subject Leader

Standards acknowledge the centrality of the subject leader in contributing to whole-school policy and development. The overall purpose of the subject leader's role is to contribute to school improvement and increased standards of performance through the provision of high-quality teaching within the subject area. To achieve this, the subject leader has to lead and manage the curriculum and to respond to the internal and external demands for accountability and quality. All of these demands have to be met in the particular context of the individual school and the community it serves.

#### **2.4.6 The Roles and responsibilities of Supervisors as Instructional leaders**

Supervisor's roles vary from locality to locality and from country to country. They are defined by the superintendents to whom the supervisors are responsible and, as happens in most positions of leadership, by the supervisors themselves. A supervisor assists teachers in the improvement of instruction, curriculum planning and improvement, and personal professional growth and development. According to Glickman (2004) some of the roles of supervisors are as follow: coordinator, consultant, group leader, evaluators etc.

**As coordinator:** the supervisor serves as a coordinator of program, groups, materials, and reports. It is the supervisor who acts as a link between program and people, and he/she knows the disparate pieces of the educational process and directs the actions of others to make the pieces bring together. As a director of the staff development, the supervisor plans with teachers, arranges, evaluates, and often conducts in-service programs for teachers.

**As consultant:** the supervisor serves in a consulting capacity as a specialist in curriculum, instructional methodology, and staff development. In this capacity, he/she renders serves to both teachers and groups and at the same times, the supervisor may simply furnish necessary information and suggestions. At other times, the supervisor may help teachers to define, set, and pursue goals. The supervisor should be a prime source of assistance to teachers wishing to improve either their generic or specialized teaching skills. Though some will disagree with us, we believe the supervisor-consultant should be able to demonstrate a repertoire of teaching strategies.

**As group leader:** supervisor works continuously to release the potential of groups seeking to improve the curriculum, instruction, or themselves to perform this role the supervisor must

be knowledgeable about group dynamics and demonstrate leadership skills. The supervisor assists groups in consensus building, in moving toward group goals, and in perfecting the democratic process. Finally as a group leader supervisor seeks, identifies, fosters leadership from within the group.

**As evaluator:** the supervisor provides assistance to teachers in evaluating instruction and curriculum. The supervisor helps teachers find answers to curriculum and instructional problems identify research studies that may have a bearing on their problems, and conduct limited research projects. Additionally, the supervisor helps teachers evaluate their classroom performance, assess their own strengths and weaknesses, and select means of overcoming their deficiencies.

### **2.5 Supervisory Skills of Instructional Leaders**

As per the positions they maintain in the organizations, supervisors are said to be managers who manage employees performing the most basic job duties required in the organizations. Supervisors' management success and leadership effectiveness largely depend up on their three basic supervisory skills. These skills are sometimes called human energy, and they take the form of human abilities, and behavior experienced or exercised by everyone at his own level of responsibilities. They are all applicable in all work of schools, be it elementary or secondary levels. Katz in Sergiovanni and Starratt (1999) identified three basic skills up on which successful instructional supervision rest on: namely, technical, human and conceptual skills. Though these three basic skills are intrinsically permeating one another, it is hardly possible to perceive their differences

**Technical Skill:** Of the three basic skills, technical skill is one of the major components of supervisory behavior (Harris, 1963:4).technical skill in supervisory leadership is displayed as a knowledge of teaching, knowledge of the profession of teaching knowledge of the wider concept of educational service and the working of the particular local education authority, and knowledge of particular subjects. Adding to this, Griffiths (1956:2) defined technical skills as follows: an understanding of, and proficiency in as specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques. Technical skill draws upon specialized knowledge, analytical ability in the use of tools and techniques of the specific discipline.

Regarding the skills mentioned above, Griffin (2000) viewed as specialized knowledge, analytical ability to use tool and techniques of particular tasks. Monolake (cited in Glickman, 2005) brought to the surface that supervisors spend a major portion of their time as advisors in the technical domain. He further foreword those instructional supervisors as technical advisor deals with their concerns in variety of ways. they can serve as source of specific ideas and activities; plan with teachers' new activities' or instructional unit; actually work with teachers in the classroom; demonstrate techniques of activities and allow the teachers to observe and critique the episodes; offer teachers feedback through visiting classroom followed by conferences. Technical skills are the characteristics of administrative supervisory behaviour that are concerned with things in the school setting.

**Human skill:** It refers to supervisors' ability and judgment in working with and through people. Regarding to this, Lucio (1962) noted that the supervisor test his ways of acting in the arena of interpersonal relations, how he/she behaves with others, and how he/she assesses his/her own strengths, lacks, successes and failures, determines the kind of skills he/she develops in working with others. He sees to the fact that a primary responsibility in developing human relation skills is to one self. Therefore, the supervisors must make themselves the most educated, objective minded and responsible persons. So it is not surprising to hear that they can give to others only after giving to themselves, i.e., they are culturally and humanly expanding persons. As they develop a rich body of knowledge, both for and about themselves, they can use their experiences and knowledge with others, incorporating new skills and understandings in to their behavior and rejecting ineffective ones. These skills require self-understanding and acceptance as well as consideration for others. As remarked by Griffin (2000) human relation skill concern to the executrixes' ability to work effectively as group members and build cooperative effort within the teams of the school staff.

**Conceptual skill:** It is the part of professional skills that pertain to the supervisor's ability to view the school and its instructional program as whole including the effective mapping of the interdependence between the components of the school as organizational system; educational program as instructional system and the human organization as a functioning system. Supporting the above idea, Griffiths (1956) defined the conceptual skill as follows: the ability

to see the organization as a whole; it includes recognition how the various functions of the organization depend on another, and how changes in any one part affect all the others. Recognizing those relationships and perceiving the significant elements in any situation, the supervisor should then be able to act in a way which advances the overall welfare of the total organization. In short, the supervisor should be able to conceptualize the environment, the organization and his/her own job so that, the supervisors can set appropriate and relevant goals for the organizational achievement.

Generally, the above three instructional leadership supervisory skills are used to help school leaders to create an environment and situation which can lead them to practice effective instructional leadership role in their respective schools.

### **2.6 Approaches to Instructional Supervision**

Depending on the supervisor's behaviour and supervisory practices instructional leaders, involve many supervisory approaches such as: directive, in directive or supportive approach on different situations. Oliva and Paulos (1997) specify the directive, in directive and collegial behaviours of supervisors as: a supervisor who mainly depend on directives behaviour practices, providing specifics who, what, when, where and how.

According to Cogan (cited in Glickman, 2004) there are variety of approaches in implementing instructional supervision. He provides options for instructional supervision to be used depending on the needs and circumstances of the teachers. Therefore, instructional leaders can follow different supervisory approaches to improve the students learning depending on the culture of the schools and on the teachers' professional development. What tasks are there for supervisors to assist teachers improve instruction seems a fundamental question. The tasks of supervision that can bring about improved instruction can be materialized in a variety of ways but in this review, the researchers will focus on direct assistance to classroom teachers through clinical, collegial, informal, self direct and inquire based supervisions will be treated.

**Clinical Supervision:** According to Cogan (1973) it is the rational practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance and it is an approach of instructional supervision which draws its data from first hand observation of actual teaching events and

involves face to face interaction between the supervisor and the teachers in the analysis of teaching behaviors and activities for instructional improvement.

According to Gold Hammer and Anderson (cited in Glickman, Ross and Gordon 2004) have identified some feature of clinical supervision as a concept. They have asserted that: clinical supervision is a technology for improving instruction, it is a deliberate intervention in to the instruction process, goal oriented combining school needs with the personal growth needs of those who work with in the school, it assumed a professional working relationship between teachers and supervisors, and that the supervisors knows a great deal about productive human interaction.

One powerful approach for instructional leaders to help teachers learns and improves their practices to engage in clinical supervision. Clinical supervision is partnership strength (Sergivoanni, 2001).it take different formats but always involves on in depth examination and careful study of selected teaching issues the collection of data that help teacher understand these issues and development of improved practice. Clinical supervision is carried out through the stages of five steps that are repeated to form an ongoing cycle. The five stages are as follow: pre observation, class observation, analysis of conference, post observation and post conference analysis.

**Collegial Supervision:** Glutton (cited in Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2002) has described this approach as moderately formalized process by which two or more teachers agree to work for their own professional growth, usually by observing each other's classroom, giving each other's feedback about the observation and discussion shared professional concerns and it is an approach of teachers helping teachers since teachers naturally turn to each other for help, more often than to a supervisor and supervisions concerned primarily with improving instruction, teachers helping teachers have become a well received way of assuring direct assistance to every staff members in school system.

Like any other supervisory practices, peer coaching program should have clear goals, purposes and objectives, the objectives should contribute to the larger school goals of improving instruction, in turn, peer coaching program without clearly defined purpose and goals will not provide for good preparation. Generally, collegial supervision extends

supervision well beyond classroom observation. It also provides a setting in which teacher can informally discuss problems they faced, share ideas, help one another in preparing lessons, exchange the tips of the device and materials, and provide other support to one another (Glickman,2004).

**Informal Supervision:** The casual encounters that occurs between supervisors and teachers. It is characterized by frequent informal visits to teachers' classroom to make conversation with teachers about their work and other informal activities. Typically no appointments are made and classroom visits are not announced because they are considered as the normal part of the work flow of the school.

**Self Direct Supervision:** As Glickman (2004) suggested that in self directed supervision, teacher work alone by assuming responsibility for their professional development. For example, they develop yearly plan that includes goals derived from an assessment of their own needs.

**Inquiry Based Supervision:** According to Sergiovanni (1999) inquiry based supervision is the form of action research options that can be represented an individual initiative or the collaborative efforts as pairs (teachers working to solve problems).Generally, the above five approaches of instructional supervision are used at the school to improve the quality of teachers, instruction, and to create a well educated citizens at all levels.

## **2.7 Practice of Instructional Leadership**

Mostly outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of exceptional schools. Schools with successful and effective leaderships are generally characterized by the way they setting vision and defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising and evaluating instruction, providing professional skill development, and creating conducive and healthy school environment (Murphy,1990).

### **2.7.1 Setting School Vision and Defining the School Mission**

#### **2.7.1.1 Setting the school vision**

A core function of school leadership is to create a common vision for improving students' learning. Creating a learning organization requires a deep rethinking of the leader's role.

Instructional leaders must see themselves as 'learning leaders' responsible for helping schools develop the capacity to carry out their mission. A crucial part of this role is cultivating and maintaining a shared vision which provides focus, generating questions that apply to everyone in the organization. Learning becomes a collaborative, goal-oriented task rather than a generalized desire to 'stay current'(Peter, 1990).

Peter (1990) also notes that coherent vision specifies the particular values and beliefs that will guide policy and practice within the school. Ideally, the school board and superintendent set a broad vision for all schools in the district, and, within that context, the principal coordinates the process of arriving at a particular vision for each school. The creation of a vision is not a static event, because the vision must change as culture changes.

Vision is increasingly regarded as an important component of leadership. There are different views about whether vision is an essential aspect of school leadership or, rather, a feature which distinguishes successful from less successful leaders. Beare, et al. (1989), for example, say that “outstanding leaders have a vision of their schools a mental picture of a preferred future which is shared with all in the school community”. However, Bennis and Nanus (1985), they articulate 10 ‘emerging generalization’s about leadership, four of which relate directly to vision. These are: - outstanding leaders have a vision for their organizations; vision must be communicated in a way which secures commitment among members of the organization; communication of vision requires communication of meaning and attention should be given to institutionalizing vision if leadership is to be successful.

Articulation and communication of the vision need to be supported by a process of ‘implanting’ the vision. The instructional leaders should work with others to implant the vision in the structures and processes of the school, something that calls for the technical and human skills of policymaking and planning. These generalizations are essentially normative views about the centrality of vision to effective leadership (South worth, 1997).

Responsible and accountable school leaders develop clear visions which focus on students’ academic achievements. Their activity inspires and leads new and challenging innovations. These leaders also establish clear goals and keep them in front of attention such leaders expect high performance with achievable goals and objectives through planning and

organizing (Leith wood, et al., 2006). Hatcher and Hyle (1996) investigated instructional leadership strategies and their relationship with achieving higher standard by students. They have concluded that excellent instructional leaders are very important and they are a vital part of effective's schools in bringing schools up to high standards of students achievement as expected and demand by most educators and communities. Accordingly, instructional leaders need to lead the teachers, students and community for creating excellent schools by collaborative establishing vision, developing trust, earning respect for school communities.

According to Day, et al. (2010) successful instructional leaders have very strong and clear vision and set of values for their school, which heavily influenced their actions and the actions of others and established a clear sense of direction and purpose for the school. These were shared widely, clearly understood and supported by all staff. They were a touchstone against which all new developments, policies or initiatives were tested.

#### **2.7.1.2 Defining the School Mission**

Mission is what the school desires and tries to accomplish. It guides and controls the school's activities that it values. Krug (1992: 432) emphasized the importance of mission for the success of the leader and the school when he suggested "operating without a clear sense of mission is like beginning a journey without having a destination in mind." Recent literatures on effective schools and effective leadership also placed the act of defining a school's mission as the primary task of school leaders (Clayton, 1994: Hoyel, 1988 and Bell, 1992). This refers to the leader's role in framing school-wide goals to which the school will focus its resources during a given school year (Wilson and Firestone, 1987: 22).

Despite the existence of many more goals that pursue school resources, instructionally effective schools generally have a clearly defined mission or sets of goals which focus on student learning and achievement (Walker and Murphy, 1986: 79; Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991: 219). Such goals may be stated as: "taking students to their fullest intellectual potential" (Esmonds, 1982: 13) or "the provision of thorough and systematic intellectual training in the fundamental disciplines ..." (Larkin and Kritek, 1982: 17).Such emphasis on fewer goals to which staff energy and other school resources are mobilized, increase the effectiveness of the school and the leaders.

For the practicality of school goals, leaders along with the staff members need to assess the past and present status of students' performances past experience of the school and resource flexibility while developing them (Guthrie and Reed, 1991: 221). Adjacently, leaders of effective schools frame the school goals in terms of staff and student responsibilities to ensure their achievement (Hallinger, 1985: 218).

After defining the school goals, leaders are expected to build understanding of and commitment to those goals by communicating them widely and systematically to teachers, students and parents (Walker and Murphy, 1986: 79; Edmonds, 1982: 13). To this end, leaders discuss and revise the goals with staff on a regular basis during the school year, especially in the context of instructional, curricular and budgetary decisions (Hallinger, 1985: 218). Both formal communication channels (eg. displaying on notice board, placing up over the entrance of the school, the school handbook, assemblies) and informal ones (eg. parent conferences, teacher conferences, curricular meetings, other discussions with staff) can be used to communicate the school's primary purpose (Edmonds, 1982: 13). The leader, therefore, through his/her articulation and dissemination of goals, can promote both accountability and instructional improvement in the school. This in turn improves students' achievement (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987: 57).

According to Weber (1996) the school mission as a dynamic process that tells the purpose or reason for the school's existence. The school mission serves as a basis for assessing the organizations performance, setting the priorities, strategies, and plans of the organization with binding the staff, the students and parents to common vision. It is the task of instructional leaders to develop the mission statement in partnership with the school community which describes who, what and where of the school (Murphy, 1990).

In general, leaders of effective schools work to develop a clear statement of mission where their schools are going, and understand how to build commitment to that mission. They have also the know how to disseminate it to staff, students, parents and others.

### **2.7.2 Managing Curriculum and Instruction**

Curriculum and instruction are components of schooling to which educational leaders should pay attention (Guthrie and Reed, 1991:209). In managing curriculum and instruction, school leaders need not be specialists in all areas of subjects. Their great responsibility lies on the provision of necessary conditions that make teaching possible (Knezevich, 1969:378). The instructional leaders' repertoire of instructional practices and classroom supervision offers teachers the needed resources to provide students with opportunities to be successful. The leaders help teachers to use the best practices and instructional strategies to reach school goals for student's performance. Managing the instructional program involves working directly with teachers in area related to curriculum and instruction (Hollinger and Murphy 1985). Therefore, instructional leaders promote quality instruction by conducting teaching conferences and evaluating, visiting classroom, providing specific suggestions and feedback on the teaching-learning process and determining teachers assignments in the best interests of the student learning.

### **2.7.3 Supervising and Evaluating Instruction**

Various writers' defined supervision in different ways. Typically supervision is the activity carried out by instructional leaders that over see the improvement of instructional process progress of learners, and professional development of teachers and school development in general. Haughty and McEwen (1992) defined supervision as general leadership function that coordinates and manages those school activities concerned with learning. They emphasize instructional supervision as fundamental component of instructional leadership, viewing this role as imperative to improve instruction and students achievements. They are also pointed out that there is general agreement among writers that, the focus of instructional supervision is the enhancement of students learning but it is in the practice that they differ.

Eye and Netzer (1985:23) states that supervision as a phase in school administration that mainly focuses on the provision of instruction in the classroom to achieve educational standards formally set. It involves integration of class room instruction and management with teachers, curriculum development, and team development and action research, all for improving learning outcomes (Olive and Paulos, 1997:11, Sergiovanni, 2001:254)

Observing and improving instruction starts with the principal establishing trusting and respectful relationship with the school staff. Weber (1996) proposed that observations are opportunities for professional interaction. These interactions provide professional development opportunity for both the observer and the one being observed.

Generally, the task and functions of instructional leadership are used at the school level to improve the quality of education, teachers and instruction and create well educated citizens at all levels.

#### **2.7.4 Monitoring Instructional Program**

The school's primary product is a population of the graduates who have the technical and life skills they need to cope up in increasing competitive world. Good instructional leaders to be aware of the variety of the ways in which students' progress can and should be assessed. Even more importantly, principals need to use assessment results in ways that help teachers and students improve and that help parents understand where and why improvement is needed.

Assessing the instructional program is essential for improvement of the instructional program (Weber, 1996). The instructional management job function of monitoring student progress refers to the principal use of test results for setting goals, assessing the curriculum, evaluating instruction, and measuring progress toward school goals (Hollinger and Murphy, 1985).

The instructional leader initiates and contributes to the planning, designing, administering and analysis of assessments that evaluates the effectiveness of the curriculum. This continuous scrutiny of the instructional program enables teachers to effectively meet students need through constant revision and refinement.

#### **2.7.5 Creating Conducive and Healthy School Environment**

School leaders' ability to select their teaching staff is central to their ability to establish a school culture and capacity conducive to better student performance. Lack of school leader involvement in recruiting and dismissing teachers may reduce their capacity to respond and it is difficult to hold school leaders accountable for learning outcomes when they have no say in selecting their staff (Weber et al., 1996).

A growing number of educators are focusing their efforts on improving the work environment of teaching. In place of the typical school's norms and practices that isolate teachers from one another, some schools are initiating new norms and practices that encourage teachers to cooperate with one another and with administrators on school improvement. The primary goal of these "collaborative schools" is effective teaching and learning; other objectives are that teachers will be accorded respect as professionals and that staff harmony will increase.

School leaders can promote collaboration by such simple expedients as involving school members in setting the agenda for school meetings, giving school committees a meaningful role in matters of curriculum and instruction, and helping teachers to coordinate their schedules so that they have time to observe each other teach and provide each other with feedback on their observations. Although formal structures and strategies can facilitate collaboration, collaboration ultimately depends on the development of norms of cooperation among the school's personnel. In this area the principal can lead by example. When teachers see the principal actively seeking their help and helping them to improve in their profession, they are likely to work with one another to improve their teaching. Because the principal plays such a crucial role in promoting norms of collaboration, he or she must actually exercise stronger leadership than would be necessary where norms of isolation prevail. A number of studies have shown that principals in collaborative schools are more actively involved in observing and evaluating teachers and in working with teachers on curriculum and scheduling than are principals in schools where teachers traditionally are isolated in their classrooms (Davis, 1986).

According to Weber (1996), healthy school environment for teaching and learning reflect confidence, trust and mutual respect for cooperation between staff, students, governments, parents and wider community is essential for purposeful effort and achievement. Best school leaders encourage good working relationship and overcome the worst effects by contrasting on developing positive environment, high achievement and progress. Murphy, (1990) indicated that good school leadership advocate, nurture and sustain school environment and instructional program conducive to students' learning and professional growth. In schools with such atmosphere principals treat all individuals with dignity and respect; make decisions

based on data from stockholders, skilled on problem solving and conflict resolution, finally flexible in dealing with students learning needs.

Townsend (1997) conducted a comparative study between America and Australian schools on factors which mostly help the schools to be effective and concludes that an effective schools primarily characterized by good leadership and staff, good policies and a safe and/or supportive atmosphere in which staff, parents and students are encouraged to work as teams toward common goals. Purkey and Smith (1985: 341) have identified school leadership as one of the major factors in improving academic performance. They clarify that this factors emphasize strong leadership from administrator, teachers or integrated teams are important in initiating and maintaining the improvement processes.

According to MOE (2006) parents can play an important role in improving and maintaining the school, including the classrooms, the sports field, the tree plantations, the vegetable gardens, the nursery, etc. this can be particularly important if parents feel that their contributions of knowledge, contribute to a building fund, to enable schools to increase their classrooms. This is usually done through a monetary contribution.

### **2.8 Teaching-Learning roles Instructional Leadership**

In detail studies of teachers perceptions about characteristics of school principals that influence teacher's classroom instruction have conclude that the behaviours associated with instructional leadership positively influence classroom instructions (Larson-knight, 2000). Especially, Blasé and Blasé (1999) findings indicate that when instructional leaders monitor and provide feedback on the teaching learning process, there were increases in teacher reflection and reflectively informed. Instructional behaviours, in implementations of new ideas, greater variety in teaching strategic, more responses to students diversity, lessons were prepared and planned more carefully teachers were more likely to take risks and more focus on the instructional process, and teachers used professional discretion to make changes in classroom practice.

According to Chris peel, (1992, p.231) instructional leadership behaviours associated with promoting professional growth and staff development yield positive effects on classroom practice. Conversely, instructional leaders that did not engage in monitoring and providing

feedback of the teaching-learning process had negative effect on teachers and classroom practices (Blasé and Blasé, 1998). In particular leaders that engage in behaviours that inform staff about current trends and issues, encourage attendance at workshops, seminar and conferences, build a culture of collaboration and learning, promote coaching, use inquiry to drive staff development, set, professional growth goal with teachers, and provide resources foster teacher innovation in using a variety of methods, materials, instructional strategies, reflective practice, and technology in the classroom. Locke and Latham (1990) assert that goal setting is effective way to increase motivation and performance. They postulate that goals increased attention to obtainment of the task, increase the effort expended on goals relevant to activities, increase persistent to achieve, increase the development of strategies to obtain the goal. This is true even loosely coupled organizations, such as public schools.

In relation to this, many writers explain that frequent communication of school goals by instructional leaders promotes accountability, a sense of personal ownership, and instructional improvement. A principal that define and communicate shared goals with teachers provides organizational structures that guide the school toward a common focus. This common focus on academic press challenges teacher's behaviours within the classroom, which leads to more effective schools.

### **2.8.1 Promoting Professional Skill Development**

Instructional leaders can play a key role in providing and promoting in-service professional development programs for teachers. It is essential that instructional leaders understand this aspect of leadership as one of their key responsibilities. They can ensure that teacher professional development is relevant to the local school context and aligned with overall school improvement goals and with teachers' needs. To enhance school leaders' capacity to promote staff development, policy makers should emphasize the core responsibility of teacher professional development and consider devolving discretion over training and development budgets to the school level so that school leaders can offer and coordinate meaningful professional learning opportunities for all their teachers (Leithwood et al., 2006).

In-service training at school level is one of the means to achieve professional development of teachers. The school leaders and supervision committee can deliver the training to all

teachers of the school. Through the training, teachers could share useful ideas and experiences, acquaint with new teaching methodologies and curriculum innovations, develop mutual support and stand for common goals. To attain those activities, training programs have to be participatory. In addition, programs have to be supported by variety of teaching materials. Moreover, sharing experiences and communal problem solving activities should be central to the training program. Schools that aim to build capacity and to generate professional learning communities will need to provide regular opportunities for teachers to engage in meaningful professional development. Professional development is continuous learning that it is the sum total of formal and informal learning pursued and experienced by the teacher, often under conditions of challenge. If the use of new practices is to be sustained and changes are to endure in schools, then teachers need to be able to engage in professional development that is collaborative and meaningful. Working collaboratively not only reduces the sense of isolation many teachers feel, but also enhances the quality of the work produced. Working as part of a professional development community helps focus attention on shared purpose and the goals that lead to school improvement and dynamic change (Harris & Muijs, 2005).

There are several important messages about the role of professional development in building leadership capacity for school improvement: It is important to foster deep collaboration and not superficial cooperation among the teaching staff; partnerships within schools and to network with other schools and agencies; generate teacher leadership and pupil leadership; provide opportunities for teacher enquiry and action research; allocate time for personal reflection and opportunities for teachers to talk together about teaching and learning; generate the collective capability, expertise and commitment of teachers to ensure that all teachers are involved.

Engaging regularly in continuing professional development is widely recognized as the tangible expression of the commitment to learn, and is essential if professionals at every level in the school are to remain up to date in their knowledge of the curriculum, be wise in their selection and use of a selection of pedagogical skills, be enthusiastic about their work and the students they teach, and be self-confident and clear about their purposes (Harris & Muijs, 2005).

Many country practices and evidence from different sources show that instructional leaders need specific training to respond to broadened roles and responsibilities. Strategies need to focus on developing and strengthening skills related to improving school outcomes and provide room for contextualization. Leadership development is broader than specific programs of activity or intervention. It requires a combination of formal and informal processes throughout all stages and contexts of leadership practice. This implies coherently supporting the school leadership career through the following stages (Pont et al., 2008).

**Encourage initial leadership training:** Whether initial training is voluntary or mandatory can depend on national governance structures. Governments can define national programs, collaborate with local level governments and develop incentives to ensure that school leaders participate. In countries where the position is not tenured, a trade-off must be found to make it worthwhile for principals to invest time in professional development. Efforts also need to be made to find the right candidates.

**Organize induction programs:** Induction programs are particularly valuable to prepare and shape initial school leadership practices, and they provide vital networks for principals to share concerns and explore challenges. These programs should provide a combination of theoretical and practical knowledge and self-study.

**Ensure in-service training to cover need and context:** In-service programs need to be seen in the context of prior learning opportunities for school leadership. Where there are no other initial requirements, basic in-service programs should encourage development of leadership skills. In-service training should be also offered periodically to principals and leadership teams so they can update their skills and keep up with new developments. Networks (virtual or real) also provide informal development for principals and leadership teams.

Educational leader examine the most appropriate training delivery methods with staff, monitor and evaluate impact of self training in the school. In this case, the staff professional confidence and competence increase, improve the teachers, and school's ability to identify students need. The professional development program support newly qualified and recently appointed members of staff. Skilled leaders use career entry profile and use senior colleagues as mentors to assist in teachers' professional development. They also encourage staff to

undertaken long term course in planning, leading and organizing for principals that prepare their further roles. So, the professional skill development enables the staff to gain broader experience.

### **2.8.2 Building Effective Relationship in Schools**

In institutional setting like schools everything starts with relationships, whether those relationship are among ideas (Marx,2006:135).Teachers, administrators, supervisions, students and parents need to come together to define their aspiration, design procedures for decision making, the mobilization of resources and the evaluation of learning outcomes. The role of instructional leader in team building and developing team cohesion is aimed at defining common goals. In school setting everyone wants to be safe, to be appreciated, to be accepted as part of the school community and be recognized as contributing to the school effectiveness.

### **2.8.3 Conflict Management role of instructional leaders in school**

According to Barge (1994) conflict is a social phenomenon that is heavily ingrained inhuman relation, expressed and sustained through communication and occurs when individuals or groups became dependent on one another to meet identified needs. The social context of the school is comprised of different groups, with different and sometimes opposing interests but interdependent on each other, the existence of conflict is inevitable. Effective managers and school principals need to understand the nature of conflict and develop practical skill to manage it. Leaders who are skilled in the arts of resolving conflict are prepared to deescalate the rhetoric and posturing on both sides of the dispute and substitute search for solutions that give each side of the opportunity to compromise without losing face. Such leaders go to the root of the communication breakdown, whether it is anger, fear, mistrust or differing assumption and definitions. They press each side to understand the way others perceive the problem, recognizing that how an adversary perceives the problem. Therefore, instructional leader generate alternative solutions to solve the problem in the school setting.

## 2.8.4 Instructional Leadership and School Climate

Basically some scholars of educational management, for instance Halpin and Craft (in Hoy, Tarter and Kott Kamp 1991) suggest two dimension of school climate. These are as follows: principal's behaviours and teacher's perceptions.

### 2.8.4.1 Principals Behaviour

This dimensions deals with the manner of principals interacts with teachers, students and parents. This is to large extent seems to be affect the way teachers interact with one another, with students and parents. This interaction has a considerable impact on the general atmosphere of the school. Halpin (1996) identifies three characteristics of principal behaviour.

**Production Emphasis:** Halpin (1996) states that production emphasis is the authoritarian and controlling behaviour of some principals which make them to be rigid. According to Silver (1983) production emphasis ranges from very strong to no emphasis. A principal who emphasizes production very strongly believe that, people work best under tension and pressure. He/she also believe that when all attention is directed to work, it minimizes personal clashes that sometimes occur among the staff. He/she believe that social and psychological needs of the teachers are met when they are dedicated and committed to their work. This type of principal behaviour influences how the staff will discharge their responsibilities and it will ultimately affect the school. However, Paisey (1992) argues that if there is no emphasis on production the staff may not be concerned about the accomplishment of the school goal.

**Consideration Emphasis:** Halpin (1996) state that, consideration has to be done with how the principal relates and responds to staff and their needs; having personal interest in things that concern his staff, students and parents, even if it means of scarifying sometimes to do this he/she shows sympathy when the need arises and celebrates teachers, parents, and pupils is the heart of the school leadership. Therefore, for the head teachers to be effective, he/she must relate to stakeholders in the way that demonstrates his/her concern for them. Rooley (2003) and Heller (2002) opine that, students and teachers function effectively when their basic needs are met and this contributes to caring environment in which every body cares for one another and invariably foster excellent teaching-learning principal's differ in this aspect,

they range from being highly considerate is the most effective because the development of positive personal relationship with the entire school is the core of school leadership.

**Thrust:** Halpin (1966) describe thrust as the way some principals act as a role model for the type of behaviour they expect of their staff. They set the standard and support the staff so as to maintain the standard. Thrust is characterized by the following: the principal is hard working; the staffs are both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, the staff work hard and enjoy their work. The principal behaviour may range from showing high thrust to no thrust. The principal with high thrust influences the school climate positively; all activities are focused and directed to achieving the school goals, both teachers and pupils enjoy teaching and learning. Robbins (2001) maintains that the principal with no thrust also affects the school climate .Robbins says further that, there is no example of expectations and standard by the principal, and that this may result in lack of motivation and performance on the part of teachers and pupils. This is because the quality of leadership of the principal is critical to the effectiveness of the school.

#### **2.8.4.2 Teacher Perceptions/behaviors**

Teachers play a critical role in determining the school climate. The school system as a system of social interaction allows interpersonal relationship among its stakeholders; teachers interact with one another, with the principal, pupils and parents. The ways teachers interact among themselves and with others determine the school climate. Halpin (1966:150) identified four characteristics of teacher's behaviours and how they influence to school climate. These characteristics are disengagement, hindrance, esprit and intimacy.

**Disengagement:** Halpin (1966) state that, disengagement is used to describe teacher lack of commitment to the school. According to Hoy and Miskel (2001), in a disengaged school some teachers complain a lot, they are unproductive and engage themselves internal matters. These teachers dislike and criticized the principal. Their negative attitude is reflected in the manner they relate to one another, they negatively criticized and disrespect each other. Hoy and Sabo (1998) classify this set of teachers as individuals who are just putting in their time to sabotage the principal's leadership attempts.

**Hindrance:** Can be stated as a concept used to describe some teachers attitude toward paper work and non- instructional school activities. Teachers see routine duties and committee requirement as hindrance to their teaching responsibility. Owens (1981) asserts that these teachers are only concerned with teaching and consider rules, paper work and other administrative work quite unnecessary, such teachers do not enjoy writing daily preparation note, keeping class attendance records, recording tests marks and communicating and corresponding with parents. According to Silver (1983) other teachers consider administrative duties not only necessary but also useful in facilitating the achievement of the school goals.

**Esprit:** Halpin (1966) uses this term to describe teacher's satisfaction with their social and professional needs. In school characterized by high esprit and accomplishments, teachers help, support and work with each other. As a team, they like and respect each other. They enjoy each other's company and they are committed to their work and school. They are enthusiastic, innovative and they willingly render mutual assistance where necessarily. In case of low esprit, teachers do their work reluctantly. They do not derive satisfaction from their work. Thus, they work just to earn a living. There is no strong relationship among teachers, they careless about each other. This kind of situation produces a climate that is not conducive for work.

**Intimacy:** Hoy and Miskel (2001) observe that high intimacy reflects a close relationship among teachers. Teachers in school characterized by high intimacy know each other well and share personal issues with each other. This kind of relationship does not end at school; they socialized on regular bases in school and outside school. They provide strong support for each other, that is, they exchange visits, know each other's family members, they are always there for each other even in difficult situations. They find their closest friends among their colleagues. High intimacy among teachers may either have positive or negative impact on the school climate. If burdens are lifted, sorrow gives way to joy and a smile is brought to somebody's face when teachers share their personal matters with one another. In this kind of situation, teachers' emotional and psychological needs are met.

## **2.9 Overview of Instructional Leadership in Ethiopia**

Throughout Africa, there is no formal requirement for principals to be trained managers. They are often appointed on the basis of a successful record as teachers with an implicit assumption that this provides a sufficient starting point for school leadership. In Kenya, for example, “deputy principals as well as good assistant teachers are appointed to the leadership without any leadership training. But good teaching abilities are not necessarily an indication that the person appointed will be a capable educational leader” (Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997).

Principal ship in schools is one of the influential administrative positions in the success of school plans with respect to the historical background of principal ship, authorities give their own argument. As indicated in Knezevich, (in Ahmed, 2006) the origin of principal ship can be traced to 1515 to the time of Johann Sturm in USA. The position developed from classroom teacher with a few administrative duties to principal teacher and then to supervising principal. The history of Ethiopian education system traces back its origin to the introduction of Christianity about fourth century A.D. However, the western type of education system was formally introduced into Ethiopia in 1908 with the opening of Menelik second school. In 1943 the first high school which was dominated by expatriates was opened. According to Ahmed at its early stage the history of principal ship in Ethiopia was dominated by foreign principals. In all government owned schools that were opened before and few years after the Italian occupation expatriates from France and Britain were assigned as school principals.

After the restoration of independence in 1942, education was given high priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country. However, there was not enough educated Ethiopians to teach and run schools, most of the teachers and principals in school were from foreign countries such as USA, Egypt and India (ICDR, 1999). According to MoE (2002) prior to 1962 expatriate principals were assigned in the elementary and secondary schools of different provinces of Ethiopia.

Gradually, the history had developed in to a new phase where Ethiopians began to replace expatriates which started in 1964. According to Teshome (cited in Ahmed, 2006) this new phase of principal ship started with supervising principals such leaders were responsible for

the school and the education system of the community where the schools located. From 1960's the Ethiopian schools principals were directly assigned in elementary school without competition among candidates. Only educational level and teaching experience were given highest priority for principal ship. However, during the first few years of 1960's it was understood that those graduates of certificate in teaching were directly assigned in primary schools. On the other hand, the promotion that were issued from 1973-1976 show that primary school principals were those who had at least worked for a limited time as a unit leader, department heads or teacher. It is also stated in the job description of the MoE issued in 1989 that primary school principals should have certificate in school administration and supervision including sufficient work experiences.

But in Ethiopia most principals are appointed by the government without enough training, experience and development in leadership. Primary school principals had been political appointed by major problems of primary schools in instructional leadership are: lack of professional training for principal ship, lack of required qualification and commitment in making maximum use of environment resources and negative attitude toward leadership. This shows that instructional leadership as professions has been given little attention.

To sum up, considering education as key elements for economic, social and technological development, many countries invest substantial amount of their national resources for the improvement of their education. Similarly the government of Ethiopia recognizing the role of education in developing the country economy, the ministry of education has placed great emphasis on professional development for school principals, vice principals, department heads, teachers as well as officers in charge of education at different levels. In its education sector development program four(2010:12) the ministry of education stated that although the decentralization reforms have been implemented some years ago and important responsibilities have been transferred to the woreda offices and school functioning also needs further improvement in particular concerning school leadership.

It was thus being fully aware of the importance of school in its blue print (MoE,2007) acknowledged that educational leadership are professional by their own with established theories and practices and indicated that those who assumed these roles should be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to exhibit proper professional ethics that are

necessitated at school levels. Instructional leadership play roles to improve students' learning outcomes, teachers' profession and produce well educated citizens at all levels. Finally the approaches of instruction and create an environment and situation which can lead them to practices effective instructional leadership role in their respective schools.

### **2.10 Challenges for Instructional Leadership Effectiveness**

Limited understanding exists about how schools and school districts can establish the conditions, change processes, and external supports necessary for producing a culture of effective practice. According to Leith wood and Montgomery (1984) conducted a study whose focus was identifying the existence of obstacles outside the formal preparation program that inhibit the effectiveness of school leaders. Many administrators are prevented by obstacles, real or perceived from performing tasks identified as informing effectiveness and efficiency. Being an effective instructional leader requires knowledge, skills, and attitudes that inform the successful operation of schools. The ability to identify and perform tasks directly associated with the educational needs of students correlates directly with effectiveness as instructional leaders. Within the public school setting however, barriers and obstacles exist that inhibit the successful operation of schools.

Several situational and environmental factors other than human, materials or financial resources, can affect the operation of instructional leadership practices of any school. For decades, schools have proved impervious to change at the instructional core, in large measure because of the overall complexity of the instructional process. Instructional leaders are often faced with a number of roadblocks: incompetence in educational leadership, lack of incentive for teachers, problems related with teachers promotions, lack of administrative skills and commitment of those assigned as school leaders, shortage of educational materials, or finance are among problems frequently cited as factors that hinder effective performance of teachers (MoE, 2004).In addition, disconnected departmental subcultures; a resistance to school wide interventions, norms for teacher autonomy and teacher tracking; and a lack of training on and support for engaging disconnected adolescents who have significant learning gaps (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2007).Although the economic, political, social or technological variations, the following were cited as challenges to the effectiveness of instructional

leadership practices: lack of skill and training, lack of cooperation from superiors and community, lack of time, lack of adequate resources, and lack of vision, will and courage.

**Lack of Skills and Training:** As Sergiovanni (2001) stated that, technical, human and educational skills, abilities and knowledge are essential properties that instructional leaders have to possess. Instructional leaders without adequate skills and training in educational leadership and professional development of teachers can do little or no for the improvement of learning (West-Burnham, 1998).

**Lack of Cooperation from Superiors and Community:** Teachers' cooperation is essential for effective instructional leadership. The cooperation of teachers, students, and parents could be available in school climate where the leaders exercise democratic leadership (MoE, 2002).

**Lack of Time:** Principals have multiple roles they have play. For instance information over load, paper work, too many reports, many non-academic demands and work over load consume much of the principals time. Therefore only principals committed to instructional improvement can choose and use their time for the enhancement of the classroom instruction and teacher development (Harris and Muijs, 2003).

**Lack of Adequate Resources:** Lack of adequate resources of all type and support from central offices discourages instructional leaders. Bureaucratic management that hampers timely assignment human, financial and materials resources required can be restricted the success of the schools and limits development of the teachers (Dimmock, 2000).

**Lack of Vision, Will and Courage:** Nothing can affect instructional improvement more than lack of leaders will. Instructional leaders have to spend more time on improving the teaching learning, initiating changes and encouraging others to achieve educational goals. However lack of vision, will and courage could hinder the effectiveness of leadership performance (Sergiovanni, 2001).generally the barriers of instructional leadership hinder the leader's performance, sabotage principal's attempts and finally bring a serious problem on the quality of education.

### **Summary on Review of Related Literature**

The chapter addressed the concept of instructional leadership, concept of leadership, concept of supervision, dimensions of instructional leadership, supervisory skills, approaches to instructional supervision, the role of instructional leadership, and barriers to instructional leadership effectiveness to answer the following basic questions.

To this end, to understand the current roles of instructional leadership, dimensions of instructional leadership such as defining school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising and evaluating instruction, monitoring instructional program and promoting a conducive learning climate were addressed.

With regard to teaching learning role of instructional leaders, the study covered the areas of professional skill development, building effective relationship in School, supportive role of instructional leadership, directive role of instructional leadership and Conflict Management roles were treated.

Concerning to major problems that affected leadership effectiveness, lack of knowledge, will, and courage, lack of skill and training, lack of cooperation of instructional leadership with stake holders and lack of resources were consulted. Thus, the reviewed literature helped the researcher to get the insight about the issues in detail.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **Introduction**

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the basic research design and methodology that were used to carry out the study. Under this overview the basic research design, research methodology, source of data, sample population and sampling technique, data collection instruments, procedure of data collection and method of data analyses will be treated in detail.

#### **3.1 Design of the study**

The study attempted to examine the instructional leadership practices in the selected preparatory schools of Hadiya Zone and how effectively the leadership practices were implemented in terms of setting vision and defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, monitoring students progress, supervising and evaluating instruction, building effective relation, providing professional skill development, and creating conducive and healthy school environment (Murphy, 1990). It also tried to explore the challenges instructional leaders' face, strengths and weakness of the school leaders in implementing instructional leadership practices.

Quantitative approach is considered as appropriate because it uses the survey in collecting data from a wide area by selecting a representative sample of a large population. besides, the qualitative approach was employed so as to obtain detailed descriptions of the phenomenon such as direct quotations capturing peoples personal perspectives and experience of instructional leadership through an in depth interview. McLaughlin et al. (2001:18) believe that for information that cannot be obtained through quantitative method can be effective in obtaining such information. Therefore, in this study, a mixed approach involving both quantitative and qualitative designs were employed so as to collect extensive data and used to confirm findings from different data sources through triangulated data instruments and consequently to draw valid general conclusions. So, it advocates using mixed approach even though more weight was give to quantitative approach.

### **3.2 The Research Methodology**

A descriptive survey method was employed in this study. Because the intention of the study is to assess the existing situation and to describe opinions that are held on by participants of the study and to look into school leaders problems with regard to instructional leadership practices. With regard to the use of descriptive survey research method, Best and Kahn (2003; p.14) have argued that this method is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, process that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing. Thus, the method was preferred on the ground that practices and problems of school leadership are better perceived from the opinion survey of the school leaders (Principals, vice principals) and other staff members in schools (teaching and non teaching).

### **3.3 Sources of Data**

Data were collected using two sources: primary and secondary. The primary sources of the study were key informants from the zone including Woreda educational office heads, supervisors, principals, vice principals, department heads and senior teachers of the preparatory schools. Those in the managerial position were contacted for information sources for the reason that they directly involved in the practices of schools leadership. Teachers were taken as source of information for the reason that they were direct beneficiaries of the service delivered.

In addition, information was collected from Secondary sources of the study. As a secondary source the data collected from documents mainly focused on records and minutes concerning the school based supervision and instructional leadership support in the preparatory schools. In addition to this, other relevant documents of the schools such as brochures that state the vision, mission, gaols, and manuals prepared for training purposes.

### **3.4 Sample Population and Sampling Techniques**

The entire Hadiya zone in Southern Nation, Nationalities and People Regional State was considered as the study area. This area was decided to be taken as a setting for this study for two reasons. Firstly, since the researcher has worked in different schools located at different Woredas of the Zones, it is thought that this may better help him in the process of data collection and Secondly, since the Zones consisted of people with diversified cultures, life styles and economic conditions, there is high probability that the findings could be at a

certain level representative of the situation in other Zones too. The sample respondents and schools are determined based on the 2005/6 E. C. annual report of Hadiya Zone Education Department. According to this report, there are 8 government preparatory schools in 10 Woredas and one town administration of the Zone. Of which, 6 schools are grade 9 up to 12 and the remaining 2 are grade 11 and 12. In these preparatory schools, a sum of 199 teachers, 8 supervisors, 8 principals, 16 vice principals, 112 department heads, 16 unit leaders are working and 2538 students who are currently attending their education in these preparatory schools.

Regarding the school samples, out of the existing eight schools, five schools were purposefully selected and used as data sources. The remaining three schools are deliberately excluded with the reason that they contain teaching staff size of less than 15, they are newly established, and started teaching and learning process in 2005 E.C and also new schools did not included for they lack experience compared to the old, So all the five old schools were included. This is purposely done to lessen the deviations of such schools from others. To select sample schools the researcher was intended to use purposive sampling technique. It was used because the researcher has previous knowledge and information on the sample schools and he hopes that he can get sufficient information for his study. In addition to this, as it was indicated in the annual report of Hadiya Zone Education Department, the sample schools have both discouraging and encouraging factors regarding the practice and challenges of instructional leadership. Accordingly, the preparatory schools selected include Danama, Shone, Wachamo, Bonosha and Ginbichu Preparatory schools.

After such selection of sample schools, the selection of the respondents of the study was conducted. Accordingly, data were collected from six categories of respondents including five Woreda Education office heads, fifteen(15) school leaders (principals and vice principals), five supervisors, seventy(70) department heads, and one hundred fifty eight (158) teachers. As result, the availability sampling technique was employed for the selection of heads in woreda educational officials and at the same time availability sampling was employed in selecting supervisors, principals, and vice principals from the sample schools. It is due to they are few in numbers, and their direct involvement in the practices of schools leadership. In addition, simple random selection was used to select department heads from

each school. This is because; they are very close to the overall instructional activities of teachers and closely assist teachers in the practices of instructional leadership in particular.

In selecting sample teachers, out of 158 (100%) teachers in the sample preparatory schools, 66(41.8%) of them were selected through simple random sampling technique, particularly through lottery method with the assumption that all teachers have equal chance of being selected and to obtain representative sample. Simple random sampling gives each unit of the population equal opportunity of being selected (Seyoum and Ayalew,1989:59).The researcher believed that, to make the data collected more comprehensive, it is decided to include large proportion (41.8%) is sufficient to secure the validity of the data obtained from teacher respondents. Accordingly, information was collected from 66 teachers working in all of the sample schools. The number of sample teachers from each selected schools were determined in proportional to the size of teachers in each preparatory schools. In this regard, Gay and Arirasian (2003:111) state that the sample of 10% to 20% of the target population is often used in descriptive research for large population. Therefore, the total number of research participants were 126, i.e. 5(100) education office heads (one from each woreda), 5(100%) school principals (1 from each selected schools), 10(%) school vice principal (1 from each selected schools), 5(100%) supervisors (1 from each selected schools), 35 (50%) department heads (seven from each school) and 66(41.8%) of teachers from the selected preparatory schools.

**Table 1: Target Population and Sample Size**

Types of respondents	Target population	Sample population	Sample population in percent (%)	Sampling techniques	Data gathering instruments
Teachers	158	66	41.8%	Simple random sampling	Questionnaires
Principals	5	5	100%	Availability sampling	Questionnaires
Vice-principals	10	10	100%	Availability sampling	Questionnaires
Department heads	70	35	50%	Simple random sampling	Questionnaires
Supervisors	5	5	100%	Availability sampling	Interview
Education office heads	5	5	100%	Availability sampling	Interview
Total	260	126	49%		

### **3.5 Data Gathering Instruments**

Three instruments were used in the process of gathering the necessary data for the study. These are questionnaire, unstructured interview and document analysis.

#### **3.5.1 Questionnaire**

The first data collecting instrument to be employed in the study is the questionnaire. A total of 83 self-developed questionnaires were prepared and distributed for 66 sample teachers and 50 instructional leaders (principals, vice principals and department heads) who have been purposefully selected as information sources. Questionnaire is decided to be used in collecting the data because the numbers of respondents in these four groups are large. Open ended questions are included because it gives respondents a freedom to give their extended views on the issue. Close ended questions were used for their easiness in tabulation, objectivity and suitability to keep respondents on the subjects of discussion. Responses from participants were taken using Likert Scale method of rating and the respondents are expected to express their degree of agreement on five point scale that is relevant to the issues. Thus, questionnaire containing both open and close ended questions were carefully selected and presented to respondents under four subsequent sections: background information, practices, and roles of instructional leadership and challenges of instructional leadership.

#### **3.5.2 Interview**

Interview was the second important data gathering instrument in this study. This data gathering instrument is selected with the belief that deeper information is obtained on issues critical to the study underway. It was also being used to cross-check the responses obtained through questionnaire and it let the interviewee to express her/his feeling freely and knowledge of people in a program in depth (Best and Kahn, 2003). In order to obtain deeper information related to the practices of instructional leadership in the study area, a semi structure interview was held with two groups of respondents: five school supervisors and five Woreda Education Office Heads were interviewed to reflect on some (12) guiding questions related with the practices and challenges of instructional leadership implementation in the study area. These two groups of respondents are selected for interview in the ground that more information can possibly obtained from them due to their position in the instructional leadership and daily engagements in the core activities of instructional leadership. In

addition, it is believed that they are very close to the day to day challenges exist in the schools.

### **3.5.3 Document Analysis**

Document analysis was the other essential data collecting tool. Various documents including school performance reports, guidelines of the MoE, minutes that show what leadership decisions made and discussed, and records were explored in the process of the study. It is believed that the data obtained in this method was used to validate and substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire and semi-structured interview.

## **3.6 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments**

### **3.5.1 Pilot Test**

Before the final questionnaires were administered, pilot testing was conducted in Morsuto preparatory school which was not included in the sample study. It was helped to ensure that the respondents understand what the questionnaire wants to address and was done with the objectives of checking whether or not the items contained in the instruments could enable the researcher to gather relevant information, to identify and eliminate problems in collecting data from the target population. The draft questionnaires were distributed to 1 school principal, 2 vice principals, 7 department heads and 10 teachers of the above stated preparatory school was selected purposively. After the questionnaires were filled and returned the reliability and validity of items were measured by using Crobach's alpha method by the help of SPSS version 20. The obtained test result was 0.85. Then as the result indicated it was a good indication of the internal consistency of items. That is the instrument was found to be reliable as statistical literature recommend a test result of 0.65 (65% reliability) and above as reliable.

### **3.5.2 Validity of the Study**

To be sure of the face validity, senior colleagues were invited to provide their comment. The participants of the pilot test was also be first informed about the objectives and how to fill, evaluate and give feedback on the relevance of the contents, item length, clarity of items, and layout of the questionnaire. Based on their reflections, the instruments were improved before

they were administered to the main participants of the study. As a result of the comment, two irrelevant items were removed; two lengthy items were shortened, and some unclear items were made clear.

Moreover, to verify the content validity of the instrument, the questionnaire with sufficient number (200 copies) of items addressing all objectives of the study was administered to large number of preparatory school teachers in Misha Woreda and then, 189 copies were collected with high return rate of 94.5%. Triangulation of data gathering tools was executed by using semi structured interview. Information sources were also be multi-faceted by using variety of respondents such as, principals, vice principals, Supervisors, head departments, teachers and Woreda education office heads. Finally, after the necessary improvement made, the questionnaires were duplicated and distributed with necessary orientations by the researcher to be filled by respondents. Then interview and document analysis were also carried out by the same time.

### **3.6 Procedures of Data Collection**

First, the researcher visited the Woreda education office and discussed the purpose of the research showing the letter of cooperation from Addis Ababa University and asked the Woreda education office to write a letter to preparatory school in their Woreda. Then the researcher visited the school director and vice-director and discussed the purpose of the research with principals and vice-principals showing the letters from the University and the Woreda education Office which later their copies distributed to each department heads.

Then the researcher clarified the objective of the research, and asked whether the respondents are willing to the interview or not. After that the researcher was used semi structured interview so as to let the interviewee to express her/his feeling freely, let the researcher use the ideas from other source (in contrast to the well structured one)and at the same time more convenient for analysis purpose than unstructured interview(Wragg,2002). The researcher also distributed the questionnaires to the respondent teachers and department head after he selected them and give enough time to fill the questionnaires.

### **3.7 Method of Data Analysis**

After the collection and gathering of data from the respondents, the next step is analyzing of the given data by using tables, graph and so on according to similarities of issues raised in the

questionnaires. Depending on the nature of the variables quantitative as well as qualitative data analysis method was employed. To begin the analysis, first respondents were categorized under different groups in terms of the practices that they have in leadership activity. Then, different characteristics of respondents were analyzed by using frequency and percentage. Secondly, the quantitative data obtained through Likert Scale in questionnaires were organized and tabulated around the sub-topics related to the research questions. Descriptive statistics like arithmetic mean, standard deviation, weighed mean were calculated for those items prepared in Likert type of scale. For more advanced statistical operations and decision making, data was inserted into modern statistical software or SPSS (20 version) program and further analysis were done.

A five point Likert Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree were used for the sake of analysis and interpretation. Therefore, the mean values less than 1.80 as strongly disagree, 1.81-2.60 as disagree, 2.61-3.40 as undecided, 3.41-4.20 as agree and 4.21-5.00 as strongly agree implementation of the items. For the case of analysis strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the school and undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. Similarly strongly disagree and disagree indicates ineffective implementation of the items in the task.

On the other hand, for the challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness five point scales ranging from very high to very low problem be used for the sake of analysis and interpretation. Thus, the mean values from 1.00-1.80 as very low, 1.81-2.60 as low, 2.61-3.20 as moderate, and 3.21-4.20 as high and 4.21-5.00 as very high problem of the items were used.

An independent sample t- test was used to make sure whether there is a significant difference in the distribution of preferences between two groups of respondents in terms of a given items. In such a way that-critical (1.99), degree of freedom (114), alpha level of 0.05 was used for comparison of the various respondent opinions. Finally the qualitative data that were collected through interviews and document analysis were analyzed qualitatively and reported through narrative description to complement the quantitative data.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data obtained from teachers, department heads, principals, vice principals, supervisors and heads of WEOs. The study employed questionnaires for teachers, department heads, vice-principals and principals, and interviews with supervisors and heads of WEOs. Besides, additional information was gathered through document analysis. Thus, the quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of data was incorporated in to this chapter. The qualitative part was supposed to be complementary to the quantitative analysis.

The study covered five preparatory schools of Hadiya Zone namely; Shone, Danema, Wachamo, Gimbichu and Bonosha preparatory schools. A total of 83 questionnaires were prepared and distributed for 66 sample teachers and 50 instructional leaders (principals, vice principals and department heads,) who have been purposefully selected as information sources. All the questionnaires (100%) that were distributed to the teachers and instructional leaders were filled and returned to the researcher. In addition, to supplement the information gathered through questionnaire, interviews were held with five supervisors and five WEO heads, and also information from document analysis was used to triangulate the data obtained.

In analyzing the data of the study, different statistical techniques and procedures were used. Initially, the data collected through questionnaire were coded and inserted in to SPSS for analysis. Then the means for the two groups of respondents (instructional leaders and teachers) were identified and analysis was done using the average means of the two groups' respondents. To determine the existence/implementation of the different instructional leadership practices in the preparatory schools of the Zone, an average point of decision was set. Accordingly, an average mean point of less than 1.80 is considered as strongly disagree, 1.81-2.60 as disagree, 2.61-3.20 as undecided, 3.21-4.20 as agree and 4.21-5.00 as strongly agree.

To examine the difference of the views of the two groups of respondents (teachers and instructional leaders) up on the practices of instructional leadership, an independent sample t-test has been conducted. To this end, a test of significance has been carried out with five

dimensions of instructional leadership, five teaching learning roles of instructional leaders and four barriers to instructional leadership items. Accordingly, if a calculated value is greater than 0.05 significant levels, there is no significance difference between the views of the two groups of respondents, while the calculated value is less than the 0.05 significant values, there is significant difference between the views of the two groups' of respondents.

Items involved in the questionnaires were classified in to two major categories. The first category dealt with general background information of the respondents, while the second part has treated specific issues of the study. Hence, this leads to use different approaches in treating or analyzing the data from the two categories questions. Therefore, frequency and percentages were used for the analysis of characteristics of respondents. On the other hand, mean, standard deviation, t-test and spearman correlation coefficient were used for the analysis of specific items.

Therefore, in the first part of the analysis, the characteristics of the respondents in relation to their age, sex, education level, qualification, work experience and the position they hold currently were tabulated and analyzed as indicated under table 2. In the second part of the analysis the views of the two groups'(teachers and instructional leaders) respondents were analyzed and interpretation were made based on mean, grand mean, standard deviation, t-test and spearman correlation coefficient.

#### 4.1 Characteristics of Respondents

**Table2: Characteristics of Respondents in terms of Sex, Age, Qualification or Level of Education, Work Experience, Area of Specialization and Service in Current Position.**

No	Item	Category of Items	Respondents							
			Teachers		Instructional leaders		Supervisors and heads of WEOs		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sex	Male	54	81.8	42	84	10	100	106	84.1
		Female	12	19.2	8	16	-	-	20	15.9
		Total	66	100	50	100	10	100	126	100
2	Age in years	20-25	14	21.2	9	18	-	-	23	18.3
		26-30	33	50	26	52	2	20	61	48.4
		31-35	8	12.1	6	12	6	60	20	15.9
		36-40	6	9.1	5	10	1	10	12	9.5
		41 and above	5	7.6	4	8	1	10	10	8
		Total	66	100	50	100	10	100	126	100
3	Qualification or level of education	Diploma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		BA/BSC/BE D Degree	52	78.8	38	76	7	70	97	76.98
		MA/MSC/ME D Deg.	14	21.2	12	24	3	30	29	23.01
		Total	66	100	50	100	10	100	126	100
4	Work experience	Under 5 years	36	54.5	11	22	5	50	52	41.3
		6-10 years	12	18.2	23	46	3	30	38	30.2
		11-15 years	8	12.1	7	14	1	10	16	12.7
		16-20 years	3	4.5	5	10	1	10	9	7.1
		21 years	7	10.6	4	8	-	-	11	8.7
		Total	66	100	50	100	10	100	126	100
5	Area of specialization	Subject matter	66	100	41	82	8	80	115	91.2
		EdPM/Pedagogical Science	-	-	9	18	2	20	11	8.8
		Total	66	100	50	100	10	100	126	100
6	Service in current position	Under 5 years	-	-	38	76	8	80	46	76.7
		6-10 years	-	-	12	24	2	20	14	23.3
		11 years and above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	-	-	50	100	10	100	60	100

As shown in table-2 item 1, 54 (81.8%) of the teacher respondents, 42(84%) of instructional leaders (main principals, vice principals and department heads) and all of the supervisors and heads of the WEOs were males, while the remaining 12(19.2%) of the teachers and 8 (16 %) of the instructional leaders were female respondents. According to this data, almost 85% of the respondents were males and only 15 % were females in all positions. This show that the females' participation, as compared to their male counter parts, were very low both in the teaching and leadership position at preparatory schools level. This is not a new finding; rather it has been reported by various researchers and organizations who have involved in educational affairs in the country. For instance, Emebet (2003) and MoE (2005) witnessed that participation of females in education had been low and this has resulted in lower rate of employment. This could be due to serious economic deprivation, unreasonable house load, school distance, early marriage, marriage by abduction and pregnancy.

With regard to the age distribution of the respondents as indicated under item 2 of the same table, 14 (21.2%) and 33 (50%) of the teacher respondents, fall into the age ranges of 25 and below and 26 to 30 years old respectively. The remaining 19 (28.8%) of the teacher respondents were 31 and above years old. Regarding the instructional leader (main principals, vice principals and department heads) respondents, only 9 (18. %) of them lie in the age ranges of 25 and below years old. On the other hand, the majority (52 %) of the instructional leaders and 2(20%) of supervisors and WEOs were between the age ranges 26-30 years old. The remaining 23 (38.3%) of the instructional leaders were 31 and above years old. In sum, out of the total respondents (126), the majority (103 / 81.7%) were 26 years old and above, whereas the remaining 23 (18.3%) were under the age ranges of 25 and below years old. Therefore, this figure indicates that the majority of the respondents are matured enough to provide reliable information with regard to the issue under study.

In terms of level of education, as shown in item 3 of the above table, the majority of teachers and instructional leaders(main principals, vice principals and department heads), 52( 78.8%) and 36 (76%) were BA/BSC/BED degree holders respectively; while the remaining 14 (21.2%) and 12(24%) of them were M.A/MSC/MED Degree holders. These data imply that a significant number of under qualified teachers and instructional leaders are teaching and leading in preparatory school of the zone respectively. In addition, the data shows that the

level of education of the majority (78.8%) of the teacher respondents was equal to or better than that of school leaders. Such a similarity might be one of the challenges for instructional leaders in carrying out their school leadership activities successfully.

On the parts of supervisors and heads of WEos, 7(70%) of them were BA/BSC/BED Degree holders and the small numbers of them (30%) were M.A/MSC/MED Degree holders. It may, therefore, be inferred that a considerable number of teachers and instructional leaders do not satisfy the standard set by the MOE (1996:8) which requires at least MA/MSC/MED degree for principals, supervisor and teachers of preparatory schools. Thus, it would be possible to conclude from this that the placement of individuals in a leadership position was on appointment basis rather than on proper educational background.

Item 3 of table 1 shows that 36(54.5%) of the teacher respondents had 1 to 5 years experience, whereas 12(18.2%) teacher respondents had 6 to 10 years experience. The remaining 18(27.3%) teacher respondents had above 11 years of experience. This implies that the majority of teachers was less experience and need more support from the school leaders. About 66% and 80% of the instructional leaders and supervisors and Heads of WEos had 1 to 10 years of experience respectively. The remaining 16 (32%) and 2(20%) instructional leaders and supervisors and Heads of WEos respondents had above 11 years experiences.

Under item 5 of the above table, the teachers, the instructional leaders (main principals, vice principals and department heads), supervisors and Heads of WEos were asked to indicate their areas of specialization. Accordingly, all of the teachers were academic subject area graduates and the majority of the instructional leaders and supervisors and Heads of WEos 41(82%), and 8(80%) of them were academic subject area graduates respectively; while the remaining 9(18%) and 2(20%) of them were a graduate of EdPM/pedagogical science respectively. As these data show, almost all of the instructional leaders and supervisors and heads of WEos in the preparatory schools of Hadiya zone were subject area graduates, even though a blue print of Teacher Development Program (MoE, 2007:30-31) has stated that the academic qualification required for the preparatory school principals are Master of Art degree in Educational planning and Management. This might have its own negative implication on the overall success of leaders in the implementation of their respected roles.

As it can be seen from item 6, table 1, 38 (76%) of the instructional leaders(main principals, vice principals and department heads) and 8(80%) heads of WEos provided under 5 years service in their current position; while the remaining 12(24%) and 2(20%)of the respondents have served 6 to 10 years in their current position. This also implies that the principals had very limited exposure to school leadership position which could have its own negative impacts on their role performances.

#### **4.2 Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data Gathered through Questionnaires and Interview**

As the review of the related literature discussed in the foregoing chapters revealed that the effectiveness of instructional leadership practices are mainly determined by the extent to which instructional leadership dimensions are implemented in the organization. Thus, the instructional dimensions including setting the school vision and defining mission, managing curriculum and instructional program, supervising and evaluating instruction, monitoring instructional program and promoting positive school learning climate were examined to see their implementation in the schools. In addition to that, the teaching learning roles of instructional leaders (main principals, vice principals and department heads) and major challenges that affect the effectiveness of instructional leadership were assessed.

A five point scales ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree were used. In order to determine the degree of implementation of each of the instructional dimensions and roles in the preparatory schools, the following mean ranges were used as a cut point. A mean values less than 1.80 as strongly disagree, 1.81-2.60 as disagree,2.61-3.40 as undecided,3.41-4.20 as agree and 4.21-5.00 as strongly agree level of implementation of the items one.

To verify the extent to which the difference between the mean values of the teachers and instructional leaders (main principals, vice principals and department heads) responses, t -test for significance were employed at alpha level *0.05*. On each dimension/practice the schools document analysis and the interview notes were used to triangulate the close ended questionnaires from the respondents.

#### **4.2.1 Dimensions of Instructional Leadership**

The success of any instructional leadership practices are mainly determined by the extent to which instructional leadership dimensions are implemented within the preparatory schools. Therefore, the most important dimensions and their implementation in the study area such as setting the school vision and defining mission, managing curriculum and instructional program, supervising and evaluating instruction, monitoring instructional program and promoting positive school learning climate are discussed below.

##### **4.2.1.1 Setting the School Vision and Defining School Mission**

Concerning setting school vision and defining school mission, eight items that describe the extent of implementation of the dimension were presented to the group of teachers and instructional leaders and analyzed under table 3. Both groups of respondents were asked to rate from strongly agree to strongly disagree depending on the degree of implementation of the items in their schools. In the process of data analysis, the scales strongly agree and agree indicate effective implementation of each item in the dimension; whereas undecided presents neither positive nor negative agreement. On the other hand, the scales disagree and strongly disagree indicate low implementation of the items in the sample schools.

**Table 3: Setting the School Vision and Defining School’s Mission**

No	Item Description  Your school leader.../As a leader...	Respondents’ Response							
		Instructional leaders		Teachers N=66		W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD		T-value	Df	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Collect data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school	3.35	1.183	3.42	1.180	3.38	-.323	114	0.747
2	Well express or communicate the vision to all stakeholders	3.30	1.109	3.48	1.165	3.39	-.833	114	0.407
3	Allocate adequate resources for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission	3.45	1.179	3.40	1.161	3.43	0.248	114	0.804
4	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	3.18	1.094	3.36	1.174	3.27	-.842	114	0.402
5	Frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities	3.42	1.124	3.48	1.111	3.45	-.266	114	0.791
6	Identify the impediments to achieve missions of the school and design strategies to address the impediments in advance	3.54	1.180	3.60	1.107	3.56	-.394	114	0.694
7	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning	3.52	1.218	3.52	1.199	3.52	-.021	114	0.983
8	Use students performance results to develop the school’s missions	3.41	1.081	3.44	1.181	3.42	-.147	114	0.884
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.42</b>		<b>3.46</b>		<b>3.44</b>			

W.M weighed mean, Significant level =0.05, t-critical value =1.99, Df= degree of freedom,

Mean scores

1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As it can be seen from table 3, setting the school visions and defining school mission found to be on agree scale as indicated in the average means of 3.42 and 3.46 by instructional leaders and teachers respectively. Accordingly, there seems an agreement between the responses of instructional leaders and teachers with regard to the important function of setting the school visions and defining school mission. Both groups have rated the implementation of this dimension as agreed. This implies that the first dimension had average level of implementation in the preparatory schools of the Zone. However, this does not mean that multiple roles under this umbrella dimension have similar level of implementation.

Among the several roles under the major dimension of setting vision and developing missions, the three activities, i.e., developing missions that are easily understood and used by teachers to create a common vision and mission in the school, collecting data from multiple sources and well express or communicate the vision to all stakeholders with mean value of 3.18,3,30 and 3.35 respectively felt under undecided according to the rating of instructional leaders. The views of teachers match with the instructional leaders except that they replaced item number 2 with item 3. For them, resource allocation by leaders for effective implementation of vision and mission was least implemented than communicating the vision to stake holders as rated by 3.40 mean values. This shows that the respondents not reached to decision and the mentioned items were not effectively put into practice.

Of the several dimensions indicated in the table, the two roles of instructional leaders including use students performance results to develop the school's missions and framing school vision and mission in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them to all stakeholders rated 3.41 and 3.42 and 3.44 and 3.48 by instructional leaders and teachers respectively were found to have relatively moderate level of implementation. On the other hand, the two elements of the instructional dimensions, i.e. identify the impediments to achieve missions of the school and design strategies to address the impediments in advance and develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning with a mean values of both 3.54 and 3.60 and 3.52 by the instructional leaders and teachers respectively

were found to be agreed scale. This shows that the school vision and mission was relatively better implemented by the instructional leaders in the preparatory schools of Hadiya Zone.

The data obtained from analysis show that there is a variation between the mean values of the responses of the two groups of respondents. However, these do not have meaning as long as a t-test is not made to see the implications of the mean differences between the two groups of respondents. Thus, to examine the implications of the mean difference found between the two groups' respondents, an independent sample t-test was conducted across the multiple roles indicated under the main instructional leadership listed down of setting of the school vision and defining the school mission. Accordingly, since all obtained t-values are less than the t-critical (1.99), there is no statistically significant difference between the mean values of both group responses. Except item 7 which shows that there is statistical significance difference between the means of both groups as obtained t values which is 0.024 was less than 0.05. This implies that the views of instructional leaders and teachers are more or less the same with regard to the several activities raised under the main domain of school vision and defining school mission.

As indicated in the methodology section, interview was held with the supervisors and woreda education office heads and analysis of the various document that show the various roles undertaken by the leaders (department heads, vice principal and main principals ,etc) was conducted to triangulate the methodology. The interview results quite complement the findings obtained through questionnaire. According to the majority of interviewees the instructional leaders in the preparatory schools were better or high in identifying the impediments that hinder the achievement of missions of the school and design strategies to address the impediments in advance and developing a set of annual school-related goals focused on student learning. Lastly, the researcher checked the written documents regarding the effectiveness of the implementation of school vision and missions. The checked written materials were: stated vision of the schools defined mission and developed school-wide goals. The document reviewed also showed that in most of the schools, instructional leaders had stated vision, defined mission and developed a set of school- wide goals and that were posted in the office of the heads and bulletin of the schools.

In general, the mean value indicate that instructional leaders of the preparatory schools were found to be high in identifying the impediments to achieve missions of the school and design strategies to address the impediments in advance and develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning. However, in the remaining activities of instructional leadership, that is developing missions that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school, collecting data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school, expressing or communicating the vision to all stakeholders, using students performance results to develop the school's missions and framing the school mission in terms of staff responsibilities were responded to as undecided. Therefore, as indicated in the average mean value in the table 3 above, it can be concluded that the activity of school vision and defining school mission putting it in to practice was effectively implemented in the selected preparatory schools of Hadiya zone.

This dimension is concerned with how the school sets and defines their vision and mission that directs towards effective instructional leadership and contributes to the schools climate. Peter (1990), in this regard suggests that coherent vision specifies the particular values and beliefs that will guide policy and practice within a school. Weller and Hartley (1994:25) also add that schools that are improving in learning achievement have mission statements that focus on curricula and instructional goals. These goals become the frame work for everything the school does and are translated a vision for excellence. A visionary instructional leadership provides teachers with an overall sense of purpose and what roles are expected of them.

As a whole, instructional leaders in the preparatory schools of Hadyia Zone were found to be good at setting the vision and defining the missions. However, their effectiveness was negatively affected because of their poor performances on the three roles, i.e., developing the missions that are easily understood and used by teachers, communicating the vision to all stakeholders and collecting data from multiple sources to create a common vision.

#### **4.2.1.2. Managing Curriculum and Instruction**

Managing curriculum and instruction is among the major functions of leaders who involved in to educational issues. It basically refers to the instructional leaders' activities of providing

opportunity for staff to collaborate for the alignment of curriculum contents and achievement. It also refers to a principal works with teachers to coordinate curriculum and provide the necessary assistance for teachers for instructional issues. In this regard, six questions were administered to gather the opinions of instructional leaders and teachers concerning the role of managing curriculum and instruction of their respective schools. The data collected through the five point scales were interpreted as indicated in table below.

As presented in table 4, instructional leaders and teachers rated the dimension of managing curriculum and instruction a little difference with average mean values of 3.48 and 3.47 respectively. This shows that both groups of respondents agreed on managing curriculum and instructional activities in their school. As an average mean values 3.48 indicates the instructional leaders views on the dimension were effectively practiced in their school.

**Table 4: Managing Curriculum and Instruction**

No	Item Description  Your school leader.../As a leader...	Respondents' Response							
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N=66		W M	T- valu e	Df	Sig(2 tailed )
		Mea n	STD	Mea n	STD				
1	Coordinate the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to the curriculum	3.46	1.147	3.39	1.094	3.42	-.316	114	0.753
2	Check periodically students result in order to ensure the effective implementation of the curriculum	3.66	1.099	3.35	1.074	3.50	1.531	114	0.128
3	Advice teachers regarding the challenges they faced in relation to the implementation of the curriculum	3.64	1.064	3.42	1.151	3.53	1.032	114	0.304
4	Encourage and provide the necessary support to teachers to periodically evaluate and comment for curriculum improvement.	3.40	.926	3.59	1.123	3.49	0.977	114	0.331
5	Evaluating the effectiveness of instructional program in achieving school goals	3.38	1.048	3.59	1.123	3.48	1.031	114	0.305
6	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process	3.36	.985	3.47	1.205	3.42	0.524	114	0.601
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.48</b>		<b>3.47</b>					

T-critical =1.99, significant level 0.05, STD=standard deviation, Df =degree of freedom, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

In the same table above, items like coordinating the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to the curriculum, checking periodically students result in order to ensure the effective implementation of the curriculum and advising teachers

regarding the challenges that they faced in relation to the implementation of the curriculum were a great difference when comparing it with teachers respondent in the dimensions with mean values of 3.44, 3.66 and 3.64 found to be agreed. This proves that instructional leaders agreed that the school gives priorities were clearly identified in the dimensions. whereas, items like ensuring timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process and evaluating the effectiveness of instructional program in achieving school goals, encouraging and providing the necessary support to teachers to periodically evaluate and comment for curriculum improvement in the dimension with mean values of 3.36,3.38 and 3.40 found to be undecided. This indicates that the instructional leaders were not performed successfully or faced difficulty to undecided scale whether the issues were implemented effectively in the school and undecided scale is below agree scale which implies the items were to some extent not practiced in the dimension of managing curriculum and instruction.

The responses of instructional leaders and teachers to open-ended questions show that, the responsibility of coordinating curriculum and instruction was given to the instructional leaders and even senior teachers who play pivotal role in the instructional leadership. But they couldn't obey their responsibility as expected from them in their respective schools. Regarding to this, Hollinger (1985) indicated that the instructional leaders' provide opportunity for staff collaboration on the alignment of curriculum with standards and achievement. From this, it can be concluded that, the activity of managing the school curriculum and instruction was moderate in all preparatory schools of the study area.

In general, in managing curriculum and instruction by the instructional leaders of the school under the study, they provide checking periodically students result in order to ensure the effective implementation of the curriculum and advising teachers regarding the challenges they faced in relation to the implementation of the curriculum were found to be under agreed scale. However, in the remaining activities of instructional leadership, with respect to coordinating the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to the curriculum, encouraging and provide the necessary support to teachers to periodically evaluate and comment for curriculum improvement, evaluating the effectiveness of instructional program in achieving school goals and ensuring the timely allocation of

resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process they were found to be undecided i.e. managing curriculum and instructional activities was below the agree which implies the items were to some extent not successfully implemented in the sampled schools.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare managing curriculum scores for instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated all the items in the dimension as moderate and high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical ( $1.99$ ). All obtained t-values are less than t-critical ( $1.99$ ) when tested at alpha level  $0.05$ . So the obtained responses were reliable.

#### **4.2.1.3. Supervising and Evaluating the Instruction**

As literatures show, the major roles of supervisions are to examine the instructional process and assist teachers to be competent in their subject area and at the end achieve students' learning progress. Unless instructional leaders endeavor to manage and evaluate the day to day activities and cope up with current supervisory leadership demand, it would be difficult for them to provide the necessary support for teachers and obtain the required results. Instructional leaders, then, are expected to play supervisory leadership role through examining the direction of the ongoing educational changes, teaching approach, continuous assessment, and task centered research and instructional material (MoE, 2007: 64).

Table 5: Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

No	Item Description	Respondents' Response							
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N=66		W M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD		T-value	Df	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Make classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process	3.44	1.128	3.48	1.180	3.47	0.207	114	0.837
2	Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together	3.52	.974	3.36	1.047	3.44	-.821	114	0.414
3	Hold regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction	3.14	.904	3.32	1.010	3.23	0.984	114	0.327
4	Use teaching staff meetings to discuss curricular and instructional issues	3.18	.748	3.47	1.070	3.33	1.635	114	0.105
5	Create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers	3.44	.993	3.50	1.154	3.47	0.294	114	0.769
6	Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods	3.64	1.083	3.62	1.078	3.63	-.093	114	0.926
7	Make regular follow-up and feedback to teachers	3.54	1.182	3.39	.990	3.46	-.723	114	0.471
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.56</b>		<b>3.45</b>					

T-critical =1.99, significant level 0.05, STD=standard deviation, DF=degree of freedom, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree

As it can be seen from table 5 with average mean value of 3.56 and 3.45 by instructional leaders and teachers respectively, both groups have perceived that the supervisory support and instructional evaluation activities had been found agreed scale. This shows that both groups of respondents effectively implemented the practice in the preparatory schools of the Zone.

As indicated in the table 5, item number 4,1, 6 and 5 (use teaching staff meetings to discuss curricular and instructional issues, make classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process ,encourage teachers to use different instructional methods and create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers), which were rated under agreed with average mean values of 3.47, 3.48, 3.50 and 3.62,the remaining three instructional leadership functions including hold regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction, give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together, make regular follow-up and feedback to teachers, with mean values of 3.32,3.36 and 3.39,respectively found to be undecided scale according to the perception of teachers in the sampled preparatory schools. This indicates that most of the respondents either could not understand the questions while they may not give emphasis for the items carefully.

The self-rated views of the instructional leaders complement teachers with regard to item like holding regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction, and using teaching staff meetings to discuss curricular and instructional issues create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers the instructional leaders also rated under undecided scale with mean value of ( 3.14 and3.18). However, unlike teachers, instructional leaders have reported that the supervisory related tasks of making classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process, giving adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together, making regular follow-up and feedback to teacher and encourage teachers to use different instructional methods with mean value of 3.44, 3.52, 3.54 and 3.64 had agreed level of implementation in their respective schools. Here too instructional leaders appear to favoring themselves especially in the four major supervisory roles indicated in item 1, 2, 6 and7.

This can also be confirmed from the output of interview held with five supervisor and five WEos. They reported that instructional leaders in the schools they provide with support conduct ones or twice per year a class visit and they also indicated that the time taken to comment after class was very minimal.

From the above table, one can see that, efforts towards providing support to teachers shall be made in line with professional growth and development of teachers. This is to mean the supervision has to give prior attention for teachers in guiding and initiating activities with the assumption of improving the capabilities. Instructional leaders are, therefore, responsible in facilitating the working condition for teachers and need to invest their efforts to bring teachers fit in teaching profession. On the other hand, the group of instructional leaders rated the overall items in the dimension were agreed with average mean value of 3.56 greater than teachers' group 3.45. In any case, the instructional leaders' judgment on the dimension as a whole was much higher than the teachers' judgment.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was conducted to examine the difference in responses of two groups of respondents. As indicated in the table, since the calculated p-value which ranges from-.093 to 1.635 were greater than 0.05 were lower than the t- critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of both groups of respondents. This implies that although variation with regard to the mean values of the responses, both groups had viewed the implementation of the instructional tasks as moderate. These results might be due to the fact that both instructional leaders and teachers have similar thoughts on the effect of supervising and evaluating instructional program in teaching and learning process. Both groups understood that the supervising and evaluating instructional program played a great role in improving the process of teaching and learning even though it has not been implemented fully as it was intended.

#### **4.2.1.4 Monitoring Instructional Program**

Monitoring the instructional activities refers to the principals' use of test result for setting goals, evaluating instructional activities and measuring progress toward school goals. Thus, the ultimate goal of monitoring instructional program is to ensure that all students have successfully attained proficiency in their learning. In relation to this, Murphy (1985) stated

that, good instructional leader need to use assessment results that help teachers, student and parents to understand where and why improvement is needed. This continuous inspection of the instructional program enables teachers to effectively meet students need through constant revision. In order to assess monitoring of instructional program four inquiry items were prepared and presented to both leaders and teachers respondents.

**Table 6: Monitoring Instructional Program**

No	Item Description	Respondents' Response							
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N=66		W M	T- valu e	Df	Sig (2 taile d
		Mea n	STD	Mea n	STD				
1	Encourage teachers to held the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function	3.52	1.140	3.40	1.107	3.47	0.546	114	0.586
2	Inform the school's performance result to teachers in a report form after effective monitoring of the activities	3.52	1.070	3.46	1.182	3.49	0.263	114	0.793
3	Meet individually with teachers to discuss students academic progress	3.80	1.153	3.78	1.166	3.79	0.106	114	0.916
4	Use test result to assess progress toward school goals	3.58	1.110	3.76	1.153	3.66	-0.871	114	0.386
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.64</b>		<b>3.60</b>					

T-critical =1.99, significant level 0.05, STD=standard deviation, N=number, Df=degree of freedom, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As can be seen from the table 6 reveals that, the group of instructional leaders rated all the items as agreed scale. In any case, the group of instructional leaders rated the overall items in the dimension as agreed with average mean values of 3.64 while the group of teachers rated the overall items in the dimension relatively lower than their counterparts with average mean value of 3.60.

With regard to the monitoring functions of instructional leaders, the perceptions of teacher respondents categorized in to two. They evaluated the following two monitoring function, i.e. leaders encouraging teachers to hold the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function and informing the school's performance result to teachers in a report form after effective monitoring of the activities with mean value 3.40 and 3.46 as averagely implemented tasks. Thus may tell us that there exists in effective communication among instructional leaders, teachers and students. As a result teachers may not fully participate in improving instructional progress because they may not know what problem happened in their schools. On the other hand, they have rated the two tasks of leaders meet individually with teachers to discuss students academic progress (mean=3.78) and use test result to assess progress toward school goals (mean=3.76) were reported that highly agreed on the implementation of the above mentioned elements in the preparatory schools.

The self rating of instructional leaders showed that they have properly and effectively implementing the monitoring roles in their schools. They had rated all activities as highly implemented with mean values of 3.52, 3.58 and 3.80. The responses of the instructional leaders, However, have not been supported by documents. As observed in the school no evidence was found that showed instructional leaders have used check list to monitor instructional progress.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to verify if there is difference between the responses of teachers and instructional leaders with regard to the various roles of monitoring instructional program. The calculated t-values in all roles were less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. As a result, there was no statistically significant difference in their responses. This implies that there was consistency of responses between the two groups of respondents.

In general, with regarding to this, the document analysis made in the school also verifies that instructional leaders were to some extent regularly used check list for monitoring instructional programs and teacher's performance. Therefore, it can be concluding that the tasks of monitoring the preparatory schools programs found to be high. However, the items

like encouraging teachers to hold the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function and informing the school's performance result to teachers in a report form after effective monitoring of the activities need much effort to improve the performance level of their respective schools.

#### **4.2.1.5 Promoting a Conducive School Learning Climate**

A constructive school climate and atmosphere is one where individuals are valued, cared for, and respected. Such an atmosphere contributes to effective teaching and learning and to genuine communication both within and outside the school. Promoting an academic learning climate refers to the behaviors of the instructional leaders that influence the norms, beliefs and attitudes of teachers, students, and parents of the school so as to create smooth relation and motivation on each them. In order to assess to what extent instructional leaders attempted to promote conducive school learning climate, seven items were prepared and administered for both leaders and teachers.

As it can be seen from table 7, with average mean value of 3.61 and 3.56 by instructional leaders and teachers respectively, both groups have perceived that the supervisory support and instructional evaluation activities had been agreed in implementing the issues in the preparatory schools of the Zone.

**Table 7: Promoting a Conducive School Learning Climate**

No	Item Description  <b>Your school leader.../As a leader...</b>	Respondents' Response							
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N=66		W M	T- valu e	Df	Sig 2 taile d
		Mea n	STD	Mea n	STD				
<b>1</b>	Establish supportive and motivating atmosphere in which staff, parents and students are encouraged to work as a team in the school	3.67	1.086	3.56	1.198	<b>3.62</b>	<b>0.501</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.617</b>
<b>2</b>	Create positive environment in which good working relationship exist.	3.68	1.192	3.68	1.203	<b>3.68</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.994</b>
<b>3</b>	Advocate school environment conducive to student achievements.	3.61	1.201	3.58	1.247	<b>3.59</b>	<b>0.114</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.910</b>
<b>4</b>	Provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers.	3.61	1.188	3.68	1.220	<b>3.64</b>	<b>-0.328</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.743</b>
<b>5</b>	Encourage a culture of trust between school leaders and teaching staff	3.67	1.013	3.46	1.110	<b>3.58</b>	<b>1.044</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.299</b>
<b>6</b>	Establish a productive working relationship with the community	3.44	1.111	3.40	1.125	<b>3.42</b>	<b>0.188</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.851</b>
<b>7</b>	Are understandable when personal concern causes teachers to arrive work late or leave early	3.62	1.174	3.56	1.053	<b>3.59</b>	<b>0.291</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.772</b>
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.61</b>		<b>3.56</b>					

Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree

As the data indicated in the same table 7, the instructional leaders were found to be agreed on the two school climate roles of encourage a culture of trust between school leaders and teaching staff and establish a productive working relationship with the community with mean values of 3.46 and 3.40 respectively. On the other hand, the instructional leaders had more than average performance in establish supportive and motivating atmosphere in which staff, parents and students are encouraged to work as a team, create positive environment in which good working relationship exist, advocate school environment conducive, and provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers with mean values of 3.56,3.68,3.58 and 3.68.

The rating of the instructional leaders quite complement the ratings of teachers except item 5(encourage a culture of trust between school leaders and teaching staff); in which instructional leaders reported they have highly practiced in schools. The two groups of respondents have rated average the implementation of an instructional role of establishing a productive working relationship with the community. This implies that the instructional leaders are missing one of their tremendous roles of bridging the schools and the community, which is the backbone for school development.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in response between instructional leaders and teachers in relation to leadership roles of creating positive school climate in schools. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference in response between teacher respondents and instructional leaders.

### **4.3 Teaching- Learning Roles of Instructional Leadership**

#### **4.3.1 Professional Skill Development**

Professional skill development is one way of improving the professional competence of employees in an organization and considered to be an important role of individuals assumes a leadership position. To assess the practice ten items were administered and organized for both groups of respondents by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in table below.

As indicated in table 8, with reference to the role of instructional leaders (main principals, vice principals and department heads) in organizing professional skill development opportunity for all staff, creating awareness for teachers about the importance of professional skill development, playing an active role in facilitating teachers professional skill development, identifying the professional development needs of teachers and conducting teachers professional development activity for school instructional leaders respondents, reported the implementation of the items with mean values of 3.16,3.24,3.34,3.36 and 3.38 were to be found to undecided. This confirms that instructional leaders faced difficulty to decide whether the mentioned issues were implemented effectively in the school and the items were to some extent not accomplished.

Table 8: Professional skill development

No	Item Description  Your school leader.../As a leader...	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66					
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD	T value	Df	Sig 2	
1	Play an active role in facilitating teachers professional skill development	3.36	1.151	3.50	1.127	3.43	0.844	114	0.400
2	Identify the professional development needs of teachers	3.34	.895	3.41	1.067	3.38	0.370	114	0.712
3	Conduct teachers professional development activity in your school	3.38	1.058	3.58	1.124	3.48	1.244	114	0.216
4	Encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing.	3.54	1.092	3.44	1.097	3.49	-.490	114	0.625
5	Give regularly teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching	3.48	1.054	3.48	1.085	3.48	0.024	114	0.981
6	Arrange program for staff training to create a spirit of cooperative working atmosphere	3.48	.953	3.47	1.026	3.47	-.055	114	0.956
7	Provide adequate time for professional skill development	3.48	1.074	3.30	1.067	3.39	-.882	114	0.379
8	Organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff	3.16	1.131	3.71	1.200	3.44	2.515	114	0.013
9	Create awareness for teachers about the importance of professional skill development	3.24	1.188	3.54	1.084	3.39	1.370	114	0.173
10	Encourages teachers to review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities	3.44	1.146	3.45	1.139	3.45	0.068	114	0.946
<b>Average means value</b>		3.43		3.49					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df=degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

However, in the remaining activities of instructional leadership, with respect to encouraging teachers to review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities, giving regularly teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching, arranging program for staff training to create a spirit of cooperative working atmosphere, providing adequate time for professional skill development and encouraging teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing items with mean values of 3.44,3.48 and 3.54 were found to be agreed. This implies that the instructional leaders effectively implemented the tasks.

On the other hand, the view of teachers not match with the instructional leaders because they rated almost all the items which fail under agreement level except item number 7 of teachers mean score which found to be under undecided scale. This implies that teachers' respondents were better understanding than that of instructional leaders. In general, this shows that both groups have different idea on the same items.

In interview session the school professional skill development, supervisors and WEos heads were asked how they evaluate the implementation status and the effectiveness of professional skill development program in school. They replied as most of them similar with two groups of respondents responses in the questionnaires.

They said that:

*There were low professional skill development activities in the schools due to lack of budget and lack of knowledge from concerned bodies on the issues. This shows that professional skill development was not effectively practiced in the sampled schools.*

In general, the instructional leader's effectiveness in this role of professional skill development ranges from undecided to agree. However, most activities were found to agree and least activities remain at the undecided level. The above finding shows that, it is possible to conclude that the role of school leaders in professional skill development at the school under study is more of agreement between two groups of respondents.

The result of independent sample t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p values

which ranges from  $-0.055$  to  $1.370$  were greater than  $0.05$  (see table 7). Except item 5 which show that there is statistical significance difference between the means of both groups as obtained  $t$  values which is  $0.024$  was less than  $0.05$ . All obtained  $t$ -values are less than  $t$ -critical ( $1.99$ ) when tested at alpha level  $0.05$ . So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups. These results might be due to the fact that both instructional leaders and teachers have similar thoughts on the effect of professional skill development program in teaching and learning process. Both groups understood that the professional skill development program played a great role in improving the process of teaching and learning even though it has not been implemented fully as it was intended.

#### **4.3.2 Building Effective Relationship in School**

Fundamentally in school everything began with relationship among teachers, administrators, supervisors, students, communities and parents for decision making, allocation of resources and evaluation of learning outcomes. To this effect seven questions were administered and organized for leaders and teachers by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in table below.

Table 9: Building Effective Relationship in School

No	Item Description  Your school leader.../As a leader...	Respondents' Response								
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test			
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66						
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD		T value	Df	Sig 2	
1	Maintain good working relationship with teachers and other staff members	3.67	1.194	3.62	1.276	3.65	0.202	114	0.840	
2	Ensure open and collaborative communication within staff	3.45	1.126	3.40	1.125	3.43	0.259	114	0.796	
3	Understand and analyze the school situations and effectively interact with community and school members	3.55	1.112	3.62	1.067	3.58	-0.364	114	0.717	
4	Treat school community equitably and fairly	3.64	1.185	3.58	.971	3.61	0.274	114	0.785	
5	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions	3.59	1.185	3.74	1.209	3.66	-0.676	114	0.500	
6	Causes the evaluation of school community relations	3.47	1.153	3.48	1.054	3.47	-0.049	114	0.961	
7	Encourage teachers help and support each other	3.78	1.194	3.70	1.199	3.74	0.189	114	0.850	
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.63</b>		<b>3.59</b>						

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df=degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As can be seen from table 9, the overall items in the dimension were rated as agreement level of performance with the average mean value of 3.63 and 3.59 by both instructional leaders

and teachers respectively. This implies that both groups of respondents were almost similar views in the elements of instructional leadership roles.

Concerning to each items analysis, the mean value of instructional leaders and teachers indicate that maintaining good working relationship with teachers and other staff members, understanding and analyze the school situations and effectively interact with community and school members, treating school community equitably and fairly, listening to and accept teachers suggestions and encouraging teachers help and support each others were rated relatively higher than the rest of other items in the dimension with a mean value of (3.65,3.58,3.61,3.66 and 3.72).In other words, instructional leaders strongly strive to items 1,4 and 7 must adapted the way how to the teachers master building effective relationship in their the respective school. Whereas ensuring open and collaborative communication within staff and causing the evaluation of school community relations were rated as in agreement level of performance with mean value of 3.43 and 3.47 by both groups of respondents respectively.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare promoting professional skill development for both instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated all the items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups.

As a whole, the role of instructional leaders (school principals and department heads) with regard to building effective relationship in the school was agreed on. Therefore, it can be said that the role of instructional leaders in building effective relationship among teachers in the school was successful.

In connection to this, Marx (2006) stated that school leaders establish and maintain open and productive relations among the school community by working with teachers, students, parents and the community at large and need to be able to develop and maintain positive relationship with all.

### 4.3.3 Supportive Roles of Instructional Leaders

This role is to be done with how the school leaders relates and respond to staff needs and this contributes to caring environment in which every body cares for one another and invariable foster excellent teaching-learning. To assess the supportive role of instructional leaders five items were administers and organized for both of them by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in table below.

Table 10: Supportive Roles of Instructional Leaders

No	Item Description  Your school leader.../As a leader...	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66					
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD	T value	Df	Sig 2	
1	Set exemplary roles by working hard themselves with staff	3.65	1.162	3.46	1.147	3.56	0.674	114	0.502
2	Goes out of their ways to help teachers	3.67	1.141	3.66	1.118	3.66	0.031	114	0.975
3	Explains the reasons to criticism teachers	3.52	1.140	3.78	1.166	3.63	-1.227	114	0.222
4	Use constructive criticism	3.53	1.126	3.44	1.053	3.49	0.440	114	0.661
5	Looks out for the personal welfare of staff	3.48	1.098	3.46	1.092	3.48	0.025	114	0.980
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.60</b>		<b>3.56</b>					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df =degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As observed in the above table, item numbers 1up to5 both groups of respondents almost rated similarly and the mean scores of instructional leaders (main and vice principals and department heads) were ranges from 3.48-3.67 and that of teachers were ranges from 3.44-3.78 respectively and the average mean scores of two groups of respondents felt to agree.

This indicates that both groups' of respondents agreed that the activities were effectively implemented in the sampled schools.

With reference to the supportive role of instructional leaders (main and vice principals and department heads) in looking out for the personal welfare of staff, explains the reasons to criticism teachers, using constructive criticism to the teachers, Setting exemplary roles by working hard themselves with staff and goes out of their ways to help teachers rated with the mean values of 3.48, 3.52, 3.53, 3.65, and 3.67 respectively were found to agreed. In the same way, the teachers respondents have rated the aforementioned activities fail under agreed scale. As result teaching force in their respective schools were not face difficulties in their performance, highly interested in their job, and develop positive attitude on their instructional leaders. From this one can conclude that there were high interaction in between teachers with teachers, teachers with instructional leaders and teachers with students. In general this situation may lead to high commitment of teachers in their work that result to the provision of high quality education for learner, and high academic achievement.

In relation to this, Halpin (1966) indicated that supportive role of school leader has to be done with how the school leader relates and respond to staff needs and this contributes to caring environment in which every body cares for one another and invariable foster excellent teaching learning process. From this it can be concluded that the supportive role of school leaders was rated as moderately performed in the preparatory schools of the study area.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was employed to compare supportive roles of instructional leaders for both instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated most items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. Except item 5 which show that there is statistical significance difference between the means of both groups as obtained t values which is 0.025 was less than 0.05. So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups.

As a whole, the role of instructional leaders (school principals and department heads) with regard to supporting teaching-learning activities was better agreement between teachers and

leaders. For that reason, it can be concluded that the supportive role of instructional leaders was effectively practiced in the sampled schools.

#### 4.3.4 Directive Roles of Instructional Leaders

A school leader who emphasizes directive very strongly influences how the staff will discharge their responsibility and it will ultimately affect teaching- learning process in the school. To assess the directive role of instructional leaders five items were administered and organized for both of them by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in table below.

Table 11: Directive Roles of Instructional Leaders

No	Item Description  Your school leader.../As a leader...	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66			T value	Df	Sig 2
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD				
1	Take much of the time when teacher-principals conferences are held on	3.59	1.067	3.46	1.092	3.53	0.648	114	0.518
2	Closely checks teacher's activities	3.58	1.302	3.64	.985	3.60	-.291	114	0.771
3	Keep a close check on sign-in time	3.94	1.201	3.44	1.091	3.72	2.306	114	0.023
4	Tell what they do, guide and direct	3.64	1.047	3.66	1.272	3.65	-.110	114	0.913
5	Monitor everything the teachers do	3.89	1.152	3.56	1.264	3.75	1.428	114	0.141
<b>Average mean value</b>		<b>3.73</b>		<b>3.55</b>					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df=degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number-Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As depicted in the above table 11, regarding to directive roles of instructional leaders, item number 1 up to 5 both respondents almost rated similarly and the mean scores of instructional leaders were ranges from 3.58 up to 3.94 and that of teachers were ranges from 3.44 up to 3.66 respectively and the average mean scores were 3.73 and 3.55 respectively, both mean and average mean values of respondents were found to be under agreed scale. This average mean value implies that instructional leaders' interaction with teachers was found to be relatively more directive than supportive.

Item 1, 3 and 5 of the table presents that teachers' respondents contradictorily when compared with instructional leaders, that is, teachers mean scores of items ranges from 3.46, 3.44 and 3.56 respectively. This implies that teachers considered instructional leaders as leading each activity by using force rather than supporting them.

With regarding to each items analysis, the instructional leaders taking much of the time when teacher-principals conferences are held on, keeping a close check on sign-in time and monitoring everything the teachers do were rated agreed level with the mean values of 3.56, 3.89 and 3.94) by instructional leaders, in the same time, school leaders closely checks teacher's activities and telling what they do, guide and direct were rated as agreed level of scale with the mean values of 3.64 and 3.66 by teacher respondents. From this data one can deduce that almost decision making authority were on the positional leaders of respective schools. Staff members may have little influence in the decision making process. As result staff members may be in low morale, follow leaders' direction while renewing that the direction are wrong. In general this condition may influence staff member's autonomy in planning and implementing their work, since staff members are staffed by professional who able to do what right and best for their schools.

In connection to this, Halpin (1966) stated that the school leader who emphasizes directive very strongly believes that, people work best under tension and pressure. This type of principal behavior influences how the staff will discharge their responsibilities and it will ultimately affect the schools.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was employed to compare directive roles of instructional leaders for both instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated most

items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05. Except item 2 which show that there is statistical significance difference between the means of both groups as obtained t values which is 0.006 was less than 0.05.

In general, the role of instructional leaders with regard to directing role of teaching-learning activities was did not have better agreement between teachers and leaders. For that reason, it can be concluded that the directive role of instructional leaders may affect working force motivation and interest to their job that come up with low performance and low academic achievement of the learners in the sampled schools.

#### 4.3.5 Conflict Management Roles of Instructional Leaders

It is aimed to minimize affective conflict at all levels, attain and maintain a moderate amount of substantive conflict and use the appropriate conflict management strategy for diagnosis and intervention of the right problem. To assess the practice of the conflict management role of instructional leaders four items that express the functions were administered, screened and organized for both of them by SPSS for more advanced statistical operation and decision making were presented in table below.

Table 12: Conflict Management Roles of Instructional Leaders

No	Item Description  Your school leader.../As a leader...	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66			T value	Df	Sig 2
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD				
1	Use problem framing and solving skill effectively	3.73	1.144	3.58	1.032	3.66	0.716	114	0.476
2	Challenging and mediating resistance	3.62	1.160	3.62	1.105	3.62	0.006	114	0.995
3	Confront and resolve problems in timely manner	3.64	1.090	3.58	1.311	3.61	0.253	114	0.801
4	Provide a safe and supportive environment	3.85	1.193	3.32	1.151	3.62	2.399	114	0.018
<b>Average mean</b>		<b>3.71</b>		<b>3.53</b>					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df=degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, Mean scores 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree, 1.81-2.60=Disagree, 2.61-3.40=Undecided, 3.41-4.20=Agree and 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree.

As it can be seen from table 11 above, with reference to roles of instructional leaders(main and vice principals and department heads) in challenging and mediating resistance, confronting and resolving problems in timely manner, using problem framing and solving skill effectively and providing a safe and supportive environment both instructional leaders and teachers respondents ,indicated that the instructional leaders role were ranges from 3.62 to 3.85 and 3.58 to 3.62 respectively and the average mean scores were 3.71 and 3.53 respectively, both mean and average mean values of respondents were found to agreed. These averages mean values implies that instructional leaders are dominant or not participatory of teachers in conflict resolutions methods in the dimension.

Concerning to each item analysis, the instructional leaders using problem framing and solving skill effectively, challenging and mediating resistance, confronting and resolving problems in timely manner and providing a safe and supportive environment were agreed with each of the 4 items stated with mean values of (3.73, 3.62,3.64 and 3.85) by instructional leaders, in the same time, teachers respondents using problem framing and solving skill effectively, challenging and mediating resistance and confronting and resolving problems in timely manner were rated as lower than that of instructional leaders with the mean values of (3.58 3.62 3.58 and3.32) by teacher respondents except item 4(providing a safe and supportive environment) of teachers mean values which found to be under undecided . From this data one can deduce that almost all conflict management authorities were on the positional leaders of respective schools. Staff members may have little influence in the problem solving process. As result staff members may be in low morale, follow leaders' direction while renewing that the direction are wrong. In general this condition may influence staff member's autonomy in deciding and managing the ability of problem solving in their own work, since staff members are staffed by specialized who able to do what right and best for their schools. Furthermore, the observed conflict managing role of instructional leaders may affect working force motivation and interest to their job that come up with low performance of the learners in their perspective schools.

In addition to this, open ended items were asked to both groups of respondents. Accordingly, instructional leaders used the school rules and regulation to maintain and resolve the conflict rose between individual and groups. Here they were not following the scientific way of problem solving in their respective schools. In relation to this, Barge (1994) stated that, a wise leader must have ethically and to do so should be open to new information and be willing to change his or her mind as well as others mind. Effective school leaders need to understand the nature of the conflict and develop practical skill to manage it. From these findings, it is possible to conclude that, the practice of managing conflict was highly affected the task of teachers respondents in the preparatory schools of the study area.

Finally, an independent sample t-test was employed to compare conflict management roles of instructional leaders for both instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, they rated most items in the dimension as high performance with no statistically significant difference in their responses. All obtained t-values are less than t-critical ( $1.99$ ) when tested at alpha level  $0.05$ .

As a whole, the role of instructional leaders with regard to conflict management in teaching-learning activities was better agreement between teachers and leaders. As a result, it can be concluded that the conflict management role of instructional leaders over acting on the staff members and also staff members may have little influence in the problem solving process.

#### **4.4 Challenges to Instructional Leadership Effectiveness**

Range of instructional leadership barriers can be listed depending on the context to which each sampled schools are exposed. However, with the exception of some particularities, most of the factors that hinder the effective performance of instructional leadership practices in the zone are common to every school. The extent to which these factors affect each school performance dependent up on the leader's ability of controlling different situation. Therefore, the study had dealt with some of the major factors supposed will seriously affect the effective performance of instructional leaders. Four groups of hindering factors were selected for the inquiry namely; lack of vision, will and courage, lack of training, knowledge and skills in the area of educational leadership, lack of stakeholders' co-operation and insufficiency of educational inputs were selected as main factors.

Each of them was described with related question items as shown as in their respect tables. A five point scale that ranges from very highs to very low was employed to collect data through the close ended questionnaires shown. In the scale very high and high represents the extent of inadequacy of each item. On the other hand, very low and low represents adequacy of each item. For the sake of easy analysis, the mean values in the scales were interpreted as follows: means values less than 1.80 as very low, 1.81-2.60 as low, 2.61-3.40 as moderate, 3.41-4.20 as high and greater than 4.21 as very high.

#### 4.4.1 Lack of Skill and Training

The conceptual, technical and human skills are among the most important components that one instructional leader should possess. The extent to which the leaders are equipped with these components determines the level of effectiveness in their goal achievement. So, questionnaires with five point scale were distributed to judge the extent to which each school instructional leaders acquire the skills and provide opportunity to others. Hence, the five point scale was interpreted as means values less than 1.80 as very low, 1.81-2.60 as low, 2.61-3.40 as moderate, 3.41-4.20 as high and greater than 4.21 as very high problem.

Table 13: Lack of Skills and Training

No	Item Description  How do you rate the following challenges of instructional leadership in your school?	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66					
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD		T value	Df	Sig 2
1	Lack of qualified instructional leaders in the area of education	3.33	1.057	3.50	1.151	3.42	-0.848	114	0.398
2	Lack of training on instructional leadership	3.35	1.074	3.46	1.014	3.40	-0.567	114	0.572
3	Lack of in-service training and teachers development program	3.71	1.074	3.56	1.198	3.65	0.685	114	0.495
4	Lack of qualified teachers in all subject area	3.11	1.136	2.90	1.111	3.01	0.617	114	0.538
<b>Average mean</b>		<b>3.50</b>		<b>3.36</b>					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df=degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, mean values 1.00-1.80 very low, 1.81-2.60 low, 2.61-3.40 moderate, 3.41-4.20 high and 4.21 very high problem .

As depicted in table 13, with reference to challenges of instructional leaders (main and vice principal and department heads) effectiveness in adequate qualified teachers in all subject area, lack of qualified instructional leaders in the area of education and lack of training on instructional leadership instructional leaders respondents ,indicated that the instructional leaders role were ranges from 3.11 to 3.35 with mean values of respondents felled to moderate except item lack of in-service training and teachers development program of instructional leaders mean scores which found to high. This points that, most of the instructional leaders respondents considered as moderately challenges the instructional leadership effectiveness and only item #3 were highly challenged the instructional leadership effectiveness in sampled schools.

On the other hand item #1, #2 and #3 of the table 12 above present that teachers respondents responded contradictorily when compared with instructional leaders, that is, teachers mean values of items ranges from 3.46 to 3.56 which found to be highly challenged the instructional leadership effectiveness of the activities except item #4(lack of qualified teachers in all subject area) of the teachers mean scores which felt to moderately challenged the instructional leadership effectiveness in the sampled schools.

The overall items in the dimension of instructional leadership challenges in skill and training examination indicate that the items rated moderate with average mean value of 3.50 and 3.36 respectively by instructional leaders and teachers. This shows the dimension needs much effort to improve for better teaching- learning process and both groups of respondents have similar opinion on instructional leadership skill and training. As we have seen before on characteristics of respondents on section 4.1 indicates that all the participants (instructional leaders and teachers) to this study was not qualified with second degree. So, the item selection as a moderate is logical.

An independent t-test was conducted to compare instructional leaders' skill and training score for instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, the items in the dimension were rated

as moderate by both instructional leaders and teachers with no statistically significant difference in their judgments. All the obtained t-values are less than the t-critical value (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05.

The result of interview made to Woreda education office head and supervisors reveals contrary ideas to that of instructional leaders and teachers responses. According to them, the offices provided many training in leadership aspects like teacher development program, continuous professional development, community participation and etc. They stressed the problem is attached to turnover of instructional leaders from year to year and lack commitment and moral of instructional leaders to accomplish their tasks. Therefore, it is important to think while recruitment and selection of principals will be made about the past experiences of candidates' commitment and moral to perform their function and candidates interest to stay in their respective schools at least 5-7 years after gaining training on leadership. Moreover, the principals should be given in-service education opportunity and some kind of motivation in the form of house allowances. This may reduce the gap of every year turnover and commitment to their profession.

Related to this, Sergiovanni (2000) stated that the conceptual, technical and human skills are among the most important components of skill that instructional leadership has possessed. The extent to which the school leaders are equipped with these components determines the level of effectiveness in their goal achievement. Therefore, it is important to think while selecting individuals to be the candidate in-service training opportunity and some kind of motivation that encouraged them to do more.

#### **4.4.2 Lack of Cooperation and Commitment for instructional improvement of Stakeholders**

Schools effectiveness is contingent to many factors. However, the cooperation of its main stakeholders namely partners, students, teachers and governments may ease the degree of pressure exerted from other sources.

Table 14: Lack of Cooperation and Commitment for Instructional Improvement of stakeholders

No	Item Description  How do you evaluate the school leaders' relationship with the following stakeholders in your school?	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66			T value	Df	Sig 2
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD				
1	Teachers	3.42	1.012	3.45	1.026	3.44	0.181	114	0.857
2	Students	3.22	1.075	3.41	1.092	3.3	0.781	114	0.437
3	School boards	3.22	1.075	3.45	1.026	3.33	1.195	114	0.235
4	School communities	3.41	.969	3.27	.969	3.33	-.700	114	0.485
5	Woreda educational managers	3.50	.931	3.39	.959	3.4	-.597	114	0.551
<b>Average mean</b>		<b>3.36</b>		<b>3.42</b>					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df=degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, mean values 1.00-1.80 very low, 1.81-2.60 low, 2.61-3.40 moderate, 3.41-4.20 high and 4.21 very high problem .

As it can be seen from the table 14, overall items in the dimension of instructional leadership in cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement of stakeholders examination indicate that the items rated as moderate with the average mean values of (3.35 and 3.42) by instructional leaders and teachers respectively. This shows that, the dimension needs much effort to improve for better teaching- learning process and to made positive relationship with school communities opinion on cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement of stakeholders.

Regarding to each items analysis, in the dimension instructional leaders have cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement with teachers, school community and Woreda educational managers rated as high with mean value of 3.41, 3.42 and 3.50 respectively by instructional leaders. The remaining two items ( cooperation with students and school

boards) in the dimensions by instructional leaders rated moderate with the same mean values of 3.22. This illustrates that, most of the instructional leader's respondents considered that challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness in the sampled schools were not effectively successful and the moderate result indicates that, the challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness had either little impacts in the practices or successful relations with the stakeholders in the dimension.

On the other hand item #2 and #3 of the table 13 show that teachers respondents responded contradictorily when compared with instructional leaders, that is, teachers cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement with students and school boards rated as high with mean values of 3.42 and 3.45 and items #3 and #4 (school community and Woreda educational managers) rated as moderate with mean value of 3.27, 3.39. This confirms that, challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness had highly affect the teaching learning process in the implementations of tasks in the sampled schools.

The interview conducted with five supervisors and five woreda education offices revealed that instructional leaders show good will to cooperate with schools. However, despite their willingness to cooperate with the preparatory schools, as Harris and Muijs (2005: 94) asserts, many routine and seasonal issues take away the attention of the office heads and the local community leaders who can mobilize resource those schools had badly needed.

In connection to this, such cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement with stake holders can be seen as MoE, (2006: 45-51) shows the leaders were more or less capable to involve their main stake holders to their environment in the task of school affairs, or the leaders, particularly the principals were powerful of the theory as well as the practice of educational leadership. An independent t-test was conducted to compare instructional leaders' cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement with their stakeholders score for instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, the average mean values of the items in the dimension were rated as highly performed by both instructional leaders and teachers with no statistically significant difference in their judgments. All the obtained t-values are less than the t-critical value (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05.

#### 4.4.3 Lack of Resources Availability and Allocation

Adequacy of human and material resources influences the extent to which school goals are achieved. Scarcity of the resources has a great impact on the quality and quantity of school output. A five point scale ranging from very high to very low was used to rate the degree of availability or scarcity of the educational materials that each preparatory schools had needed.

Table 15: Lack of Resource Availability and Allocation

No	How do you evaluate the availability of the following resources in your school?	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66					
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD		T value	Df	Sig 2
1	Lack of adequate instructional time	3.30	1.123	3.28	1.161	3.29	0.212	114	0.832
2	Lack of stationary materials for teaching	3.77	1.020	3.60	.969	3.70	0.923	114	0.358
3	Lack of student textbook	3.83	1.017	3.54	1.034	3.71	1.528	114	0.129
4	Lack of furniture	3.79	1.103	3.78	1.112	3.78	0.038	114	0.970
5	Lack of library space and time	3.65	1.170	3.74	1.157	3.69	-.405	114	0.686
6	Lack of recurrent budget support	3.70	1.067	3.60	1.070	3.66	0.454	114	0.651
<b>Average mean</b>		<b>3.67</b>		<b>3.59</b>					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, Df =degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, mean values 1.00-1.80 very low, 1.81-2.60 low, 2.61-3.40 moderate, 3.41-4.20 high and 4.21 very high problem .

As it can be seen from the table 15, the examination of an overall item in the dimension of availability of resources rated as highly challenges the practice of instructional leaders with average mean value of 3.67 and 3.59 by both instructional leaders and teachers respectively.

This shows that both groups of respondents had how much school were suffering inadequacy of resources supply by their respective schools.

Concerning to individual item analysis, in the same table 14 the instructional leaders in relation to resource availability with items like enough instructional time, students text books, furniture, library space and time and enough stationary materials for teaching-learning process were rated as high with mean values ranges from 3.65 to 3.83 by instructional leaders respondents, this implies that there is no enough resource availability in the practice of instructional leadership and highly challenges the implementation of teaching-learning process except item#1(adequacy of instructional time) in the dimensions by instructional leaders rated moderate with mean values of 3.30 which indicates that, the resource availability had either little impacts in the practices of instructional leadership effectiveness.

Similarly, the teachers respondents responses in challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness in the same items which are listed in the table 15 like enough instructional time, students text books, furniture, library space and time and enough stationary materials for teaching-learning process were rated as high with mean values ranges from 3.54 to 3.78 by instructional leaders respondents, this implies that there is no enough resource availability in the practice of instructional leadership and highly challenges the implementation of teaching-learning process except item#1(adequacy of instructional time) in the dimensions by teachers rated moderate with mean values of 3.28 which indicates that, the resource availability had either little impacts in the practices of instructional leadership effectiveness or the respondents may not respond the item carefully.

As a whole, one can conclude that neither instructional leaders nor the teachers group believed that availability of materials in the school had been sufficient the schools to run the teaching learning processes effectively. Therefore, it would be difficult to expect effective instructional processes and high educational outputs without adequate teaching materials, text books teachers guide, library space and furniture in the absence of enough recurrent budget support. Moreover, the interview conducted with five supervisors and five Woreda Education Office heads also support the above judgment.

An independent t-test was conducted to compare the availabilities of the resources for instructional leaders and teachers. As a result, the items in the dimension were rated as moderate by both instructional leaders and teachers with no statistically significant difference in their judgments except item there is enough instructional time for instructional leaders which shows that there is statistically significant difference in the responses. I.e. instructional leaders believe that they have time for instructional issues whereas, teachers believe school leaders do not have much time for instructional issues. The remaining obtained t-values are less than the t-critical value (1.99) when tested at alpha level 0.05.

#### 4.4.4 Lack of Vision, Will and Courage

The school mission and vision reflects the hopes, dreams, needs and interests valued by school stakeholders. However, realization of vision and mission is possible when the leaders of each school possess adequate knowledge bases, willingness and courage to lead the school towards the perceived targets. Therefore, the five point scale which ranges from very high to very low was used to rate the degree of Vision, Will and Courage that each preparatory schools had needed.

Table 16: Lack of Vision, Will and Courage

No	Item Description  Evaluate your leaders in relation to the following instructional roles	Respondents' Response							
		Mean values				W. M	Comparing means by using t-test		
		Instructional leaders N=50		Teachers N= 66					
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD		T value	Df	Sig 2
1	Lack of courage to take risks, at time for the improvement of instruction	3.42	1.313	3.36	1.306	3.39	0.262	114	0.794
2	unwillingness to devote more time for instructional issues	3.39	1.251	3.34	1.287	3.37	0.227	114	0.821
3	Lack of adequate knowledge base of instruction leadership	3.48	1.180	3.38	1.244	3.43	0.463	114	0.644
4	Lack of organize the school community for leadership work	3.47	1.231	3.42	1.263	3.45	0.213	114	0.832
5	unwillingness to assess staff and school capacity for leadership	3.41	1.150	3.28	1.310	3.45	0.564	114	0.574
<b>Average mean</b>		<b>3.43</b>		<b>3.36</b>					

WM=weighted mean, STD=standard deviation, DF=degree of freedom, t critical=1.99, N=number, mean values 1.00-1.80 very low, 1.81-2.60 low, 2.61-3.40 moderate, 3.41-4.20 high and 4.21 very high problem .

As it can be seen from the table 16, instructional leaders, rated the overall items in the dimension had highly challenged the instructional leadership effectiveness with the average mean values of 3.43. This indicates that the challenges had how much difficult to instructional leadership effectiveness. In contrast, the teachers respondents rated the overall items in the dimension as moderately hindering factors of instructional leadership effectiveness with average mean values of 3.36. The views of teachers implies that the aforementioned tasks had not as much as challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness in the sampled schools.

Regarding to each individuals items analysis, to challenges of instructional leaders (main and vice principal and department heads) effectiveness in willingness to assess staff and school capacity for leadership, organizing the school community for leadership work, courage to take risks at time for the improvement of instruction and adequate knowledge base of instruction leadership instructional leaders respondents ,indicated that the instructional leaders role were ranges from 3.41 to 3.47 with mean values of respondents felt to high except item willingness to devote more time for instructional issues of instructional leaders mean scores 3.39 which found to moderate challenges when it camper with other items. Hence, this may show how much schools had suffering in the items that are mentioned in the above dimension by their respective schools in each sampled woredas.

Paradoxically, the teachers respondents responses in challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness in the same items which are listed in the table 15 like willingness to assess staff and school capacity for leadership, willingness to devote more time for instructional issues, courage to take risks at time for the improvement of instruction and adequate knowledge base of instruction leadership teachers respondents ,indicated that the instructional leaders role were ranges from 3.23 to 3.38 with mean values of respondents felt to moderate except item organizing the school community for leadership work, of instructional leaders mean scores 3.42 which is found to be high challenges when it compared with other items. This shows that challenges of instructional leaders were not as much as obstacles for the practices of instructional leadership effectiveness.

Additionally, the characteristics of respondents on section 4.1, indicates that most of instructional leaders were specialized with subject matters. This may result negative effects in teaching-learning process. Instructional leader who lacks courage to take risks at time for the improvement of instruction, unwillingness to devote more time for instructional issues, adequate knowledge base of instruction leadership, organizing the school community for leadership work and willingness to assess staff and school capacity for leadership to their schools.

Regarding to this, McEen (2003) indicates that realization of school vision and school mission is possible when the leaders of each school possess' adequate knowledge base, willingness and courage to lead the school towards the perceived objectives. On the other hand lack of vision, will and courage could hinder the effectiveness of leadership performance. As a result, it can easily conclude that, an instructional leader who lacks adequate knowledge of leadership may not courage to take risk, improve instruction and willingness to devote their time for the achievement of the school vision and mission in the sampled schools.

The result of independent sample t-test values for all items indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups as obtained p values which ranges from 0.574 to 0.832 were greater than 0.05(see table 15). All obtained t-values are less than t-critical ( $1.99$ ) when tested at alpha level  $0.05$ . So, this implies the consistency of responses between the groups. These results might be due to the fact that both instructional leaders and teachers have similar thoughts on the effect of knowledge, will and courage in teaching and learning process. Both groups understood that the knowledge, will and courage played a great role in improving the process of teaching and learning even though it has not been put into practices fully as it was intended.

Generally speaking, instructional leaders rated the overall items in the dimension as high except item 3 which is moderately challenged the practice of instructional leadership in the study area. On the other hand, teacher's respondents rated almost all items in the dimensions as moderate except item 4 which is high problem in implementing the practice of instructional leadership.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FINDINGS**

This chapter deals with the summary of major findings, the conclusion drawn from the findings and recommendations that the researcher suggests and assumes operational in improving the status of instructional leadership practices and challenges in government preparatory schools of Hadiya zone in SNNPR.

#### **5.1 Summary of Major Findings**

The main purpose of the study was to assess the practices and challenges of instructional leadership in government preparatory schools of Hadiya zone, in SNNPR. To this end, an attempt has been made to assess the dimensions of instructional leadership, the teaching learning roles of instructional leaders and barriers to instructional leadership effectiveness. Finally, the study made an effort to come up with suggestions and forwarded recommendations. In order to achieve the objective of the study, the following basic questions were stated and answered.

1. What are the instructional leadership practices in the preparatory schools of Hadiya zone?
2. To what extent do the school leaders perform different dimensions of instructional leadership effectively?
3. To what extent have the current instructional leadership roles affect teaching learning process?
4. What are the major challenges that faced instructional leadership effectiveness in the schools?

A survey study with quantitative research approach was employed in this study. The related literature was reviewed and documented. In order to get answers for the above basic questions, among of eight preparatory schools found in Hadiya zone, the study was carried out in five preparatory schools that were selected by purposive sampling techniques to the study. There were 116 total populations of school leaderships and teachers in the zone. The study incorporated a total of 126 respondents. Five Woreda Education Office heads and five woreda school supervisors, instructional leaders and teachers of Hadiya zone were

incorporated in the study. Five Woreda Education Office heads and five woreda school supervisors were interviewed. The remaining two groups of respondents (instructional leaders and teachers) were asked to respond the questionnaires. One set of questionnaire was used for data collection in the study.

All the questionnaires that were distributed to the teachers and instructional leaders were completed and returned to the researcher. In addition, to supplement the information gathered through questionnaire, the interviews were undertaken with five supervisors and five WEOs heads, and also information from document analysis is used as supplementary as planned. Finally, the data were carefully collected, coded, and presented for analysis.

In the study, different data analysis tools such as mean values, average mean values, and an independent simple t-test for comparing means and spearman's correlation were used. Therefore, the analysis made then justifies the following major findings.

#### **5.1.1 Setting the School Vision and Defining School Mission**

The data gathered from instructional leaders (main, vice principals and department heads) teachers respondents revealed that the practice of instructional leadership perceived as positive in setting school vision and defining mission were highly implemented with average mean values of 3.42 and 3.46 respectively.

In the same way, majority of the respondents believed that regarding to the overall judgment of the practice in setting the school vision and defining school mission found to be highly successful in using students performance results to develop the school missions, framing the school mission in terms of self responsibility, allocating adequate resources for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission, identifying the impediments to achieve missions of the school and design strategies to address the impediments in advance and developing a set of annual school-wide goals focused on the student learning in the sampled school were perceived as positively in the dimensions. In contrast, the remaining activities were lays undecided which indicates both groups of respondents did not decide whether or not it is effectively practiced in sampled schools.

In the interviews session, made with five supervisors and five WEos heads, the interviewees indicated that almost all instructional leaders set school vision and defines mission effectively and observe it as positively. They further indicated that the instructional leaders are obedient to set and define school vision and mission in their school continuously. In addition to this, the reports of document analysis such as annual plan, minutes and different check lists supported that school vision and mission were effectively practiced.

### **5.1.2 Managing Curriculum and Instruction**

The data obtained from both groups of respondents' shows that they were effective implementation of instructional leadership practices in managing curriculum and instruction with average mean values of 3.48 and 3.47 respectively in their school.

Similarly, some respondents understood that regarding to the overall judgment on the practice instructional leadership in managing curriculum and instruction found to be highly successful in advising teachers regarding the challenges they faced in relation to the implementation of the curriculum and encouraging and providing the necessary support to teachers to periodically evaluate and comment for curriculum improvement in the dimensions. In the remaining activities of instructional leadership practices both groups of respondents had different views, majority of instructional leaders rated the practice higher than that of teacher respondents in contrast, teachers rated items like ensuring the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process and evaluating the effectiveness of instructional program in achieving school goals higher than instructional leaders.

In open ended question, some respondents perceived managing curriculum and instruction as positively seen the activities of practice in the dimensions and some of the others negatively.

### **5.1.3 Supervising and Evaluating Instruction**

Both groups of respondents have perceived that the supervisory support and instructional evaluation activities had successfully been practiced in the sampled schools with average mean value of 3.41 and 3.45 by instructional leaders and teachers respectively.

On the other hand, majority of the respondents believed that concerning to the overall judgment on the practices of instructional leadership in supervisory support and evaluation of instruction found to be highly employed in making classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process, creating opportunities for professional discussions among teachers, encouraging teachers to use different instructional methods and making regular follow-up and feedback to teachers in the sampled school were perceived as positively in the dimension. In contrast, both groups of respondents believed that regarding to holding regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction rated as undecided with mean value of 3.14 and 3.32 respectively which is either positively or negatively practiced in the dimension.

In the interviews session, the interviewees indicated that almost all supervisors and WEos heads perceived supervisory support and evaluation of instruction positively and they implemented that classroom observation conducted twice a semester by them. In line with this document analysis such as supervision check lists and minutes of the schools witness or support the above idea.

#### **5.1.4 Monitoring instructional program**

Both groups of the respondents believed that concerning to the overall judgment on the practices of instructional leadership in to monitoring instructional program found to be highly employed in encouraging teachers to held the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function, informing the school's performance result to teachers in report forms after effective monitoring of the activities, meeting individually with teachers to discuss student's academic progress and using test result to assess progress towards schools goals rated as agreed with average mean values of 3.64 and 3.60 respectively.

The document analysis made in the school also verifies that instructional leaders were to some extent regularly used check list for monitoring instructional programs and teacher's performance.

### **5.1.5 Promoting a Conducive School Learning Climate**

From the data obtained, both groups of the respondents believed that concerning to the overall judgment on the practices of instructional leadership in to promoting a conducive school learning climate found to be highly practiced in establishing supportive and motivating atmosphere in which staff, parents and students are encouraged to work as a team in the school, creating positive environment in which good working relationship exist, advocating school environment conducive to student achievements, providing support in building collaborative cultures among teachers, establishing a productive working relationship with the community and understandable when personal concern causes teachers to arrive work late or leave early in the sampled schools were perceived as positively rated with average mean values of 3.61 and 3.56 respectively. In general, from the above findings one can understand that, almost all the instructional leaders were performing effectively in each dimension as well as in overall instructional leadership practice.

## **The Teaching Learning Roles of Instructional Leaders**

### **5.1.6 Professional skill development**

The obtained data showed that both groups of respondents (instructional leaders and teachers) understood that concerning to the overall judgment on the practices of instructional leadership in to the role of professional skill development found to be effectively implemented with average mean values of 3.43.and 3.49 respectively.

On the other hand, instructional leaders believed that concerning to the overall judgment on the practices of instructional leadership in the role of professional skill development found to be highly employed in encouraging teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing, giving regularly teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching, arranging program for staff training to create a spirit of cooperative working atmosphere and encouraging teachers to review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities in the sampled schools were perceived as positively performed. But, the remaining activities of instructional leadership roles was found to be undecided which may result difficulties in the realization of the program effectively and efficiently in teaching –learning process.

Contrast to that, the teacher's respondents forwards their opinion regarding to overall items in dimensions were highly performed except only one item providing adequate time for professional skill development found to be undecided which implies that either the practice were implemented or not given more emphasis at all.

In the interviews session, the interviewees indicated that almost all supervisors and WEos heads perceived professional skill development positively so, the activities were more or less effectively implemented in school. In line with this document analysis such as school annual plan, school professional skill development plan, individual plan, professional skill development check lists and minutes of the schools witness or support the above idea.

### **5.1.7 Building Effective Relationship in School**

Regarding to the roles of instructional leaders in building effective relationship, the overall assessment showed that the instructional leaders found to be high in building effective relationship in their schools as witnessed by two groups of respondents with the average mean values of 3.59 and 3.59 respectively. In support of this judgment, instructional leaders maintain good working relationship with teachers and other staff members, ensure open and collaborative communication within staff, treat school community equitably and fairly and encourage teachers help and support each other as witnessed were highly implemented in the dimension by teacher's respondent's response.

### **5.1.8 Supportive Role of Instructional Leaders**

As obtained data from the two groups of respondents, concerning supportive role of instructional leaders that provide to their followers to promote positive climate in their school occurs some times as reported by their average mean values of 3.60 and 3.56 respectively. This may show that the instructional leaders and teachers felled to agree effective performance in the assigning and making good manner to support teachers as it help is needed. In support of this opinion, instructional leaders set exemplary roles by working hard themselves with staff, goes out of their ways to help teachers and used constructive criticism as witnessed by the teachers respondents were effectively practiced in the sampled schools. Generally speaking, there were effective interaction in between teachers with teachers, teachers with instructional leaders and teachers with students. Additionally, this situation

may lead to high commitment of teachers in their work that result to the provision of high quality education for learner, and high academic achievement.

#### **5.1.9 Directive Roles of Instructional Leaders**

With regarding to directive role of instructional leaders, the gathered data revealed that the instructional leaders were agreed in controlling the overall condition of their schools as witnessed by two groups of respondents with the average mean values of 3.73 and 3.55 correspondingly. As result instructional leaders roles, take much of the time when teacher-principals conferences are held on, closely checks teacher's activities, keep a close check on sign-in time, tell what they do, guide and direct and tell what they do, guide and direct, frequently occurrence of directive behaviors of school leader were witnessed by teachers respondents.

In general this condition may influence staff member's autonomy in planning and implementing their work, since staff members are staffed by professional who able to do what right and best for their schools. Furthermore, the observed directive role of instructional leaders may affect working force motivation and interest to their job that come up with low performance and low academic achievement of the learners.

#### **5.1.10 Conflict Management Role of Instructional Leaders**

From the result of data analysis, the practice of conflict management was rated as high with the average mean values of 3.71 by instructional leaders. These averages mean values implies that instructional leaders are dominant or not participatory of teachers in conflict resolutions methods in the dimension.

Furthermore, the instructional leaders using problem framing and solving skill effectively, challenging and mediating resistance, confronting and resolving problems in timely manner and providing a safe and supportive environment were rated as high with the mean values of (3.73, 3.62, 3.64 and 3.85) by instructional leaders when we compared with teachers respondents . From this data one can deduce that almost all conflict management authorities

were on the positional leaders of respective schools. Staff members may have little influence in the problem solving process.

In open ended question, instructional leaders (main and vice principals and department heads) believed that conflict management roles of instructional leadership practices as positively or negatively perceived when they were not used following scientific ways of problem solving.

## **Challenges to Instructional Leadership Effectiveness**

### **5.1.11 Lack of Skill and Training**

The data gathered from instructional leaders (main and vice principals and department heads) teachers respondents in overall assessment of items revealed that the challenges of instructional leadership perceived lack of skill and training were rated as moderately challenged practice of instructional leadership effectiveness with average mean values of 3.36 and 3.36 respectively. But the data analyses shows us that there is no better accomplishment with average mean score 3.36. So it needs further research in the area.

On the other hand, both groups of respondents concerning to lack of in-service training and teachers development program rated highly challenged the practices of instructional leadership effectiveness with mean values of 3.71 and 3.56 respectively. As indicated in the findings of the study, however, the instructional leaders of the preparatory schools of the zone have less training related with instructional leadership and management, and for this reason, they failed to lead teachers and non-teaching staffs in proper manner.

### **5.1.12 Lack of Cooperation and Commitment for Instructional Improvement of Stakeholders**

The overall examination of items in the dimension of instructional leadership to cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement of stakeholder were rated as moderately challenged the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness with the average mean values of 3.35 and 3.39 by instructional leaders and teachers respectively. This data shows that the instructional leaders have less cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement with the school teachers and school community.

Both groups of respondents regarding to item #1 (cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement with school teachers) were rated as highly challenged instructional leadership effectiveness with mean value of 3.42 and 3.45 respectively, which indicates that ineffective implementation of cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement with school teachers becomes weak as perceived by the respondents.

#### **5.1.13 Lack of Resources Availabilities and allocation**

Concerning the availabilities of resources, the study revealed that lack of instructional time was rated as moderately challenged instructional leadership effectiveness in the dimension with mean value of 3.30 and 3.28 respectively by both groups of respondents. Whereas, lack of students' text books, lack of furniture, lack of library space and time and lack of stationary materials for teaching and lack of recurrent budget support were rated as the highest challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness in the dimension with mean value of ranges from 3.65 to 3.83 and 3.54 to 3.78 respectively by both groups of respondents (instructional leaders and teachers). Hence, this may show how much schools were suffering in lack of resources availability and allocation by their respective schools. In other words the availability of resources was not adequate enough in the preparatory schools of the study area.

#### **5.1.14 Lack of Vision, Will and Courage**

Regarding to the challenges of the vision will and courage, the study revealed that instructional leaders rated as highly challenged the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness were with the average mean values of 3.43. This also witnessed by this study that the current study has identified the achievements made so far, the challenges encountered, and the future prospects in implementing instructional leadership practices in study area. On the contrary, teacher's respondents revealed that lack of knowledge, will and courage rated as moderately challenged the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness with average mean values of 3.36.

In the same way, instructional leaders said that concerning to the overall judgment on the challenges of instructional leadership effectiveness in the vision, will and courage had found

to be highly hindered the instructional leadership effectiveness in that lack of courage to take risks at time for the improvement of instruction, lack of adequate knowledge base of instruction leadership, lack of organizing the school community for leadership work and lack of willingness to assess staff and school capacity for leadership were with mean values ranges from 3.41 to 3.48 except lack of willingness to devote more time for instructional issues which is rated moderately with mean values of 3.39. This obtained data also shows that the instructional leaders were not prepared well communicated vision and mission in schools.

On the other hand, teachers respondents almost all the items rated moderate with mean values ranges from 3.28 to 3.38 except lack of organizing the school community for leadership work were rated high challenges to instructional leadership effectiveness.

As a whole ,lack of availabilities of resources, lack of knowledgeable, skilled and trained manpower(shortage of qualified teachers and instructional leaders), cooperation and commitment for instructional improvement of stakeholder, high turnover and transfer of principals, shortage of qualified teachers instructional leaders, overcrowded class, shortage of community involvement in student learning, lack of commitment from stake holders, shortage of text books and teaching materials, principals and supervisors skill gap to take self evaluation were the major challenges which hinder instructional leadership practices in the preparatory schools of the study area.

## 5.2 Conclusions

First of all, before representing some conclusions and recommendation it is worth noting what Fullan (2001: 145) elaborated what and how the instructional leaders exercise their authority and responsibility in performing their daily duties. They advice instructional leaders to be alert in driving their staff towards goal, mainly towards high students' achievement, organizing and coordinating tasks for effective and efficient outcome; allocating adequate resource for learning improvement and commitment among school members. Therefore, the following conclusions have been drawn from the results of analysis related to the basic question of the study.

Regarding to personal information of instructional leaders is expected to provide effective instructional leadership for the attainment of the school objectives. However, the study revealed that most leaders have given moderate attention to this part of their practices. As a result, instructional leadership is not provided strongly by most instructional leaders in their respective schools. Moreover, the majority (80%) of instructional leaders did not successfully perform effectively in each instructional leadership dimension. However the findings revealed that majority of the instructional leaders were not in the area of educational management institution. They were assigned the post without having management training, skills and knowledge in their respective schools.

Concerning to the involvement of instructional leaders (main and vice principals and department heads) in setting school vision and defining school mission, managing curriculum and instructional programs, supervising and evaluating instruction and promoting positive school learning climate were effectively implemented. In general, this study revealed that on the instructional leadership dimensions found finally that the involvement of preparatory school instructional leaders in performing the five major functions of instructional leadership require further improvement in the zone. Accordingly, instructional leaders need to be purposeful, visionary and develop value that focus on learning and act with the necessary commitment to realize the vision. This vision however, should reflect the hopes, needs and interests of everybody who have stake in the school. The study showed that the school mission was more or less not formulated by identifying and

addressing potential barriers to its effective realization. As a result, sufficient resources were not sourced from potential supporters of schooling. Therefore, the practice shows that the vision and mission did not command the ownership of its potential stakeholders and it will be difficult for the schools to implement and sustain the vision and mission.

Concerning about the teaching learning roles of instructional leaders that make strive to improve teachers teaching skill, giving positive directions to teachers and other staff members and supporting teachers in constructive suggestions and materials were not fairly implemented or less effective. While, providing professional skill development, building positive relationship with stakeholders, supportive role of instructional leaders, and conflict management strategies were well or efficiently practiced in the study area except directive role of instructional leaders was ineffective. However, the findings of the previous sections revealed that the term as well as the teaching learning roles of instructional leadership was not appropriately implemented among preparatory schools of Hadiya Zone. Therefore, it can be concluded that schools were more or less capable of giving positive directions to teachers and non-teaching staffs and improving the quality of schools output for the need of participatory teaching learning roles from the instructional leaders' side.

In addition, the above findings revealed that, the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness was faced by lack of adequate skill, training and knowledge, vision, will and courage, availability of resources of instructional leaders were highly hindered the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness in the study area. In this regard, McEwen (2003:12) stated that without adequate knowledge, technique and skills on the fields of educational management or any leadership training, it would be difficult for the subject specialist principals to give comments and suggestions on the technical and educational aspects of instructional improvement. Whereas, cooperation, commitment for instructional improvements was rated as moderately hindered the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness except school teachers relationship with instructional leaders were highly challenged the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness. It is marked from the literature centered on school effectiveness that no single function can bring about students achievement; rather different functions of teaching and learning process. However, the result of this study revealed that instructional leaders did not possess the necessary knowledge,

training and skills, vision, will and courage that help them in leading the school community as they were almost all subject specialists.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

It is holistically and by a strategic and inclusive activities that the challenge of enhancing the level of student learning and achievement can be met. Thus, on the basis of the results of this study, the following recommendations are forwarded for the successful implementation of the practice and challenges of instructional leadership in preparatory schools of Hadiya zone.

1. To be an effective leader, sharing, facilitating, and guiding decisions about instructional improvement for the enhancement of students' academic achievement, instructional leaders should be knowledgeable and skilful in his/her with related educational background especially in the field of educational leadership and planning rather than subject area. However, the result of this study revealed that instructional leaders did not possess the necessary knowledge and skills that help them in leading the school community and teachers as they were almost all subject specialists except a few leaders of the schools. To alleviate these problems the Woreda Education Offices and Zone Education Department in collaboration with SNNPR Education Bureau and even MoE, need to facilitate conditions in which individuals get trained instructional leadership and management and will be assigned as instructional leaders as a long term solution. As an immediate solution, for the existing principal's provision basic skill and training on instructional leadership is highly recommended. In general, this obtained data revealed that the instructional leadership skill and training needs much effort to improve for better teaching and learning process in the study area.
2. For the successful practices of instructional leadership, the instructional leaders should have to do their best in setting well communicated school vision and defining school mission to improve their school outcomes.
3. Instructional leaders should be well supervise and evaluate the instruction by face to face contact with the intent of improving instruction and potential growth. However, the practice in the schools was found merely done for the purpose of teachers' performance appraisal than teacher development and improving instruction. In doing so, teachers may

develop negative attitude on the practices of supervisory support. Therefore, instructional leaders need to change teachers' negative attitudes towards supervisory services. Teachers get motivated to receive supervisory services when they recognize the worth of the support. This can be realized by providing school based short term trainings and by making the service more of participatory. Concerning this, woreda educational office may invite scholars in the field from close by any educational institutions.

4. The instructional leaders did not engage themselves in effective monitoring of instructional programs, managing curriculum and instruction and providing feedback on the teaching learning process negatively affects the teachers and classroom instruction. Hence, the instructional leaders should give due attention for the practical implementation of instructional leadership function to influence the teaching learning process in their respective preparatory schools.
5. Concerning to teaching learning roles of instructional leadership, the instructional leaders should be strengthen their relationship with teachers and school community by spending more time in classroom instructional observation, support teachers by indicating necessarily respect for each other's, telling and participating and by minimizing showing negative direction in the school by working with woreda education offices nearby to improve the quality of classroom instructions or teaching learning process as well as others school stakeholders.
6. Regarding to challenges that impede effectiveness of instructional leadership in this study were a need for adequate skill and training of leadership, high cooperation and commitment from concerned bodies, provision of instructional resources and knowledge, will and courage were motioned. As the findings witness that availability of resource, allocating too many resources by itself does not improve school outcome. However, inadequacies of financial and material supply can endanger effective performance of schools. The finding in the study reveals that schools were not working with their full capacity for the lack of adequate finance and educational materials. Therefore, educational office heads at zonal and woreda level need to show their professional commitment to improve the quality of school outcomes by devoting much of their time,

finance and material resource for the schools with severe shortage of these items were observed.

As result instructional leaders should need to think their own income generating sources other than waiting government budget through improving their relationship with local NGOs' by preparing Bazaar (telethon) in the school, by improving the relationship and contact with their potential stakeholders and by involving community, parents and other partners into the functions of instructional leaders practices, school can alleviate their academic and non-academic problems observed in their respect schools. In addition to the above problem that hinder the effectiveness of instructional leader were the incompetence of instructional leadership, principals high turnover, lack of commitment and moral, principals too much emphasis on political matters were a few to mention. Moreover, instructional leaders should give high emphasis on instructional issues rather than administrative or political issues. In addition to this, Hadiya zone education department should make an effort to increase the commitment of school leaders by working with leadership training institution to re-examine the selection, promotion and appointment procedures of instructional leaders in preparatory schools. This might include introducing leadership career structure, career promotion and appointment, merit based regulations, interest and experience for aspiring leaders.

7. Even though this research work may have its own contributions in understanding the practices and challenges of instructional leadership and may serve as lesson for other educational leaders who are practicing or want to practice in the future, the outcomes of the study was not complete as it was initially anticipated. Therefore the researcher recommended that there is a need for those people who interested to conduct further study on this issue.

## Reference

- Alemayehu Tesema (2011). Educational Leadership Problem of Government Secondary School Principals. (AAU, Unpublished MATHesis).
- Ayallew Shibeshi.(1991).Approach to Educational organization and Management. Unpublished course material, AAU.press
- Ash, R.C. & Persall, J.M. (2000). The principal as chief learning officer: developing teacher leaders, NASSP Bulletin, 84(616): 15–22.
- Barth, R. (1999).*TheTeacherLeader.Providence, R I: The Rhode Island Foundation.*
- Barge,J.K.(1994). *Leadrship: Communication Skills foe Organizations and Groups.* NewYork: St.Martin’s Press.
- Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1989). *Creating an Excellent School.* London: Routledge
- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders,* New York, Harper and Row.
- Best,J.W.,and Khan,J.W.(2003) Research in Education.(7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Delhi:Prentice Hall of India Pvt.Ltd.
- Blase, J. and Anderson, G. (1995). *The Micro-Politics of Educational Leadership: From Control to Empowerment.* London: Cassel
- Blase,J and Balse,J (1999).Effective Instructional Leadership: Teachers’ Perspectives on how Principals Promote Teaching and Learning in Schools. Journal of Educational Administration v, 38, n-2.
- Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. (1999). *Principals’ instructional leadership and teacher development: teacher perspective.* Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(3), 349-378.
- Brundrett, Mark, Neil Burdon and Robber Smith (ed). (2003).Leadership Instructional educational, London; SAGE Publications.
- Bush, Tony and Les Bell (2003). *The principal practice of educational management.* London: Paul Chapman Polishing.

- Boles, K. & Troen, V. (1994). *Teacher leadership in a Professional Development School*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Chell, J. (1991). *Introducing principals to the role of instructional leadership*. SSTA Resource Center, No.95-14.
- Clayton, H. (1999). "Creating an effective vision for primary school. in Davies, Band Ellison (eds). *Managing the effective primary school*. England: -Longman.
- Day, C. (2007). *The Impact of School Leadership on Pupils' Outcomes*: Institute of Education: University of London.
- Demose Degefa (2007). *The Current Practices of Instructional Leadership in Enhancing the Quality of Education in the Government Primary Schools of AA City Administration*. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis).
- Dimmock, C. (1999). Principals and school restructuring: conceptualizing challenges as dilemmas, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37 (5), 441-462.
- Dimmock, Clive. (2000). *Designing the Learning Centred Schools*. London: Falmer Press
- Efrem Aragaw (2001). "*Maritu*" (3<sup>rd</sup> ed).
- Emebet Mulugeta (2003). *Problems encountered and coping strategies employed by female students in Addis Ababa high schools*. The Ethiopian Journal of Education. vol 23, No. 2:30-32
- Eye, G. Glen and Lanor A. Netzer, (1965). *Supervision of Instruction: A phase in Administration*, New York: Harper Raw Publishers.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational changes*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). New York: Rutledge Falmer
- Gay, L. et al., (2003). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Ohio, Pearson.

- Gherkin, N. (1991) *Developing Teachers' Leadership Skills*. ERIC Digest ED330691
- Gravwe, D. and Anton, Carron G. (2007). *Supervision a Key Component of a Quality Training Material. Supervision/Sup-Model*.
- Glickman, C. (2004). *Supervision and instructional leadership: development approach*. Boston: Person University Press.
- Goddard, R.D and Miller, R.J. (2010). *The Conceptualization, Measurement, and Effects of School Leadership: Instruction to the Special Issue. The Elementary School Journal*, 111,211-225.
- Goddard, J, M (2010). *Leadership in the (past) modern era* in N. Bennett and L .Anderson (eds) *rethinking educational leadership*. New Delhi: SAGE publication
- Griffin, W. Rick. (2000). *Fundamentals of Management*. India: Micro Print Ltd.
- Halpin, A.W. (1966). *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York: Macmillan.
- Harris, A. and Daniel Muijs (2002). *Improving school through teacher leadership*. New York: Open University Press.
- Hallinger, P. (2009). *Leadership For 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools: From Instructional Leadership to Leadership for Learning*.
- Harris, A. (2003). *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. New York: Rutledge Flamer
- Harris, A. and Daniel. (2005). *Improving School through Teacher' Leadership*. New York: Open University Press.
- Heller, D.A. (2002). *The Power of Gentleness*. Educational leadership.
- Hollinger. and F. Murphy (1987). *Assessing and developing principal leadership*. Englewood Cliffs NG: Prentice Hall
- Hollinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1989). *Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals*. *The Elementary School, Journal*, 86(2).
- Hopkins.D. (2005). *Instructional Leadership and School Improvement*. In Harris et.al (eds) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. Rutledge Flamer

- Hoy, W.K. and Sabo, D.J. (1998). *Quality Middle School: Open and Healthy*
- Hoy, W.K., Terter, C.J. and Kott Kamp, R.B. (1991). *Open and Health Schools: Measuring Organizational Climate*. London: Sage Publication.
- Hoy, W.K. and Miskel, C.G. (2000). *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and practice* (6<sup>th</sup>ed). New York: McGraw Hill.
- ICDR (1999). *Teacher Education: A Hand Book*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (2001). *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping Teachers to Develop as Leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Korng, & Loeb, S. (2010). New Thinking About Instructional leadership. Kappen Magazine.org.vg2, v3 p.69.
- Koul, L. (1996). *Methodology of Educational Research*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Private Ltd
- Krug, S. (1992). *Instructional leadership: a constructive perspective*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 430-443
- Kruger, A. G. and et al (2002). *School management international and external environment*, Study Guide. UNISA, Pretoria.
- Larson-Knight, B. (2000). *Leadership, culture, and organizational learning: in Understanding the Schools as Intelligent System*. Stanford, CT: JAI Press.
- Lash way, Larry (2007). *Can instructional leader could be faculty leader?* In Eric Clearing in Educational Policy and Management. <http://www.eric.uoregan.edu/publication/>
- Locke, A., Edwin and Latham (1990). *The essence of leadership*. New York: Macmillan Inc.
- Leith wood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- LiwthWood, K.A and Rich. (2008). *What We Know About Successful School Leadership*. Retrieved October 10/2011 from [www.cepn.gse.retgers.org](http://www.cepn.gse.retgers.org).

- Marcher, R.L. & Hyle, A.E. (1996). Collaborative Power: A Grounded Theory of Administrative Instructional Leadership in Elementary School, *Journal of Education Administration*. 34(3) 15-30.
- Marks, M. Helen and Susan M. Printy (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: *an international and instructional leadership*. Educational Leadership Quarterly. Vol. 39, No 3, 370-397.
- Marx, Gray. (2006). Future-Focused leadership. Preparing Schools, Students, and Communities for Tomorrow's Realities. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McEwen, E.K. (2003). *Seven steps to instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- McLaughlin M. W. & Talbert J. E. (2007). *Building Professional Learning Communities in High Schools: Challenges and Promising Practices in Professional Learning Communities: Divergence, Depth and Dilemmas*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- MoE (2002). *Responsibility and practices of school principal*. Unpublished Material
- MoE, (1994). Educational and Training policy. Addis Ababa EMPDA.
- MoE, (2006). Educational Statistics Annual Abstract 2005/6. Addis Ababa.
- MoE, (2010). Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP-IV): Program Action Plan. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) Department.
- Morriss L. Cogan. (1973): Clinical Supervision: Boston: Houghton Muffin.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal Instructional Leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration, ICB: Changing Perspectives on the School*, 163-200. AA: USAID. Pamela
- Mendels (2012). The Effective Principal Retrieved From [www.learningforworld.org](http://www.learningforworld.org)

- Noonan, B., and Hellsten, L. (2013). *Toward Instructional Leadership: Principals' Perceptions of Large-Scale Assessment in Schools*. Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Issue no-40-University of Saskatchewan.
- Olive, F. Peter and G. E. Pawlas (1997). *Supervision for today schools*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Owens, R. G. (1981). *Organizational Behavior in Education*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice.
- Sergiovanni, T.T. (2001). *The principal ship: a Reflective practice perspective* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). London: Allyn and Bacon
- Sergiovanni, T.T. (1992). *Moral Leadership: Getting In To The Heart Of School Improvement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1999). *Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles by Thomas J. Sergiovanni*. Arlington Heights, IL: SkyLight Training and Publishing.
- Seyoum Tefera and Ayalew Shibeshi (1989). *Fundamentals of educational research*. AA: AAU Printing Press
- Singhal, P.R., & Et Al. (1996). *School Inspection System: Modern Approach*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Ltd.
- Silver, P. (1983). *Educational Administration: Theoretical Perspectives on practice and Research*. Cambridge: Harpenad.
- Southworth, G. (2002) *Primary school leadership in context: Leading small medium and large sized schools*. London: -Rutledge flamer.
- Snyder, K.K (1983). "Instructional Leadership for Productive Schools." *Educational Leadership*. Vol. 40, No.5 pp.32-37.
- Paisey, A. (1992). *Organization and Management in Schools*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York: Longman Publishing.
- Peter, S. M. (1990). *The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations*. Sloan Management Review.

- Phillips. (2011). *Manager-Administration to Instructional Leader: Shift in the Roles of the School Principal*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D. & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and Practice*, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).
- Rooney, J. (2003). *Principal who Care*. A personal Reflection Educational Leadership.
- Tesfaye Nigussie, (2010). *The Role of Instructional leadership in Building Organizational Climate of Secondary School*. (AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis).
- TGE (1994). *Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA
- Wallace Foundation. (2009). *Assessing the effectiveness of school leaders: New directions and new processes*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- Wasley, P.A. (1991). From Quarterback to Coach, From Actor to Director, *Educational Leadership*, 48(8), 35-40.
- Waters, J.T., Marzano, R.J. & McNulty, B. (2004). *Leadership That Sparks Learning*. *Educational Leadership*, 61 (7), 48-51.
- Wragg, T. (2002). *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Weber, J. (1996). *Leading the instructional program: School leadership*. Cleaning house of Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon
- Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Education and Behavioural Studies**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**A questionnaire to be filled by Teachers and instructional leaders (Main and Vice principals and Department Heads)**

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information on the practice and challenges of instructional leadership. You are, therefore kindly requested to fill the questionnaires in order to give necessary information on the issue related to the study. The success of this study depends on your honest and genuine responses. The information that will be obtained from the responses to these questionnaires will be used only for the purpose of the study. All the information will be kept confidential and will be used only for the academic purpose.

**Thank you in advance for your cooperation**

**Instruction I**

1. No need of writing your name
2. Give response by putting (✓) in the appropriate box against each closed ended items and by giving brief descriptions of your opinion for open ended questions. Every response has to be based on your school context.

**Personal Information**

1. Name of the school ..... Woreda /city.....
2. Sex: A. Male  B. Female
3. Age: A. 20-25 B. 26-30 C. 31-35 D.36-40 E. 41 and above
4. Level of educational or qualification:  
A. Diploma B. B.A/BED/BSc Degree C. M.A/MSc Degree
5. Area of specialization or field of study:

A. Subject Major B. EDPM/ Pedagogical Science C. Other specify.....

6. Total work experience or service year:

A. under 5 years B.6-10 C.11-15 D.16-20 E.21 years above

6. Service year in current position:

A. under 5 years B.6-10 years C.11years and above

**Instruction -2**

Below are Tables that consist of questions that show the instructional leadership practices of your school. Each Table contains five responses. Please indicate the extent to which each statement represents your school by putting tick mark (√) in one of the boxes against each item. Every response has to be based on your school context.

The numbers shows:

5=Strongly Agree (SA)      3=Undecided (UD)      1=Strongly Disagree (SD)

4=Agree (A)                      2=Disagree (DA)

**2.1 Setting the School Vision and Developing School Mission**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the school leadership practices related to the vision and mission of your school?

no	Items	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Collect data from multiple sources to create a common vision for the school					
2	Well express or communicate the vision to all stakeholders					
3	Allocate adequate resources for the effective implementation of a school vision and mission					
4	Develop missions that are easily understood and used by					

	teachers in the school					
5	Frame the school missions in terms of staff responsibilities					
6	Identify the impediments to achieve missions of the school and design strategies to address the impediments in advance					
7	Develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning					
8	Use students performance results to develop the school's missions					

## 2.2 Managing Curriculum and Instruction

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following activities of school leaders about managing curriculum and instruction in your school?

no	Items	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Coordinate the curriculum evaluation process of the school to address problems related to the curriculum					
2	Check periodically students result in order to ensure the effective implementation of the curriculum					
3	Advice teachers and department heads regarding the challenges they faced in relation to the implementation of the curriculum					
4	Encourage and provide the necessary support to departments and teachers to periodically evaluate and comment for curriculum improvement.					
5	Evaluating the effectiveness of instructional program in achieving school goals					
6	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process					

## 2.3 Supervising and Evaluating the Instruction

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the school leadership practices related to instructional supervision of your school?

No	Item	response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SA
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Make classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process					
2	Give adequate time after class visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together					
3	Hold regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction					
4	Use teaching staff meetings to discuss curricular and instructional issues					
5	Create opportunities for professional discussions among teachers					
6	Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods					
7	Make regular follow-up and feedback to teachers					

#### 2.4 Monitoring Instructional Programs

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following activities of school leaders about the monitoring of instructional programs in your school?

no	Items	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Encourage teachers to held the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function					
2	Inform the school's performance result to teachers in a report form after effective monitoring of the activities					
3	Meet individually with teachers to discuss students academic progress					
4	Use test result to assess progress toward school goals					

## 2.5 Promoting a Conducive School Learning Climate

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following activities of school leaders about creating conducive and healthy environment in your school.

No	Items	Responses				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Establish supportive and motivating atmosphere in which staff, parents and students are encouraged to work as a team in the school					
2	Create positive environment in which good working relationship exist.					
3	Advocate school environment conducive to student achievements.					
4	Provide support in building collaborative cultures among teachers.					
5	Encourage a culture of trust between school leaders and teaching staff					
6	Establish a productive working relationship with the community					
7	Are understandable when personal concern causes teachers to arrive work late or leave early					

## 3. The Teaching Learning Roles of Instructional Leaders

**Instruction-3:** The following statements show the roles of instructional leadership on teaching learning activities in your school. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school by putting tick mark (✓) in one of the boxes against each item.

The numbers indicates: 5=Strongly Agree 4=Agree 3=Undecided 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree

### 3.1 Professional Skill Development

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that deal with professional skill development of school?

No	Items	Responses				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Play an active role in facilitating teachers professional skill development					
2	Identify the professional development needs of teachers					
3	Conduct teachers professional development activity in your school					
4	Encourage teachers to collaborate with surrounding schools for experience sharing.					
5	Give regularly teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching					
6	Arrange program for staff training to create a spirit of cooperative working atmosphere					
7	Provide adequate time for professional skill development					
8	Organize professional skill development opportunity for all staff					
9	Create awareness for teachers about the importance of professional skill development					

10	Encourages teachers to review individual professional growth goals consistent with school goals and priorities					

### 3.2 Building Effective Relationship in School

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that deal with the principal's role of Building Effective Relationship in the school?

SA-strongly agree, A- agree, UD – Undecided, DA-disagree, SD- strongly disagree

		response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Maintain good working relationship with teachers and other staff members					
2	Ensure open and collaborative communication within staff					
3	Understand and analyze the school situations and effectively interact with community and school members					
4	Treat school community equitably and fairly					
5	Listen to and accept teachers suggestions					
6	Causes the evaluation of school community relations					
7	Encourage teachers help and support each other					

### 3.3 Supportive Roles of Instructional Leaders

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the supportive roles of principals indicated with the following statements?

No	Item	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SA
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Set exemplary roles by working hard themselves with staff					
2	Goes out of their ways to help teachers					
3	Explains the reasons to criticism teachers					
4	Use constructive criticism					
5	Looks out for the personal welfare of staff					

### 3.4 Directive Roles of Instructional Leaders

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the directive roles of principals stated below?

No	Item	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SA
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Take much of the time when teacher-principals conferences are held on					
2	Closely checks teacher's activities					
3	Keep a close check on sign-in time					
4	Tell what they do, guide and direct					
5	Monitor everything the teachers do					

### 3.5 Conflict Management Roles of Instructional Leaders

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the conflict management roles of principals stated below?

No	Item	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SA
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Your school leaders .../as a school leader.....</b>					
1	Use problem framing and solving skill effectively					
2	Challenging and mediating resistance					
3	Confront and resolve problems in timely manner					
4	Provide a safe and supportive environment					
5						

#### Open ended questions for teachers

1. Do you think that the school leaders of your school effective in their roles as instructional leaders? \_\_\_\_\_

2. If your response for the above question is no, what are the major problems of your school in relation to instructional leadership?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. What solution do you suggest to improve the problems?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. What are the challenges that the school leaders in your school face in implementing professional skill development?\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

#### 4. Challenges of Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

**Instruction-4:** The following issues are assumed to be the common challenges of schools that hinder the practices of instructional leadership. The five point scales indicated below reflect the degree of availability each challenge in your school. Please rate each item, using the (1-5) scales that best describes the degree to which the challenges are availability in your school. The numbers indicated: 5=very high 4=high 3=moderate 2=low 1=very low

##### 4.1 Lack of Skills and Training

no	Item	Response				
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>How do you rate the following challenges of instructional leadership in your school?</b>					
1	Lack of qualified instructional leaders in the area of education					
2	Lack of training on instructional leadership					
3	Lack of in-service training and teachers development program					
4	Lack of qualified teachers in all subject area					

##### 4.2Lack of Cooperation and Commitment for Instructional Improvement

no	Item	Response				
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>How do you evaluate the school leaders' interaction with the following stakeholders in your school?</b>					
1	Teachers					
2	Students					
3	School boards					
4	School communities					
6	Woreda educational managers					

#### 4.3 Lack of Resource Availability and Allocation

no	Item	Response				
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>How do you evaluate the availability of the following resources in your school?</b>					
1	Lack of adequacy of Instructional time					
2	Lack of stationary materials for teaching					
3	Lack of student textbook					
4	Lack of school furniture					
5	Lack of library space and time					
6	Lack of recurrent budget support					

#### 4.4 Lack of Vision, Will and Courage

no	Items	Response				
		5	4	3	2	1
	<b>Evaluate your leaders in relation to the following instructional roles</b>					
1	Lack of courage to take risks, at time for the improvement of instruction					
2	unwillingness to devote more time for instructional issues					
3	Lack of adequate knowledge base of instruction leadership					
4	Lack of organizing the school community for leadership work					
5	unwillingness to assess staff and school capacity for leadership					

1. How do you evaluate the success of your instructional leadership roles?

---



---



---

2. What major problems hinder your effectiveness as instructional leader?

---



---



---

3. What solutions do you suggest

---



---

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Education and Behavioural Studies**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**Interview Guide for Woreda Education Office Heads**

**Section 1: Personal Information**

1. Name of the school ..... Woreda /city.....
2. Sex: A. Male  B. Female
3. Age: A. 20-25 B. 26-30 C. 31-35 D.36-40 E. 41 and above
4. Level of educational or qualification:  
A. Diploma B. B.A/BED/BSc Degree C. M.A/MSc Degree
5. Area of specialization or field of study:  
A. Subject Major B. EDPM/ Pedagogical Science C. Other specify.....
6. Total work experience or service year:  
A. under 5 years B.6-10 C.11-15 D.16-20 E.21 years above
7. Service year in current position:  
A. under 5 years B.6-10 years C.11years and above

**Section 2: Interview guide questions**

1. Do you believe that your office is giving the necessary support to all school leaders to enhance their leadership effectiveness? If so, how?
2. Are you giving training to enhance the capacity of instructional leadership? If so, how often?
3. Is there school based supervision practice in the preparatory schools? If so, how do you evaluate its effectiveness?
4. How often woreda supervisors monitor preparatory schools?
5. What are the major challenges that hinder the effectiveness of instructional leadership activity and what mechanism do you use to solve the problem?

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Education and Behavioural Studies**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**An Interview Question for Supervisors**

**Section 1: Personal Information**

1. Name of the school ..... Woreda /city.....
2. Sex: A. Male  B. Female
3. Age: A. 20-25 B. 26-30 C. 31-35 D.36-40 E. 41 and above
4. Level of educational or qualification:  
A. Diploma B. B.A/BED/BSc Degree C. M.A/MSc Degree
5. Area of specialization or field of study:  
A. Subject Major B. EDPM/ Pedagogical Science C. Other specify.....
6. Total work experience or service year:  
A. under 5 years B.6-10 C.11-15 D.16-20 E.21 years above
7. Service year in current position:  
A. under 5 years B.6-10 years C.11years and above

**Section 2: Interview Guide Questions**

1. Does your school have a clearly stated vision and mission?
2. What support do you get from the woreda education office in effectively perform your duty as supervisor?
3. To what extent you are focusing on instructional issues while giving supervisory support?
4. What criteria the woreda education office uses to assign school leaders in principal ship positions? How do you evaluate the effectiveness of the criteria?
5. Do you think that principals effectively undertake their instructional leadership roles? If no, what factors influence their effectiveness?
6. How do you evaluate the professional skill development practice in schools?
7. How often do you discuss on the teaching-learning process with teachers and school leaders?

**Addis Ababa University**  
**College of Education and Behavioural Studies**  
**Department of Educational Planning and Management**  
**Check List for Document Analysis**

1. Does the school have stated Vision and mission?

-----  
-----  
-----.

2. Does the schools have strategic plan?

-----  
-----  
-----.

3. Do they have the written report documents or minutes?

-----  
-----  
-----.

4. Do they have self assessment documents and data?

-----  
-----  
-----.

5. Does the schools have regular check list?

---

### **Declaration**

I, undersigned declare that this thesis entiteled “practice and challenges of instructional leadership” in selected preparatory school of Hadiya Zone,SNNPR, is my original work. I also declare that this thesis has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Addisu Chonde

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This thesis entitled “practice and challenges of instructional leadership” in selected preparatory school of Hadiya Zone,SNNPR, has been submitted for examination with approval as a university advisor.

Name: Ato Kenennisa Dabi

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_