ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

A STUDY ON PRINCIPAL'S INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND INFLUENCING FACTORS IN SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF AMHARA REGION

BY

TEMESGEN MELAKU

MAY, 1998

A STUDY ON PRINCIPAL'S INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND INFLUENCING FACTORS IN SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF AMHARA REGION

A Thesis Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Addis Ababa University

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for

The Degree of Master of Arts in

Educational Administration

By

Temesgen Melaku

May, 1998

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

A STUDY ON PRINCIPAL'S INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND INFLUENCING FACTORS IN SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF AMHARA REGION

BY

TEMESGEN MELAKU

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Approved by the Examining Board

አያሌው ሽበሽ
YALEW SHIBESH

Chairman, Department Graduate Committee

Yalew Ingdayehu (Dr.)

Tassew Tewdoe

Examiner

አያሌው ሽበሽ
YALEW SHIBESH

Examiner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	i
ACRONYMS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	5
1.3 Purpose of the Study	7
1.4 Significance of the Study	8
1.5 Delimitation of the Study	8
1.6 Limitation of the Study	9
1.7 Research Design and Methodology	10
1.7.1 Sampling Technique and Sampling Population	10
1.7.2 Data Gathering Instrument	13
1.7.3 Methods of Data Analysis	16
1.8 Organization of the Study	18
1.9 Definition of Key Terms	18
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	20
2.1 Conceptual Framework of Instructional Leadership	20
2.1.1 Defining the School Mission	21
2.1.2 Managing Curriculum and Instruction	23
2.1.3 Supervising Instruction	27

Page

2.1.4 Monitoring Student Progress 30

2.1.5 Promoting School Learning Climate 32

2.1.5.1 Setting and Communicating High Expectation 34

2.1.5.2 Physical Presence of the Leader..... 37

2.1.5.3 Using Symbolic Activities and Rewards 38

2.2 Personal Characteristics and Leadership ... 39

2.3 Factors Affecting Leadership Effectiveness 42

2.3.1 Organizational Characteristics 42

2.3.2 District/zone Education Department Characteristics 45

CHAPTER THREE: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 46

3.1 Description of Sample Population 46

3.1.2 Respondents Characteristics 47

3.2 Interpretation of the Data 53

3.2.1 Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 53

3.2.2 Some Correlates of Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 58

3.2.3 Personal Factors Influencing Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 64

3.2.4 Organizational Factors Influencing Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 65

Page

3.2.5 District/zone Education Department Factors Influencing Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 67

3.2.5.1 Higher Officials Expectation

3.2.5.2 Some Administrative Elements 70

CHAPTER FOUR: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION 73

4.1 Summary 73

4.2 Conclusion 77

4.3 Recommendations 79

BIBLIOGRAPHY 84

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES		PAGE
1	Distribution of Sample Schools Based on Teaching Staff Size	11
2	Distribution of Sample Schools by Staff Size and Zones	12
3	Characteristics of Respondents by their Sex and Age	47
4	Characteristics of Respondents by their Level of Education and Qualification	48
5	Characteristics of Respondents by their work Experience	51
6	Distribution of Leaders in the Three ILE Levels	55
7	Distribution of Leaders in the Three LED Levels	55
8	Summary of Correlations of Age and Experience with ILE	59
9	T-test of Mean Difference for Degree and Diploma Holder Leaders on their ILE	60
10	T-test of Mean Difference for Ed.Ad Graduates and Subjects Specialists on their ILE	61
11	Correlation of Leaders' Achievement (GPA) and Number of Credit Hours Taken in Some Education Fields with ILE	62
12	T-test of Mean Difference for Assigned and Elected Leaders on their ILE	64

Table		PAGE
13	Summary of Correlations of Some Organizational Factors and ILE	65
14	T-test of Mean Difference for Leaders Receiving Equal and High Emphasis and Lesser Emphasis by Higher Officials on their ILE	68
15	T-test of Mean Difference for Leaders Expecting Promotion Through Instructional Leadership Competency and Other Competency on their ILE	69
16	T-test of Mean Differences for More Constrained and Less Constrained Leaders (Of each administrative element) on their ILE	71

Acronyms

MOE	-	Ministry of Education
REB	-	Regional Education Bureau
ILE	-	Instructional Leadership Effectiveness
LED	-	Leader's Effectiveness in Each Dimension
PIMRS	-	Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale
EPL	-	Executive Professional Leadership

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Yalew Ingidayehu, whose deep concern, constructive comments and suggestions have contributed tremendously to the successful accomplishment of the study.

My appreciation also goes to teachers, directors and supervisors who have displayed kind collaboration while conducting this study.

I am also indepted to my parents, siblings and colleagues for their encouragement and multiplex help to complete the study. My gratitude is also so great that the few lines devoted to it will not justify the invaluable contribution of W/t Luli Ali for material, financial and moral support she rendered to complete the study on time.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to assess the current status of instructional leadership effectiveness and to investigate some of the factors that affect its provision in senior secondary schools of Amhara Region.

Leader's engagement in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning climate were used as indicators to assess instructional leadership effectiveness. The context in which instructional leadership is held like personal characteristics, organizational characteristics and district/zone administrative characteristics were treated as influencing factors.

To this end, the study was conducted in 14 senior secondary schools selected from 6 zones by using a combination of stratified and quota sampling techniques. Twenty six school leaders, 192 teachers and 6 supervision staff were used as the subjects of the study to obtain the necessary data. Questionnaire, document analysis and unstructured interview were the instruments used for data collection. The data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed using percentage, Pearson's correlation coefficient and t-test statistical instruments.

Findings from the data analysis revealed that most school leaders are strong (effective) neither in each dimension nor in their overall instructional leadership role. Of the personal characteristics treated, only experience as department head, number of credit hours taken in educational fields and level of education appeared to have significant relationship with ILE. And hence, longer experience,more credits and higher level in the above characteristics, respectively contributed positively to the success of leaders in their instructional leadership role. Of the organizational characteristics, greater availability of instructional resources, professional norm that greatly value leaders' participation in curricular and instructional issues, and larger teaching staff size contributed positively to ILE, whereas greater role diversity lowered their ILE. Among the district/zone education department characteristics, generally, the manifest emphasis of expectations of higher officials on activities other than instructional leadership or matters that are secondary to ILE as well as high degree of financial and supply delivery problems, untimely teacher transfer and delay substitutes to and deployment of teachers have significantly influenced ILE in the negative direction. In sum, these findings indicated that ILE is a function of personal, organizational and district/zone education department characteristics (factors).

Following the findings and conclusions drawn, it is recommended that REB in collaboration with zone and district education departments should define the instructional leadership roles of leaders clearly in terms of the five dimensions, provide trainings in the area, revise and improve the selection and appointment criteria of leadership positions, reduce and improve the organizational and district/zone factors debilitating instructional leadership role of the leader.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Education is widely recognized as one indicator of development. One of the basic purposes of education is, therefore, to produce trained human resource which can overcome development impediments of a given country.

The organizations primarily responsible for the production and provision of qualified human resource are schools. They are in charge of achieving educational objectives expected to shape pupils in accordance with the needs and interests of beneficiaries. It is generally believed that the society's future depends on the success of schools in effectively carrying out their objectives.

In order to accomplish their purpose schools need to deliver learning through effective teaching. The primary service that the school offers, therefore, is instruction (Krug, 1992: 432). And its success is determined by the school outcomes - the quality and quantity of graduates. However, this cannot be attained without adequate and proper provision of the school curriculum and instruction for each level and grades. The responsibility for proper and adequate provision of the school

curriculum and instruction rests with the school instructional leader (the principal and/or assistant principal).

School leaders are expected to mobilize the abilities and efforts of the teaching staff to provide effective educational program. To this end, instructional leaders should devote considerable time to coordinate and manage instruction; they should be highly visible in the school; and stay close to the instructional process (Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991: 44). In light of this, Tompkins and Trum (in Bishaw, 1975: 12) allocated "three-fourth" of principals time for instructional matters.

In relation to the tasks expected from the school leaders for effective instructional leadership, different authors and researchers have developed different conceptual frameworks based on the characteristics of effective schools and effective principals. Snyder (1983: 32), for instance, conceptualized instructional leadership in terms of planning, staff and program development, and evaluation activities. Using such organizational properties, however, may not entirely capture the normative dimension of school social organization without which the instructional leadership tasks of leaders could not influence the quality of instruction as well as student achievement (Purkey and Smith cited in Gorton, 1987: 125).

Considering such limitation of Snyder's conceptual model, Hallinger and Murphy (1987: 56) developed a three dimensional conceptual framework which embraces ten functional categories: framing goals, communicating goals, knowledge of curriculum and instruction, coordinating curriculum, supervising and evaluating instruction, monitoring progress, setting standards setting expectations, protecting time and promoting improvement.

Recent authors and researchers, however, reframed the conceptual framework of instructional leadership into five dimensions based on Hallinger's and Murphy's functional categories and other similar studies. These dimensions are: defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning climate (Krug and others cited in Krug, 1992: 431). These researchers and authors believed that the five dimensions are "... structurally more tenable, simpler to work with and not appreciably less precise" (1992: 431).

In sum, the above evidences reveal that instructional leadership role has become the most widely accepted role of the school leader. This means, thus, the central job of the school leaders has to be redirected from routine administration duties to instructional leadership. In light of this, Johnson and Snyder (1986: 237) recommended that school leaders particularly

principals are key factors in the school's attempt to alter achievement norms. And strong instructional leadership is one of the most important determinants of all school activities associated with school effectiveness (Walker and Murphy, 1986: 89; Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991: 44).

On the other hand, studies on the managerial behavior or duties of principals demonstrate that the instructional leadership component of school administration is held as passive and incomplete activity. The evidence from Martin and Willower (1981: 83) study of the "Managerial Behavior of High School Principals" has shown that principals spent 17.4% of their time on instructional matters. This is insignificant as compared to Tompkin's and Trump's allotment described earlier. Similarly, Bishaw (1975: 12) in his study of principalship in Ethiopian Secondary schools has found that principals devote much of their time to routine clerical duties rather than to instructional leadership roles.

Schools of developing countries including Ethiopia- which manifest limited concern for instructional leadership activities, have as a result been criticised for wastage of instructional time - when teachers leave classes for various reasons - and for minimum participation of parents in following up students' learning progress (Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991:43). Along with this, experience shows that most senior secondary schools in our country are characterized by delay

in the commencement time of the instructional process, problem of curriculum coverage, burden of make up classes around the end of the semester, etc.

These problems can be generally attributed to the leaders' limited skills and abilities in managing the instructional program. Of course, there may be some contextual factors which influence principals' instructional leadership functions. These influences may be categorized into three groups: personal characteristics, organizational (school) characteristics and district or zone education department characteristics (Bossert and others, 1982:52).

Although such problems and influences seem to be prevalent in our country, no local comprehensive and scientific research has been made so far in this area. Hence, taken as an innovative managerial activity, and given its considerable importance to a school's success, principals' (or assistant principals') instructional leadership effectiveness as well as factors influencing it becomes a timely area of interest for research.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Based on the above background and the assumption that school leaders have a positive effect on instructional process of schools, their instructional leadership task will be examined in terms of the five dimensions described earlier. Factors

influencing this task are also other area of concern for this study.

Generally, the purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness of leaders in their instructional leadership role and to identify the major influencing factors affecting this role in senior secondary schools of the Amhara Region.

Thus, the study attempts to obtain reliable responses for the following basic questions.

1. Do most school leaders provide instructional leadership strongly?
2. Do most school leaders perform strongly in each dimension of instructional leadership? (I.e. in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction; supervising instruction, monitoring student progress, promoting school learning climate)
3. Is there any signficant relationship between leaders' personal characteristics (age, sex, work experience, academic achievement (G.P.A.), number of credit hours taken in education fields, level of education, qualification and position attainment condition - assigned or elected) and instructional leadership effectiveness (ILE)?
4. What are the factors that affect the instructional leadership effectiveness?

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study is assumed to be very important since it is expected to benefit the following bodies:

1. Principals and assistant principals may have some ideas on how to become effective in their instructional leadership role.
2. Higher officials and policy makers may have clear insight into the existing pitfalls in instructional leadership role and the influencing factors so that appropriate measures that enhance instructional leadership could possibly be taken based on the findings and recommendations of the study.
3. Trainers of school administrators could get clear insight into the magnitude and the nature of the problem, and help them to gear their program to the improvement of instructional leadership role.
4. Researchers may benefit from the study, in that it contributes additional information to the existing findings to serve as literature for related areas.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

Although instructional leadership roles can be held by department heads and unit leaders, in addition to the principals and assistant principals, the emphasis of this study is delimited to be on the principal's and assistant principal's

instructional leadership role. This is because most dimensions used to conceptualize instructional leadership role as the responsibilities of the main and assistant principals than others.

Based on the availability of literature and its manageability, the influencing factors are delimited to the three contextual factors described earlier (personal, organizational and district/zone education department administration characteristics).

Taking the time and the labour required in carrying out the data collection process into consideration, the study is delimited to 14 senior secondary schools of Amhara Region. The selection of the region as a setting for the study is based on the researcher's experience as a student and a teacher in the region that helped him to sense the problem.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

Due to shortage of reference materials on domestic issues related to the study, the researcher has mainly depended on foreign sources. Besides, shortage of time and finance withheld the researcher from conducting pilot testing of the instrument. Nevertheless, to increase the reliability of responses, the researcher has verified some professional terms and expressions (constructions) that could possibly cause

confusions to respondents before they filled out the questionnaire.

1.7 Research Design and Methodology

As mentioned elsewhere, the study was targeted at assessing the leaders' instructional leadership effectiveness and identifying some of the factors that influence the provision of this leadership. And since the study was found to be the first of its kind, it was designed to obtain pertinent and precise information concerning the current status of instructional leadership effectiveness and the factors affecting its provision and implementation. Thus, descriptive survey approach was found suitable to this end and employed in the study. This approach has also been recommended by scholars in the field (Koul, 1996: 405; Nachmias and Nachmias, 1987: 227).

1.7.1 Sampling Technique and Sampling Population

The determination of the population and sample schools was based on the 1997 annual statistical report of the Amhara Education Bureau. According to this report there were 77 senior secondary schools in the 11 zones of the region. Among these, 44 were schools with teaching staff size 20 and above each, whereas, the remaining 33 schools were with teaching staff size less than 20. Of these 33 schools some had grades 7 to 10 and others grades 7 to 12 but with very few number of teachers for the senior secondary part. Thus, in order to

reduce extreme deviation of such schools from others the researcher excluded these 33 schools intentionally.

Accordingly, the target population of schools were limited to those 44 (out of 77) schools with teaching staff size of 20 and above in each school. Similarly, to represent schools from different location and complexity, the teaching staff size was once again used to select sample schools. Based on their staff size characteristics, 14 (31%) out of 44 schools were selected by stratified sampling technique as shown in the table below.

Table 1

Distribution of Sample Sschools Based on Teaching Staff Size

Total Staff Size	No. Schools	No. Sample Schools (31%)
20-39	27	8
40-59	10	3
60-79	2	1
≥80	5	2
Total	44	14

Then, in order to facilitate easy access to reach the required respondents with the limited time available at the researcher's control, the unit schools from each strata were selected by quota sampling technique from 6 zones. The following table displays the distribution of sample schools by staff size and zones.

Table 2

Distribution of Sample Schools by Staff Size and Zones

Zone	Staff Size				Total
	20-39	40-59	60-79	≥80	
E.Gojjam	01	-	-	03	2
W.Gojjam	08,07	05	-	-	3
Awsi	06	-	04	-	2
Bahir Dar	-	02	-	09	2
S. Gondar	10,11	-	-	-	2
N. Gondar	14,12	13	-	-	3
Total	8	3	1	2	14

01-14 are school cods. see Appendix C for detailed description.

After such selection of sample schools and zones,the subjects of the study were chosen from three role groups: school leaders (principals and assistant principals): supervisors and teachers.

About 28 school leaders (2 from each school) and 6 supervisors (1 from each zone) were taken by availability sampling technique, whereas the selection of teachers were done through two steps. First, the number of sample teachers from each school were determined by probability proportion to size (PPS) sampling technique. That is, 31% of teachers in each school were included in the study which makes up a total of 198 teachers. Then, quota sampling technique was used to pick up

the fixed number of respondents in each school. Moreover, the representation of teachers from different departments was considered to increase the reliability of responses.

1.7.2 Data Gathering Instruments

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

Questionnaire

Separate questionnaires were prepared for teachers and leaders. The questionnaire to be filled by the school leaders contained four parts designed to address the variables in the study and provide information in conformity with the leading questions.

The first part of the questionnaire contained items designed to obtain information on personal characteristics of the respondents. Items in the second part were designed to obtain information on the critical job related behaviors of the leader in the five dimensions of instructional leadership. The items in each dimension were prepared in five point interval scale. Some of them were adopted from Hallinger's PIMRS and others were developed by the researcher based on the literature. The respondents indicated the extent of their engagement to a particular behavior or practice by choosing one of the five point scale ranging from "almost always" (5) to "almost never" (1).

Items in the third section were designed to obtain information on some organizational characteristics of the school that seem to influence the provision of instructional leadership. These items address the extent of instructional resources, school size, role diversity and state of professional norm of each school.

The availability of instructional resources were treated in terms of qualified teachers, student textbooks, teacher's guides, instructional equipment, supplies and operational fund. Respondents were required to indicate the extent of availability of these resources by labelling numbers ranging from 1 (almost none) to 5 (more than adequate).

The School size in terms of student number, teacher and non-teaching staff size was treated in intervals. In order to measure the extent of role diversity that leaders have in each school, respondents were required to indicate the percentage of their time devoted to their instructional leadership role, administration and other duties. Moreover, they were required to express the extent of the constraining effect of role diversity on their provision of instructional leadership in their school. They respond by choosing one of the alternatives (5 = a great deal, 4 = a lot, 3 = some what, 2 = a little, 1 = not at all).

Regarding the professional norm each school has, five point interval scale items were prepared based on the literature used. Respondents, then, indicate the extent to which their teaching staff value the norms expressed in each item by choosing a number from the five point interval scale ranging from "a great deal": (5) to "not at all" (1).

The last section of the questionnaire for leaders contained items designed to obtain information on the perception of respondents regarding the characteristics of district or zone education department to which they are accountable.

In order to get information on the higher officials' expectations, respondents were required to express the degree of emphasis given for their instructional leadership role as compared to administrative duties by the higher officials. And they responded by choosing one of the alternatives: much higher (5): higher (4); equal (3); lesser (2) and much lesser (1). Respondents were also required to rank in order of priorities from the listed requirements commonly used for recognition and promotion of leaders to higher position.

In the same fashion, other district or zone education department administrative elements that the literature regard as constraints for the provision of instructional leadership were listed down to be ranked by respondents in their order of constraining effect.

On the other hand, the questionnaire prepared for teachers contained two parts. The first part was on personal characteristics of the respondents and the second part was on instructional leadership dimensions. Items for the second part were identical with those in the leaders' questionnaire except for the directions. In this case teachers rate leaders performance on the individual behaviors (practices) but in the principals' questionnaire, leaders rate themselves.

In addition to the questionnaires, unstructured interview and documentary analysis were used to substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire. The interview mainly addressed the frequency of supervisory services offered to senior secondary schools, the area it mainly focused on and issues on the assignment of leaders according to the current policy and its effect on the instructional leadership process.

Faculty meeting minutes and 1989-90 E.C. annual school plans were consulted as documents to examine the emphasis given to curriculum and instructional issues, and whether school goals are clearly stated and framed in terms of staff responsibilities.

1.7.3 Method of Data Analysis

Depending on the nature of the basic questions and variables treated, different statistical tools were employed.

In order to determine the current status of instructional leadership effectiveness and leader engagement in each dimension, percentage has been employed.

In determining the relationship between personal characteristics and ILE, Pearson's correlation coefficient and t-test were used based on the nature of the variables. The relationship between ILE and personal characteristics like age, work experience, quantity of credit hours taken in the field of education and leaders over all academic achievement (G.P.A.) Were computed by Person's correlation coefficient. On the other hand, mean difference between: degree and diploma holders, Ed.Ad and subject majoring leaders, and elected and appointed leaders were computed using t-test to determine whether level of educational attainment, qualification and position attainment condition have resulted in (related with) instructional leadership effectiveness differences.

The observed relationships between personal characteristics and ILE were used to determine those personal factors affecting instructional leadership effectiveness significantly.

In order to determine the organizational factors which significantly influenced instructional leadership effectiveness, Pearson's correlation coefficient has been employed.

Finally, comparisons of mean differences between two independent sample groups (resulting from the effects of district/zone administrative characteristics) on their ILE were made using t-test to determine whether the resulting differences were consequences of those characteristics or not.

1.8 Organization of the Study

This study is organized into four chapters. Chapter one provides the problem and its approach. Chapter two deals with the review of related literature. Chapter three provides the presentaiton and analysis of the data. Chapter four includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

1.9 Definition of Key Terms

Instructional Leadership:- Refers to role behavior (or practices) of school leaders in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning climate (Krug and Others in Krug, 1992).

Instructional Leadership Effectiveness:- Refers to the frequency of leaders engagement in the role behavior (or practices) used to represent the five instructional leadership dimensions (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987).

Senior Secondary School:- Refers to a school system following the elementary schools solely established to offer general education courses to students from grade 9 to 12 (Good, 1973).

School Leader:- In this study school leader refers to principals and assistant principals of senior secondary schools. And they are interchangably used.

Senior Secondary School:- Refers to a school system following the elementary schools solely established to offer general education courses to students from grade 9 to 12 (Good, 1973).

School Leader:- In this study school leader refers to principals and assistant principals of senior secondary schools. And they are interchangably used.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this section the conceptual framework of instructional leadership, its correlates and influencing factors are presented.

2.1 Conceptual Framework of Instructional Leadership

The quest for clear understanding of what makes certain leaders more effective than others has spanned several decades. Literature in educational leadership of earlier years showed that leadership effectiveness was treated in terms of leadership styles and capacity for leader's personal interactions (Bevoise, 1984: 17). However, the uniqueness of each situation in which leadership is assumed makes generalizations about characteristics and leadership styles difficult. Moreover, due to the growing emphasis on the management of non-instructional functions, instructional leadership was overshadowed by administrative leadership studies. Such studies also failed to show activities of leaders that have great effect on the student learning.

Such limitations of earlier studies brought the attention of most researchers of the 1980's to focus on the common

leadership functions that contribute to effective teaching and student learning in schools. In reference to this, Brandt (1987: 19); Blum and Other (1987: 25): Hager and Scarr (1983: 38); and Hallinger and Murphy (1987: 57) found almost similar set of activities that characterized principals of effective schools. Based on such studies Krug and Others (cited in Kurg, 1992: 431) conceptualized instructional leadership in terms of the activities of the leader in five dimensions discussed below:

2.1.1 Defining the School Mission

Mission is what the school aspires 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 (Guthrie and Reed, 1991: 219).

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).

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.

2.1.2 Managing Curriculum and Instruction

Curriculum and instruction are important components of schooling to which educational leaders should pay substantial 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). One way

of achieving this goal is by preventing wastage of instructional time resources.

Schools often have specific time allotments for interaction in various curricular areas. However, different (in and out of school) factors can seriously reduce the amount of time that students have in handling certain subject areas. Such conditions force teachers either to rush through, jump some part or leave some portion of the curricula uncovered. Consequently, the sequence and pacing of the curriculum suffers as a result of inefficient use of instructional time in the school.

Leaders, therefore, need to reduce the amount of wastage in instructional time and increase the amount of time that the students have in certain subject areas by controlling the internal and external interruption of the instructional time (Bossert and other, 1982: 41; and Wilson and Firestone, 1987: 206). The impact of instructional time on students' learning is reflected by Guthrie and Reed (1991: 223) when they suggest "... the longer a subject is studied the more a pupil will learn".

In addition to interruptions, other factors like non-instructional duties of teachers, co-curricular activities and resource allocation problems could minimize the amount of instructional time. Mibit (1984: 113), and Lockheed and

Verspoor (1991: 47-48), for instance, pointed out the importance of materials such as textbooks, teacher guides and supplies for the practicality of intended curriculum as well as preventing the instructional time that could be wasted when teachers and students copy text on and off the blackboard. Leaders, therefore, play significant role in minimizing instructional time wastage by: reducing non-instructional duties for teachers, planning co-curricular activities in support of the formal instructional program, and by allocating and coordinating instructional resources for effective teaching (Knezevich, 1969: 378; Wilson and Firestone, 1987: 113; and Guthrie and Reed, 1991: 13).

Different authors also suggest that leaders can influence teachers' organization of classroom instruction by their decisions on the assignments of students in classroom. For instance, Wilson and Firestone (1987: 20), and Guthrie and Reed (1991: 21) suggested that the size of students in a classroom as well as their composition influences teachers' teaching style, student and teacher expectation and ultimate effectiveness of instruction. In most cases (Bossert and others, 1982: 42) assignments of students to classrooms are made on the factors that do not seem to have direct effect on student performance such as "age distribution, sex balancing, student behavior and the like." Evidently the way teachers organize their classroom instruction will be shaped in terms of these compositions. This dictates that the leader's

decision on class size and composition influences classroom instructional organization of the teachers. In light of this Wilston & Firestone (1987: 20), and Bossert and others (1982: 42) pointed out that leaders can influence the classroom organization of instruction positively by controlling the class size and composition in a way that increases student achievement. Beckerman and Good (cited in Bossert and Others 1982: 41), for instance, suggested the importance of overall achievement distribution within classrooms to affect learning significantly.

Other mechanisms by which leaders of effective schools use to influence the coordination of instruction in their schools are teacher task assignment and class-scheduling (Dwyer, 1984: 36). Literature suggests that, assigning tasks to teachers by considering the factors affecting teaching such as nature of the task, types of teachers and teachers' personal factors make the instructional process more conducive to the needs of students and attainment of school goals (Ayalew, 1991: 110).

Similarly, strong leaders consider the existence of subjects that need consecutive periods (eg. craft) and subjects that need students' fresh mind and high attention (eg. Maths and Language) when scheduling classes (Mibit, 1984: 58). This implies that leaders need to schedule-classes in such a way that students can learn more comfortably and actively. In other words class-scheduling must be in favour of students than teachers.

Another characteristics which stands out in instructionally effective schools is the high degree of curricular coordination. School curricular objectives are closely aligned with both the content taught in classes and the achievement tests used by the school (Guthrie and Reed, 1991: 219). The need for school level curriculum improvement and modification are also regarded as one of the school concerns about curriculum. Some of the school's concerns about curriculum concentrate on the sequence of content within and between subjects and grades, evaluation of a given curriculum for its relevance to bring the desired behavioural change, and adjustment of the curriculum to the needs of exceptional students as well as to the changing environment of the school (MOE, 1995: 15).

Leaders, therefore, need to ensure that curriculum coordination is practiced, new educational research findings and informations are provided; or that promising practices are readily introduced in the school. They also encourage and support individual teachers as well as curriculum committee to revise and improve the curriculum at the school level (Guthrie and Reed, 1991: 220; Knezevich, 1969: 378; and Dwyer, 1984: 36).

2.1.3 Supervising Instruction

The leader's supervisory role in instructional leadership remains important for the improvement of instruction as well

as for the professional growth of teachers. Leaders of effective schools are concerned about "what can be, not what was" and they are "prospective than retrospective" regarding the staff and instructional activities (Krug, 1992: 432). Supervision in effective schools is a helping process and not part of the final appraisal of performance.

Literature on effective schools suggest that the principal's supervisory activity concentrates more on issues involving instructional improvement and on identifying and diagnosing instructional problems as well as prescribing solutions (Edmonds, 1982: 12; Levine and Stark, 1982: 44).

The identification of instructional problems may be handled through different ways. Some of these could be listening to teachers' talk, asking teachers directly, using recorded documents and classroom visiting (Holmes, 1993: 53; Swearinger cited in Ovard, 1966: 230). Classroom visiting, however, is the most widely and frequently used by effective principals to acquire first hand information concerning the teacher's technique of teaching and his/her problems (Bent and McCann, 1960: 84; and Edmonds, 1982: 13). Instructionally effective school leaders, therefore, support teachers and monitor classroom instruction through numerous formal and informal classroom visits (Levine and Others cited in Hallinger, 1985: 219).

Instructional problems identified through such formal and informal classroom visiting may be that the leader may not able to suggest immediate solutions. As the teachers in senior secondary schools are specialists in their subject areas, the solutions of most difficulties rests with the teachers themselves. To this end, leaders of effective schools confer with teachers after the classroom visit to discuss the identified problems and to make plans for improvement (Jacobson and others, 1973: 140).

Leaders in their supervisory role also serve as consultant for a group of teachers and hold regular meetings on issues like planning lessons, efficient utilization of teaching aids, evaluation mechanisms etc., with department teachers (Bent and McCann, 1960: 85).

Similarly, effective leaders mostly use staff meetings to deal with curricular and instructional issues than administrative affairs. Methodological aspects, evaluation problems, test construction procedures, redefinition of school -goals, educational policy issues and the like are some issues that effective leaders deal within staff meetings (Jacobson and others, 1973: 140).

Furthermore, preparing professional discussions or dialogues among teachers and creating demonstration opportunities for skilled and interested teachers as well as experts are regarded

as supervisory techniques of leaders in effective schools (Jacobson and Others, 1973: 141). At such opportunities competent teachers provide examples of good teaching and demonstrate new teaching methods and teaching aids. Staff members who have attended conferences in instructional and curricular issues at regional or any level share the conference outcomes to the staff in such programs.

In general, the supervisory processes in effective schools are participatory, diagnostic, cooperative and are based on a mutual commitment to improvement and growth by both the principal and the teachers. The instructional leaders also integrate and use all the characteristics of consulting, helping, supporting and diagnosing the process that result in teacher competency (Ness, 1980: 406).

2.1.4 Monitoring Student Progress

Since the school's primary product is a population of graduates who have attained the objectives that the school provides through different curricular offerings, assessment of students' progress towards the intended objectives is vital if the school is to reach its goal. To this end, leaders of effective schools along with teachers become engaged in monitoring student progress closely and frequently (Walker and Murphy, 1986: 81). The effect of leaders' involvement in student progress has been shown by Johnson and Synder when they suggested "... the greater the evolvement of the principal in

assessment of students the higher is their [students'] achievement." (1986: 424).

Leaders' involvement in monitoring students' progress, however, does not require specialization in educational measurement and evaluation. Rather, they need to be aware of a variety of ways in which student progress can and should be assessed (Krug, 1992: 433). For instance, leaders can meet teachers individually to discuss students' academic progress and their leadership encourages teachers to regard the school testing program as a more integral portion of the total educational process of the school than treating it as a separate entity (Jacobson and others, 1973: 206).

Moreover, insructionally effective schools use information obtained from test results for different purposes: to assess the progress of students towards the intended objectives and school goals, for curriculum and instructional planning by the staff and individual teachers, and to provide special remedial or enrichment supports for underachievers (Walker and Murphy, 1986: 81; Lockheed and Levine, 1993: 126). Test results are also used to diagnose programmatic and student weakness and help in making classroom assignments (Hallinger, 1985: 219).

The leader, thus, plays a great role in this area by providing teachers with test results in a timely and useful manner and discuss the result with the staff as a whole and with grade

level and individual teachers. And it includes also providing interpretive analysis for teachers detailing the relevant test data in concise form (Edmonds and others cited in Hallinger, 1985: 219).

Furthermore, Jacobson and others (1973: 207) identified some additional roles of leaders in monitoring student progress. These are:

. Providing clerical support to the staff to facilitate measurement practices.
. Securing the cooperation of the entire faculty ... in determining what testing programs should be developed.
. Providing ... facilities for ... administering and scoring tests.

2.1.5 Promoting School Learning Climate

Although the aforementioned dimensions provide some understanding of instructional leadership, the more informal and normative dimension of a school's social organization may not be entirely captured in its structural properties. Promoting school climate - viewed as one dimension of instructional leadership - serves the principal to influence the social organization and thereby establish environment that supports the instructional process (Bossert and other, 1982: 48).

Research findings of the 1980's also show the positive contribution of favourable school climate to student learning. For example, Brookover and his associates, Clark and others, and Stawant (all cited in Hoy and Miskel, 1987: 399-400) found different climate components associated with student learning outcomes. And they generally agreed that student achievement is positively related to climate of the school.

Although these findings suggest the potential value of climate for understanding educational processes contributing to student achievement, the climate components used are varied and are not easily manipulable by the principal for immediate use. Due to these difficulties Hallinger's and Murphy's (1987: 58) concept of climate suitable for manipulating informal and normative components of social dimensions is taken for this paper. According to them school climate is defined as "... the norms [beliefs] and attitudes of the staff and students that influence student learning in schools."

Experience and literature evidence that teachers as well as students differ in their beliefs and attitudes of learning and learning activities in their school. In some schools, for instance, the majority of teachers approach teaching as a dull and routine duty; in others they show strong energy and zeal in their activities. Still, individual teachers may also believe that "only those who can profit from an organization should receive it", implying the belief that all students are

not capable of achieving the learning offered (Lucio and McNeil, 1962: 123). Most students in today's schools lack the necessary devotion and commitment to their learning. And such attitudes and beliefs of teachers and students obviously influence the learning atmosphere of the school and the efforts made for greater achievement. The principal, therefore, needs to work with such climate components if the school is intended to have a climate that promotes learning.

But how can the principal influence such informal and normative components of school climate in order to overcome the norms and beliefs that reflect apathy, disloyalty, lack of enthusiasm etc., and bring better learning atmosphere? In response to this question, research findings in effective schools suggest some tentative solutions. The most commonly used are discussed next:

2.1.5.1 Setting and Communicating High Expectation

Many writers on effective schools suggested that principals of effective schools influence the climate of the school by setting and communicating high expectation of work and achievement for both teachers and students (Gorton, 1987: 125; Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991: 42; and Lockheed and Levin, 1993: 6). These expectations enforce teachers and students to work hard and to do well academically.

For promoting the high expectations of principals, Murphy and others (1982: 23-26) suggested some school level policies and classroom practices. According to these and other authors, framing the whole purpose of the school in terms of one or two instructional goals can be used as the school purpose to communicate what is expected from teachers and students. To this end leaders may state the school purpose as:

1. The purpose of this school is to educate all students to a high level of academic performance.
2. To attain this purpose the members of the staff believe that:
   a) All students should have a challenging academic program
   b) All students should master their grade level objectives
   c) Teachers are obligated to prepare all students to perform at a mastery level

   (Brookover cited in Gorton, 1987: 131).

Evidently, through such statements of school purpose the leader communicates the need for hardwork and greater achievement on the part of teachers and students.

Leaders also set high expectations to teachers and students by their student grouping policies. Squires and others (1981: 176), for instance, suggested that grouping students on the basis of overall achievement distribution rather than academic abilities promotes the belief that all students can achieve grade level objectives and convey high academic expectation to teachers and students.

In addition, through the development of school-wide policies related to the interruption of classroom learning time, leaders can communicate that learning is important and enforce teachers and students to use maximum learning time (Hallinger, 1985: 220). Attendance and student behavior policies can also be used to maintain orderly environment for instructional process (Murphy and others, 1982: 24).

Moreover, student progress policies that deal with homework, grading monitoring and reporting progress, policies on remedial education and promotion can be used to communicate high student expectation and reinforce teachers' and parents' commitment to successful student learning and create appealing learning atmosphere (Murphy and others, 1982: 25).

Similarly, leaders can set policies on teachers' classroom practices and behavior that best promote student achievement to show their emphasis on learning and productive work (Murphy and others, 1982: 25).

These and other expectations aim at excellence in student achievement and concurrently toward greater staff responsibility for this achievement. As a result, commitment to learning, work and sense of achievement could be attained on the part of students and teachers. Consequently, the school climate becomes conducive for effective instruction. In this respect, Walker and Murphy (1986: 78) suggested that when a

school is committed to such high expectations, it will have an atmosphere where the staff:

- expects all students to do well
- believes that all students have the capacity to excel
- believes their own ability to positively influence student outcomes
- accepts responsibility for student achievement
- is willing to be held accountable for student learning

2.1.5.2 Physical Presence of the Leaders

In addition to setting and communicating high expectations, the physical presence of the leader also influence the climate of the school. On top of this, Sergiovanni and Starrat (1993: 104) suggested that "... principal's close personal contact with the process of teaching and learning influence the school climate." Hallinger and Murphy (1987: 58) also contend that principals can influence the school learning climate by maintaining high visibility to communicate priorities and model behaviors for teachers and students. Moreover, visibility on the campus and in classrooms increases the interaction between the principal and students as well as with teachers (Hallinger, 1985: 220). The effect of leader's visible presence on students progress and development is revealed in the study of effective schools by Mortimore and his associates. Their findings state:

> Where the deputy [instructional leader] was frequently absent, or absent for prolonged period (due to illness, attendance on long

> courses, or other commitments), this was detrimental to pupil's progress and development... (1988: 119).

In general, by maintaining high visibility in the school and around the instructional process, a principal can show his/her interest to the students learning and teachers effort in the instructional process. And this in turn affect the teachers' and students' devotion to the teaching and learning process (Casey and others cited in Hallinger, 1985: 220).

2.1.5.3 Using Symbolic Activities and Rewards

According to Peters and Austin (cited in Gorton, 1987: 131) symbolic and informal communication that take the form of stories, ceremonies and slogans can influence the learning climate of the school.

By using school slogans and ceremonies principals can communicate the importance of learning, influence the beliefs and attitudes of new teachers by articulating how students and teachers have invested extra effort to improve themselves and to help achieve school goals in anecdotes (Gorton, 1987: 131). Such occasions reflect the effort expected, the need for self improvement and governance of activities toward school objectives for new teachers.

Similarly, principals can increase the adherence of teachers and students to expectations of the school by using reward

systems. In this regard, Putter and others (cited in Gorton, 1987: 127) found that "... schools recognizing student accomplishment tend to have high level of achievement", Krug (1992: 433) notes that: recognition and support of teachers increase teachers' productivity and commitment to their work. Principals, therefore, need to create a reward system that reinforces academic achievement and productive effort in order to shape the school climate positively (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987: 58). Of such systems, ceremonies such as academic superstar recognition, homework recognition, average riser recognition and teacher of the month recognition are suggested as some examples by Gorton (1987: 132).

2.2 Personal Characteristics and Leadership

Personal characteristics are factors which are most commonly used in selecting leaders for principalship. Researchers also recognize the potential influence they have on how principals enact their role.

The first variable is sex. Studies of leadership and principalship indicate that women out rank men in their performance. Pitner (in Ozga, 1993: 11), for example, found that women visited more classroom, keep up to date on curriculum issues, spent more time with their peers than men principals. Similarly, Ozga (1993: 11) identified that women principals spend more time on fostering an integrative culture and climate than men. Female principals are more likely to

involve themselves in instructional supervision, exhibit democratic leadership and show concerne to students learning than men (Fishel and Pottker cited in Adikson, 1981: 317; Johnson cited in Outston, 1993: 6). On the other hand, an earlier study by Gross and Herriott (1965: 54) found no apparent relationship between sex and executive professional leadership effectiveness (EPL).

The second factor is age. Although little attention is given to age as a requirement for certification as well as selection of school leaders, one may expect the older principals tend to have greater experience in education and therefore, will offer more instructional leadership. Others, on the contrary, may expect that younger principals show more energy and capacity, and therefore, strong instructional leadership. Research findings, however, are inconsistent about the relationship between age and leadership effectiveness. Gross and Herriott (1965: 76), for instance, found "negative" relations that dictate older principals provide less leadership than do the younger, whereas Jacobson and others (1973: 133) reported "very little" relationship between age and successful leadership.

Work experience, as a third factor, has been commonly used as criteria in selecting principals and assistant principals. MOE (1996: 7), for instance, has set criteria for selecting principals which requires at least five years teaching experience or experience as unit leader, department head, head

of pedagogical center or school supervisor. However, research findings do not support this. Fore example, Gross and Herriott (1965: 68-73) found that the length of experience as teacher, previous administrative experiences and even the number of years at the principalship position have no significant relationship with leadership effectiveness (Measured as EPL).

Educational attainment and qualification are other personal factors more often used as a criteria for selecting leaders for principalship. For instance, MOE (1996: 8) requires educational attainment of at least a Bachelor's degree and more preferably qualified in educational administration. For instructional leadership role, training in educational areas is highly considered for leader effectiveness. In this connection with Hallinger and Murphy (1987: 55) suggested that "lack of knowledge in curriculum and instruction deters the instructional leadership role." However, research fails to establish the determining effect of training. Gross and Herriott (1965: 55-58), for example, found no relationship between effective leadership (EPL) and training in the areas of education. But they found G.P.A. of leaders' undergraduate study related significantly with leadership effectiveness. Similarly, Zenebe (1992: 128), found that qualification does not predict leaders effectiveness strongly.

Position attainment condition is also taken as one personal characteristic in this study. Knezevich (1969: 108) suggested

that principals can be assigned by higher officials or elected by the staff. The common trend in our country was assigning principals, if not necessarily assistants, directly by higher officials. But currently there is a tendency to assign leaders for the principalship position by election from among the staff members by either the staff or district education and training board committee (MOE,1996: 8). However, no research has yet revealed the relationship between position attainment condition and leadership effectiveness.

2.3 Factors Affecting Leadership Effectiveness

The treatment of instructional leadership effectiveness in the five dimensions focused on the school as a closed system. However, evidence from leadership studies suggest the existence of some factors that influence the leadership effectiveness of school leaders. Such factors can be classified into personal characteristics, organizational characteristics and district or zone education department characteristics. The first has been presented in the above section, the last two are presented here under:

2.3.1 Organizational Characteristics

Organizational characteristics in this context refer to the factors existing in the school. The first variable is resource availability (human, material, and financial). In instructional leadership process the availability of teachers, textbooks, equipment, supplies and finance is crucial for its

success. Mibit (1984: 113), for example, stressed this when he suggested: "... just as well - trained personnel are important for the success of the school curricula, so are equipment and supplies". Hence, leaders instructional leadership functions may be constrained or facilitated by the extent of resources available in their school. Confirming this, a research conducted in elementary schools of developing countries revealed that the instructional improvement effort of principals are highly constrained by the chronic shortage of materials, operating funds and staff development resources (Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991: 44). Experience also shows that shortage of qualified teachers makes instructional leadership process problematic.

Role diversity is the second organizational factor to which most of secondary school leaders complain. Reviewing different studies on principals' time allotment to their work, Jacobson and others (1973: 135) reported that the variety of roles that the principals assumed made them unable to devote enough time to matters that concern instruction. Seymour (1976: 89) also pointed out that instructional leadership role of the principal is always dwarfed by the long list of administrative duties. So the multiplicity of roles and expectations by parents, students and teachers tend to fragment whatever vision the principal may be attempting to shape in the school (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987: 57).

professional norm is also another factor that influence instructional leadership effectiveness. Teachers in secondary schools are sensitive, intelligent people who feel that their professional preparation and experience have equipped them to do a job skilfully (Corbally and others, 1965: 90). Such professional norm makes the relationship between teachers and school leaders on the matters of instruction loosely coupled and leave educational decisions to teachers. Consequently, such professional norm limits the frequency and depth of principal's classroom visits as well as their initiative of consulting teachers about instructional matters (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987: 56).

Many authors and research findings also identified school size as one factor that influences principal's leadership. Zenebe (1992: 127), for example, found that "the size of the school stress the job demands of ... the principal." Holmes (1993: 41) again confirm that the learning priorities and needs of children can easily be detacted in small schools than in larger ones. The findings of Gross and Herriott (1965: 153) also reveal that principals' leadership effectiveness increase in small schools. On the contrary, reviewing earlier studies of the principals' time budgeting Ovardconcluded that:

> principals of small schools spent more time in teaching, while principals of larger schools spent more time in curriculum and instruction, guidance and problems of the staff. (1966: 17).

This implies that school size and instructional leadership effectiveness have a direct relationship.

2.3.2 District or Zone Education Department Characteristics

The second source of influence on the principals leadership is district or zone office characteristics. One of such factors is expectation of higher administrative officers. Different authors suggest that the expectation set by the administration of higher offices can influence the principals role. Hallinger and Murphy (1987: 56), for example, pointed out that the informal culture of school district which emphasize managerial efficiency and political stability than instructional leadership constrains the principal effort in instructional improvement. On the positive side, Gross and Herriott's (1965: 109) findings that reveal high EPL by the principals when their superiors also have high EPL suggests that the district with a climate that promotes and rewards instructional leadership might enhance the ability and motivation of principals to successful leadership.

Other district or zone administrative elements, such as rules, regulations and policies, financial and supply delivery problems, numerous reporting requirements, untimely teacher transfer and delay in deployment of teachers are suggested as constraining elements in principals instructional leadership process (Bossert and others, 1982: 53).

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This section of the thesis deals with the description of the sample population, analysis and interpretation of the data.

3.1 Description of Sample Population

Based on the sampling procedure described in chapter one, 14 schools were included in the study. The sample size of leaders and teachers, however, has been slightly reduced for the following reasons. On the part of leaders, one of the sample schools had no principal by the time the study was conducted and in another school the principal was not present at the time of data collection. Thus, the sample size of leaders was reduced from 28 to 26 leaders (i.e. 12 principals and 14 assistant principals). On the part of teachers, a total of 198 teachers were expected to respond and return the questionnaire destributed to them. However, 6 of them didn't return it. And this reduces the sample size of teachers to 192. Supervisory staff were represented as planned, and thus 6 supervisory members from 6 zones were included in the study.

Thus, the analysis was made on the basis of information obtained from the returned questionnaires - 100 percent of leaders and 96.7 percent of teacher responses. Interview held

with supervisors and information from document analysis are used as suplementary and not quantified.

3.1.2 Respondents Characteristics

Sex and Age of Respondents

Table 3

Characteristics of Respondents by their Sex and Age

Characteristics		Respondents					
		Teacher		Leader		supervisor	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Sex:	M	182	94.8	26	100	6	100
	F	10	5.2	-	-	-	-
	Total	192	100	26	100	6	100
Age	20-30 years	54	28.1	4	15.4	-	-
	31-40 "	97	50.5	17	65.4	3	50
	41-55 "	41	21.4	5	19.2	3	50
	Total	192	100	26	100	6	100

As table 3 shows the gender of respondents is dominated by males. As the data reveals only 5.2 percent of teachers were female, but none among leaders and supervisiors. Hence, females participation as teachers is very low and is completly absent in the leadership as well as supervisory positions. For this reason, the study excludes its original intention of detecting the relationship beween leaders' ILE and sex.

Regarding the age destribution, teachers and leaders have almost the same pattern. About 28.1 percent of teachers and 15.4 percent of leaders were between 20 and 30 years. And the majority (50.5%) of teachers and (65.4%) of leaders were between 31 and 40 years. Whereas the remaining 21.4 percent of teachers and 19.2 percent of leaders age range from 41 to 55 years. The supervisors are, however, mainly over 30 years, which may be due to their long years of services in their previous positions as teachers and school leaders. The fair representation of respondent particularly leaders from different age groups helps to compare the energetic group and the older ones in their instructional leadership performance.

Educational Level and Qualification of Respondents

Table 4

Characteristics of Respondents by Their Level of Education and Qualification

Characteristics	Respondents					
	Teacher		Leader		Supervisor	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Level of Education						
Diploma	80	41.7	9	34.6	-	-
Bachelor's Deg.	104	54.2	17	65.4	5	83.3
Master's Deg.	3	1.6	-	-	1	16.7
Other (12+3)	5	2.6	-	-	-	-
Total	192	100	26	100	6	100
Qualification						
Ed.Ad major			12	46.2	4	66.7
Pd.Sc major			1	3.8	2	33.3
Subject major			13	50.0	-	-
Total			26	100	6	100

Regarding the educational level of respondents, the data on the part of teachers reveal that only a negligible number (3 or 1.6%) hold a master's degree, while a considerable number (41.7%) are diploma, 54.2 percent bachelor degree holders and the remaining 2.6 percent summer course attendants (12+3). All leaders and 83.3 percent of the supervisors were bachelor's degree. Only 1 (16.7%) of the supervisors possesses master's degree.

In terms of qualifications, half (50%) of the leaders were subject specialists and 46.2 percent were qualified in educational administration. The remaining negligible size (only one or 3.8%) was a graduate in pedagogical science. Similarly, about 66.7 percent of supervisors were qualified in educational administration and 33.3 percent were qualified in pedagogical science. On the part of teachers, the table in Appendix A displays that 21.4 percent were language graduates, 38.1 were in natural science fields, 15.6 were in social science fields, 16.0 percent were in vocational areas and 8.8 percent were in education, including pedagogical science, psychology and educational administration graduates.

Such representation of respondents from different levels of education and qualfication will have its contribution to the study, i.e., teachers' representation from different levels and fields of spcialization makes their assessment of leaders' ILE more reliable and unbiased. Besides, the supervisors level

of education and areas of study (professional education) make their information more professional and comprehensive. The leaders' distribution or representation from different level and specialization also help for test whether these characteristics can contribute to leaders success in instructional leadership role.

Although consensus has not been reached about the contribution of training in educational courses like curriculum and instruction, supervision, and measurement and evaluation to instructional leadership effectiveness, this study attempts to test whether such course offerings can tell us something about the effectiveness of leaders in this role. The data in this respect revealed that one leader (3.8%) has taken no course in those areas. Four (15.4%) have taken 1 to 10 credit hours, about 38.5 percent have taken 11 to 20 credit hours and the remaining 42.4 percent have taken over 20 credit hours. In addition, leaders' general academic achievement (G.P.A.) in their studies has also been tested for its impact on ILE in section 3.2.2.

Work Experience of Respondents

Table 5

Characteristics of Respondents by Their Work Experience

Characteristics (experience)	Respondents					
	Teacher		Leader		Supervisor	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In teaching						
1-10 years	63	32.8	11	42.3	4	66.7
11-20 "	94	48.9	11	42.3	2	33.3
>20 "	35	18.3	4	15.4	-	-
Total	192	100	26	100	6	100
As a unit leader	13*	6.8				
no service			14	53.8	-	-
1-5 years			8	30.8	-	-
6-10 years			4	15.4	-	-
Total			26	100	-	-
As a department	68*	35.4				
head	111*	67.8	10	37.7	-	-
no service			10	37.7	-	-
1-5 years			6	24.6	-	-
6-10 "		100	26	100	-	-
Total	192*					
In principalship						
1-2 years			11	42.3	-	-
3-6 "			6	23.1	5	83.3
7-10 "			5	19.2	1	16.7
>10 "			4	15.2	-	-
Total			26	100	6	100
As a supervisor						
1-3					1	16.7
4-6					5	83.3
≥7					-	-
Total					6	100

* indicates the number of teachers serving in the particular position. The interval years do not work for this group.

Apart from professional preparation, the selection and placement of leaders commonly requires work experience on the job as well as on related tasks such as teaching, unit leader, department head and other responsibilities (MOE: 1996:7). This was so because of the belief that such experiences improve the competency as well as effectiveness of leaders in their position. The data in table 5 also conforms to this tendency. About 42.3 percent of leaders have served 1 to 10 years in teaching and the remaining 57.5 percent serves for over 10 years. Similarly, 37.7 percent and 24.6 percent of them have served as department head for 1 to 5 and 6 to 10 years respectively and a considerable size of them (46.2%) also served as unit leader for 1 to 10 years. Thus, it can be concluded that most leaders included in the study have gained a great deal of work experience in teaching, unit leader and department head responsibilities prior to their present position.

In addition, about 42.3 percent of leaders have served for 1 to 2 years in their present position (principalship). And 23.1 percent have served for 3 to 6 years and the remaining 34.5 percent have served for over 6 years. Thus, it can be assumed that most leaders have wide potential skills and knowledge in school leadership.

However, consensus has not yet been reached about the contribution of such experiences to instructional leadership

effectiveness. Hallinger and Murphy (1987: 55) and Gross and Herriott (1965) can be mentioned in this vein. Yet MOE uses it as policy alternative in the appointment of leadership position. This debatable fact initiated the researcher to consider the relationship of such experiences and instructional leadership effectiveness, which is treated in section 3.2.2

As shown in table 5 teachers who have participated in assessing leaders' instructional leadership effectiveness were with different number of years of teaching experience and a considerable size of them were also department heads and unit leaders who have had close contact with instructional leadership activities. Thus, the information obtained from teachers will have great reliability. The wide range of experiences of most supervisors as teachers, leaders and supervisor also help to get relevant information on the problem under study.

3.2 Interpretation of the Data

3.2.1 Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

As already defined in chapter one, instructional leadership effectiveness is the frequency of the leader's engagement in specified role behaviors/practices used to represent each dimension of instructional leadership. Leaders' engagements in the role behavior were evaluated by teachers and through their own rating.

To maximize the reliability of the evaluation results the scores of the two groups were changed into a single whole score. In doing so, the teacher data were, first, aggregated to form two leader scores in each school on the five dimensions. Thus, the scores of 192 teachers are changed into 26 scores of each dimension.

Next, the average of the 26 teacher scores and the corresponding 26 leaders' self - rating scores on each dimension were calculated. The resulting scores were used as a measure of leader's effectiveness in each dimension (LED). The mean score of the dimensions used as LED was calculated to use as a measure of instructional leadership effectiveness (ILE) for each leader. See Appendix B.

In using the ILE and LED scores in this research, they are considered to be a continuous variable running from "relatively lowest" (1.00) to "relatively highest" (5.00) with two trisecting scores 2.33 and 3.66. Based on the trisecting scores leaders were grouped into three effectiveness levels: "weak leader" (ILE = 1.00-2.33), "moderatly effective leader" (ILE = 2.34-3.66) and "strong leader"(ILE = 3.67 - 5.00). These intervals and levels also work for LED.

Thus, the distribution of leaders in each effectiveness levels is presented in tables 6 and 7 below.

Table 6

Distribution of Leaders in the Three ILE Levels

Leader's ILE Level	No.	%	Cum %
weak	1	3.8	3.8
moderate	21	80.8	84.6
strong	4	15.4	100

As the data in table 6 reveal 15.4 percent of leaders are strong, 80.8 percent are moderate and a negligible size (only one or 3.8%) are weak in their ILE. This implies that the great majority (84.6%) of leaders are not providing instructional leadership effectively (strongly).

Furthermore, detailed examination of leaders' performance in each dimension shows that about 50.0 percent were weak, in 33.5 percent were moderate and only 3 (11.5%) were strong in defining their school's mission (see table 7).

Table 7

Distribution of Leaders in the Three LED Levels-

Leader's LED Levels	Dimensions									
	Mission		M.C. & In.		Sup. Inc.		Mon. St.P		Climate	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Weak	13	50.0	1	3.8	2	7.7	2	7.7	1	3.8
Moderate	10	38.5	16	61.6	22	84.6	20	76.9	21	30.8
strong	3	11.5	9	34.6	2	7.7	4	15.4	4	15.4
Total	26	100	26	100	26	100	26	100	26	100

As the data in table 7 reveal, most leaders' (61.6%) performances in managing curriculum and instruction were moderate whereas 34.6 percent of them were strong. But a negligible proportion (3.8%) was found weak. In other words, the majority (65.4%) of leaders were not strong (effective) in managing curriculum and instruction. Similarly, about 7.7 percent were effective and the majority (84.6%) were moderate in their engagement in supervising instruction, whereas the remaining 2.7 percent were weak.

Monitoring student progress, like the aforementioned dimensions, has not been performed strongly by most leaders. Only 4 (15.4%) were strong, whereas the majority (76.9%) moderate performers and the remining 7.7 percent were weak. Promoting school learning climate has also suffered from ineffective leadership. Only 15.4 percent of leaders were strong in promoting their school learning climate whereas the great majority (80.8%) performed at a moderate level and 3.8 percent were weak.

In general, the leaders effectiveness in each dimension ranges from weak to strong. However, the majority, except for defining the school mission, remain at the moderate level.

The information obtained from documents in each school also confirms the described findings about leaders engagement in each dimension. The annual school plan, for instance, revealed

that most leaders set their plans without statements of goal. For this reason, their plans were found non-developmental and mere repetitions of past years' experience. It also meantthat they led their schools without clear vision of where to go and what to achieve.

The other leaders, although they have stated the school goals they intended to reach through the activities included in their plans, they consentrated on administrative areas than student learning and achievement.

Besides such shortcomings of mission statements, the teaching staff minutes observed revealed that only few leaders discussed the school goals with teachers at the begining of the year, and moreover, the statements were not revised and reframed subsequently following their implementation and success.

In most cases - as the minutes revealed - discussions dealt with and issues raised at the staff meetings were disciplinary problems, organizational tasks and other administrative problems. Little attention was given to curriculum and instructional areas. This had even come to the attention of leaders when it became a serious problem. Among the issues raised in staff meetings, problems in teacher performance evaluation for career promotion took the largest part. And the exercise of classroom visiting in almost all schools was intended this purpose and not to diagnose or improve instructional problems.

From the information obtained from school documents and the interview with supervisors, it was evident that school level supervision was being introduced in all senior secondary schools of the region. Although negligible size of leaders had started to implement it, the provision of in school supervision was in the form of staff development and was held by teachers mandeted by the career ladder.

Regarding monitoring the progress of students, most schools conduct tests at most six times a year. However, the test results are not used for informative purpose. And the progress of students in most schools, were reported to parents at most twice a year (semester ends) in most schools. In the staff meetings this aspect gets attention at the end of each semester and the descussions mainly focus on the administration of tests than other aspects of tests.

The number of periods wasted, teachers' and students' deciplinary problems reported in staff meetings also dictate that leaders have problems in promoting school learning climate.

3.2.2 Some Correlates of Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

Despite the inconsistency of findings most authors and researchers recommended the potential contributions of personal characteristics of leaders on their leadership effectiveness.

Based on this, this section tries to test whether some personal characteristic variables have relation with ILE.

Age and experience

Table 8

Summary of correlations of Age and Experience with ILE

	Age	Experience as			
		Teacher	Unit Leader	Dept. Head	Leader
ILE r	0.105	0.156	0.309	0.436*	0.048
P	0.611	0.446	0.124	0.026*	0.818

* Significant at 0.05 level.

As the result in table 8 shows' age and all experience variables have positive correlation with ILE. However, only experience as a department head has shown statistically significant correlation with ILE. Of the remaining variables experience as a unit leader has shown better - although not statistically significant - correlation with ILE. Age, experience as teacher and experience as a principal/or assistant principal have got very little relation with ILE. These findings, with the exception of experience as a department head, are in conformity with Hallingers' and Murphys' (1987), Gross and Herriott (1965) and Jacobson and Others (1973) findings and conclusions. The possible explanation for significant positive correlation between experience as department head and ILE may be that the

responsibility in this position requires close attention to curricular and instructional issues at individual and group level than other positions in the school.

Other personal characteristics assumed to have significant correlation with ILE were level of education, qualification and position attainment condition. To examine their relationship with ILE, t-test was computed for each.

Level of education: considering the contribution of greater education to the acquisition of greater knowledge and skill in the area of training, the t-test was computed on the assumption that the ILE is higher among degree holders than diploma holders (i.e. H1: N1>N2). The null hypothesis being: the two groups are not different in their ILE (i.e. Ho: N1-N2 = 0).

Table 9

T-test of Mean Difference for Degree and Diploma Holder Leaders on Their ILE

Variable (level of education)	No.of Cases	Mean	S.D.	Mean Dff	DF	Tc	T0.05 (24)
Degree holders	17	3.15	0.580				
Diploma Holders	9	2.73	0.238	0.423	24	2.08	1.711

Since the computed t-value (2.08) is greater than the critical t-value (t0.05 (24) = 1.711) the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, degree holders are more effective in their instructional

leadership than diploma holders. Thus, it can be concluded that level of education has positive relation with ILE. That is, the higher the level of education of the leader the higher will be his/her ILE.

Qualificaiton: Besides level of education, the qualification (specialization) that the leader has was believed to result in significant difference in ILE among leaders. Considering the potential contribution of professionalism for effectiveness in certain positions and responsibilities, t-test was computed on the assumption that leaders qualified in educational administration are higher in ILE than subject majoring leaders (i.e. H1: N1>M2)(Table 10). And the null hypothesis being: no significant difference between the two groups (i.e. H0: N1-N2 = 0).

Table 10

T-test of Mean Difference for Ed.Ad Graduates and Subject Specialists on Their ILE

Variable (Qualification)	No.of Cases	Mean	S.D.	Mean Dff	DF	Tc	T0.05 (23)
Ed.Ad major	12	3.099	0.528				
Subject major	13	2.969	0.526	0.130	23*	0.62	1.714

* One case - Pd.sc graduate - omitted.

The computed t-value (0.62), in table 10, is less than t 0.05 (23) (1.714) thus it failed to reject the null hypothesis. That means there exist no significant mean difference between leaders qualified in Ed.Ad and subject specialists on their ILE. Thus, qualification has no significanct relation with success in instructional leadership.

Other characteristics that can go with educational level and qualification are leaders' overall academic achievement in their undergraduate studies as well as their training in educational fields like curriculum and instruction, supervision, and measurement and evaluation. Although Hallinger and Murphy (1987) and Gross and Herriott's (1965) results make the contribution of these variables debatable, this study treated it on its part.

Table 11

Correlation of Leaders' Achievement (G.P.A.) And Number of Credit Hours Taken in Some Education Fields with ILE

		Achievement (G.P.A.)	No. Of Credit Hours
ILE	r	0.031	0.46
	P	0.882	0.018*

* Significant at o.05 level.

As the result in table 11 reveals, both variables have positive relationship with ILE. However, the number of credit hours

taken in educational fields has shown statistically significant relationship with ILE than leader's academic achievement (G.P.A.). The result, partly confirms Hallinger and Murphy's (1987) views and completely contradicts Gross and Herriott's (1965) findings.

position attainment conditon. Although nothing is known about the relationship between position attainment condition and leadership effectiveness, some modes of assuming principalship position were in place, which included election of leaders. According to the information obtained through interview, such selection of leaders is held by the district education and training board. And since the accountability of the board is to district administrative council, supervisors could not have chance to exert professional pressure on the selection of leaders. As the response of supervisors indicated, the selection of leaders being exercised is neither based on empirically justified effectiveness criteria nor considering professional training. Even the staff members were not involved in the selection of their own leaders in some-cases. On the other hand, the responses of leaders to the questionnaire revealed that the assigned leaders were from both professionally trained and non-professional groups. Thus, in testing the relationship between position attainment condition and ILE, the comparison of assigned to elected assumed only the existence of significant difference between the two groups. To this end, t-test was computed based on the

assumption that the elected and assigned leaders differed significantly in their mean of ILE (H1: N1 ≠ N2). And And the null hypothesis was: the two groups are not significantly different (i.e. H0 = N1-N2 = 0).

Table 12

T-test of Mean Difference for Assigned and Elected Leaders on Their ILE

Variable (Position att. Condition)	No. Cases	Mean	SD	Mean Dff	DF	Tc	t0.025(24)
Assigned	18	3.069	0.531				
Elected	8	2.868	0.519	0.201	24	0.90	2.064

The result shown in table 12 shows that the absolute value of computed t-value is less than t0.025 (24) (i.e. |0.9|<2.064). Thus, the null hypothesis is accepeted. Hence, position attainment conditions do not result in significant mean difference in ILE. In other words, position attainment condition has no significant relationship with ILE.

3.2.3 Personal Factors Influencing ILE

From the observed relationships in the previous sections it has been found that some personal characteristics such as: experience as department head, level of education and number of credit hours taken in educational fields like curriculum and instruction, supervision, and measurement and evaluation, etc., have significant positive influence on ILE.

3.2.4 Organizational Factors Influencing ILE

As revealed in most leadership studies, organizational context in which leadership is held influences the success of leaders. Based on this assumption some organizational factors are treated in this section to examine their potential infuence on ILE.

Table 13

Summary of Correlations of some Organizational Factors and ILE

		Organizational Factors						
		Inst. resources	Prof. norm	Student Size	Teaching Staff Size	Non.T, Staff Size	Time devoted to Ins. Leading	Extent of role diver-sity
ILE	r	0.523	0.561	-0.045	0.552	0.012	0.615	-0.193
	p	0.006*	0.003*	0.827	0.003*	0.954	0.001*	0.344

* Significant at 0.05 level.

As shown in the table above, ILE has significantly positive relation with the exent of instructional resources available in the school. This implies that the extent of instructional resources, such as qualified teachers, student text books, teacher's guide, instructional equipment, supplies and operative funds jointly determine the ILE of leaders.

The observed significant positive relationship of ILE and professional norm implies that in schools where the staff value and accept leaders participation in curricular and instructional issues, leaders' ILE increases. Thus, professional norm of a school has positive influence on ILE of leaders.

Regarding the size of the school, although number of students, teaching staff size and non-teaching staff size have direct relationship, only the teaching staff size has shown statistically significant positive relation with ILE. This implies that the leader working with larger teaching staff size is higher in his/her ILE than in smaller schools. Hence, the size of the school particularly in terms of teaching staff size has positive influence on instructional leadership effectiveness. Although this result contradicts Zenebe's (1992), Holmes' (1993) and Gross and Herriott's (1965) findings, it supports Ovard's (1966) result which showed that larger school leaders devote more time to instructional leadership role than smaller schools. Thus, the possible reason for the relationship obtained may be due to the fact that leaders in smaller schools have little time for instruction leadership because of their engagement as teachers.

As depicted in the table above, the statistically significant positive relationship of time devoted to instructional leadership role along with the negative - although not

significant - relationship of extent of role diversity with ILE means that role diversity has negatively influenced leaders' ILE. In other words, the lesser the extent of role diversity the higher will be the ILE.

3.2.5 District/Zone Educational Department Factors Influencing ILE

These factors are treated in two main groups: higher officials' expectations and administrative elements from district/zone education department.

3.2.5.1 Higher Official Expectations

With regards to higher officials' expectations and the infuence on leaders' ILE, leaders were asked to respond to the item "To what extent do your higher officials place emphasis on your instructional leadership role as compared to administrative duties?" Their reaction to this statement was re-grouped into two categories and found that 76.9 percent of them reported the lesser emphasis given to instructional leadership role as compared to administrative duties. And the remaining 23.1 percent reported that it was given equal or higher emphasis.

For the critical investigation of the influence of higher officials' expectations on leaders ILE, t-test was computed based on the assumption that leaders who perceive that their higher officials placed higher or equal emphasis on instructional leadership as compared to administrative duties

are higher in ILE than otherwise (H1: N1> N2), the null hypothes being no significant mean difference between the two groups (H0: N1-N2=0).

Table 14

T-test of Mean Difference for Leaders Receiving High and Equal Emphasis, and Lesser Emphasis by Higher Officials on Their ILE

Variable		No. Cases	Mean	S.D	Mean Dff	DF	Tc	t0.05 (24)
Higher officials emphasis on instructional leadership	equal & high	8	3.198	0.423	0.305	24	1.452	1.711
	Low	18	2.893	0.498				

As revealed in the table, computed t-value (1.452) is less than t-critical (1.711); thus, it failed to reject the null-hypothesis. So there is no significant mean difference between the two groups. Hence the emphasis placed on instructional leadership by higher officials does not have significant influence on leaders ILE. But the closeness of t-value (1.452) to the critical t (1.711) dictates that it has some contributions. The reason for this outcome may be attributed to lack of rewards for the emphasis required. To examine this, some commonly used requirements for promotion and recognition were listed, and ranked by leaders in the order of priority. And the responses were categorized into two groups (promotion

by instructional leadership competency and promotion by other requirements).

Accordingly, about 19.2 percent of leaders responded that the priority requirement for promotion and recognition was instructional leadership competency, whereas the majority (80.8%) responded otherwise. To examine the influence of such expectations of higher officials on leaders ILE t-test was computed. The computation was based on the assumption that leaders expecting promotion and recognition by their instructional leadership competency were higher in their mean of ILE than others (H1: M1>M2). The null hypothesis states no significant mean difference between the two groups.

Table 15

T-test of Mean Difference for Leaders Expecting Promotion Through Instructional Leadership Comptency and Other Competency on Their ILE

Variables		No. Cases	Mean	S.D	Mean Dff	DF	Tc	t0.05 (24)
Promotion for	In. L. Competency	5	3.247	0.372	0.346	24	- 1.730	1.711
	Other competency	21	2.901	0.391				

As the result in table 15 shows, the null hypothesis is rejected since t-computed (1.730) is greater than t 0.05 (24) (1.711). That means, leaders who expect recognition and

promotion through their instructional leadership competency are higher in ILE than the other group. This confirms Gross and Herriott's (1965) finding that reward and encouragement from higher officials increase leadership effectiveness. Thus, from the two consecuitive results it is evident that the emphasis on instructional leadership role of leaders that the higher officials place, will result in significant increase in ILE when it is followed by recognition and rewards. In sum, the higher officials' expectation on the leaders' role has significant influence for the success of leader as instructional leader.

3.2.5.2 Some Administrative Elements

About six administrative elements expected to have potential influence on leaders' ILE were listed and leaders ranked them according to their constraining effect. For computation purpose the responses of leaders for each element were grouped into two categories. That is, if leaders' ranked an element 1, 2 or 3 then they are more constrained by the element. And if leaders ranked an element 4, 5 or 6 then they are less constrained by the element. Based on this grouping, t-test was computed to test the impact of each element on ILE of leaders. The assumption used in computing the t-test was that leaders more constrained by an element are less effective in their instructional leadership role than otherwise (i.e., H1: $N_1 < N_2$). And the null hypothesis being: no significant difference between the two groups (i.e., H0: $N_1 - N_2 = 0$).

Table 16

T-test of Mean Differences for More Constrained and Less Constrained Leaders (of each administrative element) on Their ILE

No.	Elements	More Constrained			Less Constrained			tc
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
1	Policies, rules & regulations	11	3.177	0.484	15	2.833	0.534	1.44
2	Financial & supply delivery problem	20	2.875	0.389	6	3.203	0.412	-1.715
3	Numerous reporting requirements	13	3.014	0.558	13	3.001	0.512	0.06
4	Unitimely teacher transfer	10	2.732	0.414	16	3.179	0.524	-2.28
5	Delay substitute to and deployement of teachers	13	2.812	0.352	13	3.055	0.336	-1.723
6	Teaching material delivery problems	11	2.995	0.573	15	3.016	0.507	-0.10

Note: t 0.05 (24) = 1.711

As shown in table 16 the computed t-values for each of the elements 1,3, and 6 between the two groups are not less than the critical t-value (-1.711) at 0.05 level of significance and 24 degree of freedom. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Meaning, leaders more constrained by district/zone policies, rules and regulations, numerous reporting requirements and teaching material delivery problems are almost equally effective in their instructional leadership role as the less constrained ones. Thus, the evidence does not support the influence of these elements on leaders' ILE.

However, since the computed t-values for each of the elements 2, 4 and 5 are less than the critical t-value (-1.711) at 0.05 level of significance and 24 degree of freedom, the nul hypothesis is rejected. This implies that the greater constraining degree of the three elements - financial and supply delivery problem, untimely teacher transfer and delay substitute to and deployment of teachers - resulted lower performance of leaders in their instructional leadership. Hence, these three elements significantly affect ILE to the negative direction.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After analyzing and interpreting the data secured from questionnaires documents and interviews, the following summary, conclusion and recommendations are made.

4.1 Summary

This study is set out to explore the current status of instructional leadership role and to detect some of the factors influencing it in senior secondary schools of Amhara Region. To this end, basic questions addressing the strength of instructional leadership provision in general and in each dimension, leaders' personal characteristics and their relationship with instructional leadership effectiveness and the factors affecting its provision were raised.

In order to answer the basic questions raised the study was conducted in 14 government senior secondary schools of Amhara Region selected on the basis of stratified and quota sampling techniques. The subjects of the study used to obtain the necessary information include 26 school leaders, 192 teachers and 6 supervisory members. The information for the study was obtained through questionnaires, document analysis and

interview. However, the latter two were supplements to the questionnaire to make the study more reliable and comprehensive.

The data obtained were analyzed using different statistical tools such as percentages, Pearson's correlation coefficient and t-test. According to the results of the data analysis, the major findings of the study are the following:

1. Most of the school leaders (84.6%) were not providing instructional leadership strongly. Similarly, themajority of them were not performing effectively on each dimension. Only 11.5%, 34.6%, 7.7%, 15.4% and 15.4% of leaders were found very capable in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning climate respectively. Thus, only the minority of leaders were performing effectively in each dimension as well as in overall instructional leadership role.
2. In search of relationships between instructional leadership effectiveness and personal characteristics, the correlation coefficient between ILE and age (4 = 0.105), teaching experience (r=0.156), experience as a unit leader (r = 0.309), experience as principal (r = 0.048), leader's academic achievement (GPA) (r = 0.031), and the computed t-value for qualification (t=0.60) and position attainment condition (t = 0.90) indicate that

these personal characteristics have no significant relationship with ILE. On the other hand, the correlation coefficient of ILE and experience as a department head ($r = 0.436$, $p<0.05$), number of credit hours taken in education fields ($r = 0.46$, $p<0.05$) and the t-value ($t=2.08$, $p<0.05$ and $df = 24$) of level of education (degree and diploma) on their ILE revealed that these three personal characteristics have statistically significant relationship with ILE.

Regarding the factors affecting instructional leadership effectiveness of leaders, the study revealed:

3. Experience as department head, number of credit hours taken in education fields, and level of education are the three personal characteristics that have positive significance influence on ILE.
4. The availability of instructional resources ($r=0.523$, $p<0.05$), state of professional norm ($r = 0.561$, $p<0.05$) and teaching staff size as indicator of school size ($r = 0.55$, $p<0.05$) have been identified among organizational factors that affect ILE significantly in the positive direction. Observed relationship between ILE and role diversity expressed in terms of time devoted to instructional leadership role ($r = 0.615$, $p<0.05$) along with extent of role diversity ($r = -0.193$; $p>0.05$) implies that the amount of role diversity influences ILE negatively. Although their influence has been

negligible, the remaining school size variables (i.e., number of students ($r = -0.045$) and non-teaching staff size ($r = 0.012$) contributed in the expected direction.

5. The computed t-value ($t = 1.452 < 1.711$) that compared ILE mean between leaders whose instructional leadership role has been given greater emphasis by their higher officials and those who haven't been treated that way shows no significant difference. However, the computed t-value ($t = 1.730 > 1.711$) between leaders expecting their promotion and recognition through instructional leadership competency and leaders who do not expect their promotion that way has shown that the first group out-rank the second in their ILE significantly. These results, therefore, imply that the emphasis of higher officials on instructional leadership could result in greater ILE only when it is followed by rewards. Hence, the expectation that higher officials set on leaders performance seems to have significant influence on leaders' ILE.

6. With regard to other administrative elements of district/zone education department the t-test was computed for each of the six elements with respect to their constraining effect to a leader. The results show that ILE is negatively influenced for the greater constraining degree of three elements: financial and supply delivery problems, untimely teacher transfer and delay substitute to and deployment of teachers. Although

they exist as problems, the remaining three factors-district/zone policies, rules and regulations numerous reporting requirements and teaching material delivery problems - do not significantly affect ILE.

4.2 Conclusions

As the central goal of schools is providing learning through effective teaching, school leaders are expected to provide effective instructional leadership for the attainment of the school goal. However, the study revealed that most leaders have not given due attention to this part of their role. As a result, instructional leadership is not provided strongly by most school leaders. Moreover, the majority of leaders did not also perform effectively in each instructional leadership dimension.

In the hope of shading light on practical problems of instructional leadership provision in senior secondary schools of Amhara Region, the study attempted to find the correlates and factors affecting the effectiveness of leaders in this role.

Accordingly, it has been found that most personal characteristics (usually used for selection and appointment of leaders to the principalship position) failed to discriminate significantly among leaders as to their ILE. Among these are: age, teaching experience, experience as a unit leader,

experience as a principal or assistant, academic achievement, qualification and position attainment condition. The findings did reveal, however, that three personal characteristics - greater quantity of credit hours (courses) in education field, greater level of education and greater experience as department head - may have some predictive value in selecting leaders who promise effectiveness in providing instructional leadership. Thus, the cause for - incapability of most leaders to provide this leadership strongly may be attributed to their lack of the three personal characteristics.

Besides personal characteristics, instructional leadership effectiveness has been found subject to organizational and district/zone education department administrative characteristics.

Of the organizational factors, greater availability of instructional resources, a professional norm that gives high value to the involvement of leaders in curricular and instructional matters, and greater number of teachers in a school have contributed positively and significantly to the success of a leader in his/her instructional leadership role. On the other hand, a good range of role diversity has influenced ILE significantly in a negative direction. Thus, it has been found difficult to expect leaders perform their instructional leadership role strongly without considering such organizational factors.

Similarly, the study reveals that instructional leadership effectiveness significantly depends on expectations of higher officials from leaders in the form of emphasis as well as requirement for promotion. On the other hand, the study reveals that the high degree of financial and supply delivery problems, untimely teacher transfers and delay in assigning substitute to and deployment of teachers have significantly influenced the ILE of leaders negatively. Thus, instructional leadership effectiveness again requires the attention of higher officials or district/zone education department.

In general from the observed findings it can be concluded that instructional leadership effectiveness is a function of personal, organizational and district/zone education department administrative characteristics (or factors).

4.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion reached the following possible solutions are recommended so as to increase ILE of school leaders.

. As evidenced by the study the status of instructional leadership effectiveness in most senior secondary schools of the Amhara region needs improvement. And this has to start with introducing leaders with appropriate instructional leadership role behaviors and skills. In doing so, the Regional Education Bureau (REB) in collaboration with zone and district education

departments needs to define the instructional leader's duties in terms of the five dimensions - defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress, and promoting the school learning climate - as well as providing long and short term training to equip them with appropriate knowledge and skill in the area.

Moreover, reducing various factors influencing the provision of instructional leadership should be another alternative for the success of leaders. In this endeavour, the first optionis to use appropriate criteria for selecting and appointing school leaders. Despite some inconsistancy of the findings with those of other studies, the majority of personal characteristics associated with instructional leadership effectiveness have been deemed as having little empirical justification to contribute to leadership effectiveness in this study. The only characteristics identified to contribute significantly and positively are: greater experience as department head, greater level of education and greater quantity of courses taken in education fields. Although the findings tend to give greater weight to these three personal characteristics in the selection and appointment of school leaders, the smallness of sample size and the study being first of its kind make it unfair to give less value to other personal characteristics to serve as selection and assignment criteria. The possible

recommendation is, thus, that REB with zones and district education departments needs to make wider study and revise the criteria used for selecting and appointing school leaders particularly for instructional leadership position.

Evidently, it is unimaginable to provide instructional leadership strongly under the chronic shortage of instructional resources like qualified teachers, teacher guides, student textbooks, instructional equipment, supplies and operational funds. The school leaders should take the responsibility and initiative to influence the concerned bodies to provide the necessary resources timely and adequately. The other possibility is to create mechanisms by which individual schools through their own initiative along with the community can make resources available.

It is hardly possible for leaders to be engaged frequently in instructional leadership activities unless their involvement gets recognition and reward from both teachers and higher officials. To this end, the professional norm that limits the involvement of leaders in instructional matters should be improved. One means to attain this is developing leaders' skills and knowledge in instructional leadership areas so that they can be influencial and confident to suggest solutions for the instructional problems. In line with this the strategies in the selection of leaders should take into

consideration the higher level of educational attainment of school leaders to minimize inferiority complex among the leaders and the led. Providing seminars, workshops or formulating policies on the improvement of teacher-leader work relationships could be the other alternative. Above all leaders also need to create strong professional relationships with and among teachers through prolonged efforts.

Moreover, higher officials should give greater emphasis to instructional leadership part of leaders' role. This could be attained by working closely with school leaders on instructional aspects and by giving greater value to it in the appraisal of leaders' performance and promotions. The administrative support from district or zone education department should also give great emphasis to the activities that have great influence on the instructional leadership role of leaders. This could be attained by providing the necessary budget and supplies adequately on time and making the transfer and deployment of teachers before the opening or after the closing of schools. Moreover, to avoid untimely transfer of teachers, the concerned body should make updated assessment of teacher distributions by qualification, service and work load in each senior secondary schools. As the study has indicated, leaders' engagement in instructional leadership is highly constrained by role

diversity they faced. Thus, the REB in collaboration with zone and district education departments needs to minimize the burden of roles by assigning additional administrative personnel and by making leaders free from teaching duties.

Finally, the researcher having identified the need, recommends further research in the area with broader scope and depth including other variables like leaders attitude to their profession, sex and staff moral.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adikson, J. A. (1981). "Women in School Administration: A Review of Research." Review of Educational Research, Vol.51, No.3, pp.311-343.

Amhara Education Bureau. (1997). Annual Educational Statistics. Bahir Dar: Amhara Education Bureau.

Ayalew S. (1991). "Approaches to Educational Organization and Management". Addis Ababa. (unpublished)

Bell, L. (1992). Managing Teams in Secondary Schools. London: Beddles Ltd.

Bent, R. K. and L. E. McCann. (1960). Administration of Secondary Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Bevoise, W. D. (1984). "Synthesis of Research on the Principal as Instructional Leader." Educational Leadership. vol. 41, No.5, pp.14-21.

Bishaw T. (1975). "The Secondary School principalship in Ethiopia". (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation)

Blum, R.E, J. A. Butler, and N. L. Olson. (1987). "Leadership for Excellence: Research-Based Training for principals." Educational Leadership. Vol. 45, No.1, pp.25-29.

Bossert, S. T. et al. (1982). "The Instructional Management Role of the Principal." Educational Administration Quarterly. vol.18, No.3, pp.34-65.

Brandt, R. (1987). "On Leadership and Student Achievement: A Conversation with Richard Andrews" Educational Leadership. vol. 45, No.1 p.9.

Clayton, H. (1994). "Creating an Effective Vision for a Primary School." In B. Davies and L. Ellison (Eds.) Managing the Effective Primary School. n.p. Longman Group Limited, pp.34-44.

Corbally, J. ; T. J. Jonson and W. F. Staub. (1965). Educational Administration: The Secondary School. (2nd ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Dwyer, D. C. (1984). "The Search for Instructional Leadership: Routines and Subtilities in the Principal's Role." Educational Leadership. Vol. 41, No.5, pp.32-38.

Edmonds, R. (1982). "On School Improvement: An Overview". Educational Leadership. Vol.40, No.3, pp.12-15.

Good, C. V. (1973). Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Company.

Gorton, R. (1987). School Leadership and Administration: Important Concepts, Case Studies, and Simulations. (3rd ed.). n.p. W.M.C. Brown Publishers.

Gross, N. and R. E. Herriott. (1965). Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Willy and Sons, Inc.

Guthrie, J. W. and R. J. Reed. (1991). Educational Aim and Policy: Effective Leadership for American Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hager, J. L and L. E. Scarr. (1983). "Effective School-Effective Principals: How to Develop Both." Educational Leadership. Vol.40, No.5, pp.38-43.

Hallinger, P. (1985). "Assessing the Instructional Managment Behavior of Principals" Elementary School Journal, Vol. 86. No.2, pp.217-242.

Hallinger, P. and J. F. Murphy. (1987). "Assessing and Developing Principal Instructional Leadership." Educational Leadership. Vol.45, No.1, pp.54-61.

Holmes, G. (1993). Essential School Leadership: Developing Vision and Purpose in Managment. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Hoy, W. K. and C. G. Miskel (1987). Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Hoyle, E. (1988). "Leadership and Mission" In Glatter et al. (Eds.) Understanding School Management. n.p. pp.28-43.

Jocobson, P. B. J. D. Logsden and R. R. Wiegman (1973). The Principalship: New Perspectives. New Jersey: Printice - Hall, Inc.

Johnson, W. L. and K. J. Snyder (1986). "Instructional Leadership Training Needs for School Principals." The Journal of Educational Administration. vol. 24, No.2, pp.237-253.

Knezevich, S. J. (1969). Administration of Public Education. New York: Herper and Row Publisher.

Koul,L. (1996). Methodology of Educational Research. (2nd ed.). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

Krug, S. E. (1992). "Instructional Leadership: A Constructivist Perspective." Educational Administration Quarterly. Vol. 28, No.3, pp.430-443.

Larkin, M. M. and W. S. Kritek. (1982). "Milwaukee's Project Rise" Educational Leadership. Vol.40, No.3, pp.16-21.

Levine, D. v. and J. Stark (1982). "Instructional and Organizational Arrangements that Improve Achievement in Intercity Schools". Educational Leadership. Vol.40, No.3, pp.41-46.

Lockheed, M. E. and H. M. Levin. (1993). Effective Schools in Developing Countries. London: The Falmer Press.

Lockheed, M. E., A. M. Verspoor and Associates. (1991). Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries. Washington D.C.: World Bank Publication.

Lucio, W. H. and J. D. McNeil. (1962). Supervision A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Martin, W. J. And D. J. Willower (1981), "The Managerial Behavior of High School principals. Educational Administration Quarterly. Vol. 17, No.1, pp.69-90.

Mibit, D. M. (1984) Foundations of School Administration. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Mortimore, P. et al. (1988). "Key Factors for Effective Junior Schools". In R. Glatter et al. (eds.). Understanding School Management. n.p. Open University Press pp.117-123.

Murphy, J. F. et al. (1982). "Academic Press: Translating High Expectations into School Policies and Classroom Practices." Educational Leadership. Vol. 40, No.3, pp.22-27.

Nachmias, D. and G. Nachmias. (1987). Research Methods in Social Sciences. (3rd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ness, M. (1980). "The Administrator as Instructional Supervisor." Educational Leadership. vol.37, No.5, pp. 404-407.

Ovard, G. F. (1966). Administration of Change in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Ouston, J. (1993). Women in Educational Management. London: Biddles Ltd.

Ozga, J. (1993). Women in Educational Managment. Singapore: J. W. Arrowsmith Limited.

Serjiovanni, T. J. and R. S. Starratt. (1993). Suppervision A Redefinition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Seymour, H. C. (1967). "The Principal as the Instructional Leader." The Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals. No.322, pp.89-97.

Snyder, K. K. (1983). "Instructional Leadership for Productive Schools." Educational Leadership. Vol. 40, No.5 pp.32-37.

Squires, D. A.; W. G. Haitt and J. K. Separs (1981). "Improving Classrooms and Schools: What's Important" Educational Leadership. Vol. 39, No.3, pp.174-179.

Walker, A. and J. Murphy (1986). "School Effectiveness and the Disadvantaged School Program." The Journal of Educational Administration. Vol. 24, No.1, pp.74-85.

Wilson, B. L. and W. A. Firestone. (1987). "The Principal and Instruction: Combining Bureaucritic and Cultural Linkages. Educational Leadership. Vol.45, No.1, pp.18-23.

Zenebe B. (1992). "Leader Role Behavior of Senior Secondary School Principals in Ethiopia". (unpublished M.A. Thesis).

MOE. (1995). "Yetimihirt Aderjajetena Amerar/Tsinse Hassaboch Merihochena Tegibaroach". Addis Ababa. Kifil 1. (unpublished).

_____. (1995). "Beworedaena Betimihirt bet Yetimihiritena Yesilitena Aderejajectena Amerar". Addis Ababa. Kifil 2(unpublished)

_____. (1996). "Yememihiran Yedereja Ediget Siriat Afetsatsem Memeria". Addis Ababa. Kutir 2 (unpublished).

APPENDIX A

Distribution of Teachers by Their Area of Specialization

Area of Specialization	Amharic	English	Maths	Chm.	Phy.	Bio	Geo	Hist.	Agri.	H.Eco.	Pro. Tech.	Bus.	H.P.	Psy.	Pd.Sc	Ed.Ad	Total
No. by Subject	13	28	22	19	15	17	16	14	7	6	6	5	7	1	13	2	192
%	6.8	14.6	11.5	9.9	7.8	8.9	8.3	7.3	3.6	3.1	3.1	2.6	3.6	0.5	7.3	1.0	100
	Language		Natural Science				Socail Sc.			Vocational Subjects				Education			Total
No. by Dept.	41		73				30			31				16			192
%	21.4		38.1				15.6			16.0				8.8			100

APPENDIX B

Leaders' LED and ILE Measuring Scores

School Code	Leader Code	LED					
		Mission	Man Curr &Ins.	Sup Ins.	Monitoring St. Progress	Promoting Sc.l Climate	ILE
01	0 1	1.77 1.91	2.88 3.08	2.39 2.38	2.40 2.48	2.52 2.73	2.39 2.51
02	0 1	2.24 2.50	3.57 4.07	3.27 3.57	2.93 3.25	3.06 3.57	3.01 3.46
03	0 1	3.74 4.10	4.30 4.13	3.71 3.36	3.56 3.76	3.71 3.89	3.80 3.85
04	0 1	1.62 1.78	3.10 2.94	2.67 2.70	2.66 3.18	2.92 3.05	2.60 2.73
05	0 1	2.57 3.52	3.05 3.47	3.23 3.27	2.93 3.49	2.80 3.18	2.92 3.38
06	0 1	1.87 2.38	3.18 2.94	2.75 2.94	2.96 3.10	2.68 2.50	2.69 2.76
07	0 1	1.51 2.78	3.35 4.10	2.78 3.33	3.13 3.58	2.80 3.61	2.71 3.48
08	0 1	2.62 -	3.74 -	2.97 -	3.26 -	3.21 -	3.16 -
09	0 1	3.22 3.77	4.21 4.25	3.01 3.37	3.73 4.00	3.44 3.77	3.52 3.83
10	0 1	1.81 1.93	3.44 3.46	2.90 2.99	2.73 2.92	3.01 2.99	2.78 2.86
11	0 1	1.66 -	3.15 -	2.47 -	2.37 -	2.94 -	2.52 -
12	0 1	1.92 3.45	3.37 4.42	2.94 3.99	2.92 4.05	3.21 3.89	2.86 3.98
13	0 1	1.17 2.55	2.25 3.83	2.12 3.25	2.18 3.43	2.16 3.55	1.98 3.32
14	0 1	2.14 2.12	2.71 2.95	2.26 3.06	2.23 2.93	2.40 2.79	2.35 2.77

Key:- o stands for assistant principal; 1 stands for principal.

APPENDIX C

Zones and Sample Schools Included in the Study

Zone	School Code	Name of Schools
E. Gojjam	01	Gojjam Ber Senior Secondary School
	03	Debire Markos Comprehensive Senior Secondary School
W. Gojjam	05	Damot Senior Secondary School
	07	Merawi Senior Secondary School
	08	Adet Senior Secondary School
Awi	04	Dangla Senior Secondary School
	06	Ankesha Senior Secondary School
Bahir Dar	02	Ghion Senior Secondary School
	09	Tana Highk Comprehensive Senior Secondary School
S.Gondar	10	Addis Zemen Senior Secondary School
	11	Woreta Senior Secondary School
N. Gondar	12	Edget Feleg Senior Secondary School
	13	Angereb Senior Secondary School
	14	Kolladiba Senior Secondary School

APPENDIX D

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Questionnaire for Principals and Assistant Principals

This questionnaire is designed to assess principal's and/or assistant principal's instructional leadership effectiveness and gather information on the factors affecting this role of the leaders.

The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used by the researcher for strictly academic purpose. Your careful and honest response determine the success of the study and the researcher as well. Thus you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your responses will be kept confidential.

Please read the instructions and each item in the questionnaire carefully before you give your response. If you want to change any of your responses, make sure that you have cancelled the unwanted ones.

Note:- No need to write your name in any part of the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation.

School code _____

Name of the school _____

Location a. Zone _____

b. Town _____

I. Personal characteristics

Direction: Please check by writing an "X" mark on the space provided against the items.

1. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

2. Age: a. below 20 _____ e. 36-40 _____

b. 21-25 _____ f. 41-45 _____

c. 26-30 _____ g. 46-50 _____

d. 31-35 _____ h. 51-55 _____

3. Work experience in years

3.1 In teaching

a. 1-5 _____ c. 11-15 _____ e. 21-25 ____ g. 31 and above __

b. 6-10 _____ d. 16-20 _____ f. 26-30 _____

3.2 In administration before your present position. Please use the above intervals and write the letter representing the interval for your experience (if any) as:

a. An assistant principal ___ e. A guidance officer _____

b. A unit leader _____ f. A head of pedagogical center ____

c. A department head ___ g. Other specify (with service years) _____

d. A school supervisor ____

3.3 In your present position.

a. 1-2 _____ c. 7-10 _____

b. 3-6 ____ d. 11 and over ___

4. Level of educational attainment at present.

a. Diploma (12+2) _____

b. B.A./B.Sc. Degree _____

c) M.A./M.Sc. Degree _____

d) Other specify _____

5. Qualification (field of specialization) in

5.1 Under graduate program

a. Ed.Ad _____

b. Pedagogical science _____

c) Subject major _____

d. Other specify _____

5.2 Graduate program (If there is)

a. Ed.Ad _____

b. Curriculum _____

c. Psychology _____

d. Subject area _____

e. Other specify _____

6. Cumulative GPA (grade point average) of your study in college or university.

a. 2.00-2.50 _____

b. 2.51-3.00 _____

c. 3.01-3.50 _____

d. 3.51-4.00 _____

7. Number of semester hours or credits you took in educational fields (i.e. curriculum and instruction, measurement and evaluation, supervision and the like):

a. 0=(none) _____

b. 1-10 cr. _____

c. 11-20 cr. _____

d. 21-30 cr. _____

e. Over 30 cr. _____

8. Position attaintment condition

a. Appointed directly by zone education office _____

b. Elected by the staff or district education & training board _____

c. Other specify _____

II. Instructional Leadership Dimensions

Note:- Instructional leadership is conceptualized as the activities of leader (main and/or assistant) in setting school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instructional, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning climate. Each dimension is described in terms of the principal's and/or assistant principals job-related behaviors/practices.

Direction: Read each statements carefully. Then circle the number that indicates the extent to which you are engaged with the specific job behaviors or practices described in each dimension.

For the response to each statement

5 = represents almost always

4 = represents many times (frequently)

3 = represents sometimes

2 = represents rarely

1 = represents almost never

Item	Responses
A. Defining and communicating School mission (goals that the school is intended to attain)	
To what extent do you...?	
1. Develop a set of annual school-wide goals focused on student learning	5 4 3 2 1
2. Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	5 4 3 2 1
3. Use data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals	5 4 3 2 1

	Item	Responses				
4.	Communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, student and parents	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Discuss the school's goals with teachers at faculty meetings	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Refer to the school's goals when making curricular and instructional decisions	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Ensure that the schools's goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the schools	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Refer to school's goals in student assemblies	5	4	3	2	1

B. Managing Curriculum and Instruction

To what extent do you...?

1.	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Control class size for effective instructional process	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Control student composition by maintaining overall achievement distribution in classrooms	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Ensure the beginning of instructional process according to the school calender	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Prevent instructional time from external and/or international disrruptions	5	4	3	2	1

DECLARATION

I ensure with my signature that this thesis is my work and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Temesgen Melaku

Signature _____

Place and date of submission: Addis Ababa University

May, 1998

Item	Responses
6. Encourage teachers to adjust the curriculum to the needs of exceptional students	5 4 3 2 1
7. Regulate the sequence and pacing of the curriculum systematically	5 4 3 2 1
8. Prepare the class-schedule to the benefit of students than teachers	5 4 3 2 1
9 Schedule co-curricular activities in support of the formal instructional process	5 4 3 2 1
10. Consider factors affecting teaching (no.of preparation, nature of the subject, etc.) while assigning tasks for teachers	5 4 3 2 1
11. Encourage and support teachers to revise and improve their curriculum	5 4 3 2 1

C. Supervising Instruction

To what extent do you...?

1. Make classroom visits for the purpose of improving instructional process.	5 4 3 2 1
2. Confer with help needed teachers after the visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together.	5 4 3 2 1

Item	Responses				
3. Hold regular meetings with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction	5	4	3	2	1
4. Use teaching staff meetings to discuss curricular and instructional issues	5	4	3	2	1
5. Create opportunities for professional dialogue or discussions among teachers	5	4	3	2	1
6. Help teachers to use teaching aids	5	4	3	2	1
7. Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods	5	4	3	2	1

D. Monitoring Student Progress

To what extent do you...?

1. Meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress	5	4	3	2	1
2. Use test results to assess progress towards school goals	5	4	3	2	1
3. Ensure the timely distribution of test results	5	4	3	2	1
4. Inform the school's performance results to teachers in a report form	5	4	3	2	1
5. Identify students whose test results indicate a need for special instructional help (eg. enrichment)	5	4	3	2	1

Item	Responses
6. Encourage teachers to held the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function	5 4 3 2 1
7. Provide facilities for administering and scoring tests	5 4 3 2 1

E. Promoting School Learning Climate

To what extent do you...?

1. Communicate to teachers and students that all students have the capacity to excel	5 4 3 2 1
2. Develop school level policy that communicate the need for protecting instructional time from disruptions	5 4 3 2 1
3. Communicate consistent use of home work as integral part of student instruction	5 4 3 2 1
4. Communicate the need for enrichment effort to help students master the intended instructional objectives	5 4 3 2 1
5. Communicate the need for sending student progress reports to parents frequently in a year	5 4 3 2 1
6. Communicate the minimum attainment level required promote to students to the school community	5 4 3 2 1
7. Develop school level classroom practice policies requiring teachers to implement instructional practices that promote student achievement	5 4 3 2 1
8. Communicate model behaviors and priorities for teachers and students in a face-to -face fashion	5 4 3 2 1
9. Maintain close contact with instructional process	5 4 3 2 1
*10. Be absent from school for different reasons	5 4 3 2 1

Item	Responses				
11. Use school slogans or other symbolic activities to show school's emphasis on productive work and high achievement	5	4	3	2	1
12. Use different recognition or reward systems for greater achievement of students	5	4	3	2	1
13. Recognize and reward teachers for their productive work	5	4	3	2	1

III. Organizational Characteristics

Direction. Below are sets of items concerning some characteristics of your school. Subdirections on how to give your response are included with the items. Please read the items and directions carefully and react accordingly.

1. Availability of instructional resources.

Indicate the extent of availability of the following resources by labelling numbers 1 upto 5. The numbers represent:

5 = more than adequate
4 = adequately
3 = slightly deficient
2 = very deficiently
1 = almost none

a. Qualified teachers ____
b. Student textbooks ____
c. Teacher's guides ____
d. Instructional equipment ____
e. Supplies (paper, chalk etc.) ____
f. Operative funds ____

2. School Size

2.1 Number of students: Mark "X" for the interval to which the number of students (from grades 9 to 12) in your school belongs.

a. below 500 ____
b. 501-1000 ____
c. 1001-1500 ____
d. 1501-2000 ____
e. 2001-2500 ____
f. 2501-3000 ____
g. 3001-3500 ____
h. 3501-4000 ____
i. over 4000 ____

2.2 Teaching Staff Size: Mark "X" for the interval to which the number of teachers (from 9 to 12 grades) in your school belongs.

a. 20-39 _____ c. 60-79 _____

b. 40-59 _____ d. 80 and above _____

2.3 Non teaching staff size: Mark"X" for the interval to which the number of non teaching staff size in your school belongs.

a. 1-5 _____ c. 11-15 _____ e. more than 20 ____

b. 6-10 _____ d. 16-20 _____

3. Role Diversity:

3.1 What percent of your time do you devote on matters that concern for:

i. Instructional leadership _____%

ii. Administration _____%

iii. Other duties _____%

3.2 To what extent do the diversity of roles in your school constrain your instructional leadership? (circle one)

5, a great deal 4, a lot 3, some what, 2, a little 1, not at all

4. Professional Norm

Please circle the number that indicate the extent to which the teaching staff in you school value the following professional norm indicators. The numbers represent:

5 = a great deal 3 = some what 1 = not at all

4 = a lot 2 = a little

To what extent does the teaching staff in your school

value...? 5 4 3 2 1

*4.1 Teachers' domination in educational decisions

4.2 Principal's (or assistant) involvement in educational decisions 5 4 3 2 1

4.3 Principal's (or assistant) initiative in consulting teachers about instructional matters 5 4 3 2 1

4.4 Principal's (or assistant) initiative for frequent classroom visits 5 4 3 2 1

4.5 Principal's (or assistant) constructive comments and suggestions in educational matters 5 4 3 2 1

IV. District/Zone Education Department Characteristics

1. Higher Officials' Expectations

1.1 To what extent do your higher official(s) place emphasis on your curriculum and instructional activities as compared to administrative duties (Choose one of the following alternatives).

5 = much higher; 4 = higher; 3 = equal; 2 = lesser and 1=much lesser

1.2 Which of the following requirements do you think are sound for your recognition and promotion to higher position in your district/zone education department administration? (Rank them in the order of importance, i.e. 1 for the best recognized then 2, ...)

Requirements	Rank
1.2.1 Competency in instructional leadership	____
1.2.2 Administrative efficiency	____
1.2.3 Political involvement/membership	____
1.2.4 Gender priority	____
1.2.5 District/Zone visibility (loyalty to and informal relationship with higher administrative officers)	____
1.2.6 If any more, please describe & include in your ranking	____

2. Other district/zone administrative elements

Direction: Literature provides the following elements from the district/zone administration that may constrain the leader's instructional leadership role. From your experience as a school leader which elements did you find constraining your instructional leadership activities? (Rank them in their order of constraining effect i.e. 1 for highest then 2...).

Factors/elements	Rank
2.1 District/zone policies, rules and regulations	_____
2.2 Financial and supply delivery problems	_____
2.3 Numerous reporting requirements	_____
2.4 Untimely teacher transfers	_____
2.5 Delay substitute of or deployment of teachers	_____
2.6 Teaching materials delivery problems	_____
2.7 If any more please describe and include in your ranking	_____

_____

* The item is reversed when scored.

APPENDIX E

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Questionnaire for Teachers

This questionnaire is designed to assess principal's (and/or assistant principal's) instructional leadership effectiveness.

The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used by the researcher for strictly academic purpose. Your careful and honest response determines the success of the researcher and the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your responses will be kept confidential.

Please read the instructions and each item in the questionnaire carefully before you give your response. If you want to change any of your responses, make sure that you have cancelled the unwanted ones.

Note: No need to write your name in any part of the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation.

School code _____

Name of the School _____

Location a) Zone _____

b) Town _____

I. Personal Data

Direction: Please check by writing an "X" mark on the space provided against the items.

1. Sex: M_____ F _____

2. Age: a. below 20 ____ e. 36-40 ____

b. 21-25 ____ f. 41-45 ____

c. 26-30 ____ g. 46-50 ____

d. 31-35 ____ h. 51-55 ____

3. Years of experience in teaching

a. 1-5 _____ d. 16-20 _____ g. 31 and above _____

b. 6-10 _____ e. 21-25 _____

c. 11-15 _____ f. 26-30 _____

4. Your highest level of education

a. TTI certificate _____ c. B.A./B.Sc._____ e.Other specify _____

b. Diploma (12+2) ____ d. M.A./M.Sc. ____

5. Specify your qualification (specialization)

Major _____ Minor _____

6. Your position other than teaching

a. A department Head _____

b. A unit leader _____

c. Specify any other _____

II. Instructional Leadership Dimensions

Note: Instructional leadership is conceptualized as the activities of principal and/or assistant principal in setting school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress and promoting school learning climate. Each dimension is described in terms of the principal's and/or assistant principal's job-related behaviors/practices/.

Direction: Read each statement carefully and complete both columns by circling the number that indicate the extent to which you fell the principal and/or assistant principal has demonstrated the specific job behaviors (practices) in each dimension. For the response to each statement:

5 = represents almost always

4 = represents many times (frequently)

3 = represents some times

2 = represents rarely

1 = represents almost never

a. Defining and communicating school mission (goals that the school is intended to attain)

To what extent do you principal and/or assistant principal...?

Items	Responses for the Principal					Responses for the Assistant Principal				
1. Develop a set of annual school-wide goal that focus on student learning	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Items	Responses for the Principal					Responses for the Assistant Principal				
3. Use data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, students and parents	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Discuss the school's goals with teachers at the teaching staff meetings	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Refer to the school's goals when making curricular and instructional decisions	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Ensure that the school's goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Refer to school's goals in student assemblies	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

B. managing Curriculum and Instruction

To what extent do your principal and/or assistant principal ...?

	Items	Responses for the Principal					Responses for the Assistant Principal				
1.	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material, and financial) necessary for instructional process	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Control class size for effective instructional process	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Control student composition by maintaining overall achievement distribution in classrooms	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Ensure the beginning of instructional process according to the school calender	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Prevent instructional time from disrruptions (external and/or internal)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Encourage teachers to adjust the curriculum to the needs of exceptional students	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Regulate the sequence and pacing of the curriculum (contents of each subjects) systematically	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Prepare the class-schedule to the benefit of students than teachers	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Items	Responses for the Principal					Responses for the Assistant Principal				
9. Consider the factors affecting teaching (nature of the subject, no. of preparations etc.) while assigning tasks for teachers	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10. Schedule co-curricular activities in support of the formal instructional process	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11. Encourage and support teachers to revise and improve their curriculum	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
c. Supervising Instruction										
To what extent do you principal and/or assistant principal...?										
1. Make classroom visits for the purpose of instructional improvement	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Confer with help needed teachers after the visit to discuss the problems and plan improvement together	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Hold regular meeting with each department for the purpose of improving curriculum and instruction	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Items	Responses for the Principal					Assistant Principal				
4. Use teaching staff meetings to discuss curricular and instructional issues	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Create opportunities for professional dialogue or discussions among teachers	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Encourage teachers to use teaching aids	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Encourage teachers to use different instructional methods	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

D. Monitoring Student Progress

To what extent do your principal and/or assistant principal ...?

1. Meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Use test results to assess progress toward school goals	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Ensure the timely distribution of test results	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Inform the school's performance results to teachers in a report form	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Identify students whose test results indicate a need for special instructional help(eg. enrichment)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Items	Responses for the Principal					Responses for the Assistant Principal				
6. Encourage teachers to hold the school's testing practice as integral part of the total instructional process than treating it as a separate function	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Provide facilities for administering and scoring tests	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
E. Promoting Instructional Climate										
To what extent do your principal and/or assistant principal...?										
1. Communicate to teachers and students that all students have the capacity to excel	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Develop school level policy that communicate the need for protecting instructional time from disrruptions.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Items	Responses for the Principal					Responses for the Assistant Principal				
3. Communicate consistent use of home work as integral part of students instruction	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Communicate the need for enrichment effort to help students master the intended instructional objectives	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Communicate the need for sending student progress reports to parents frequently in a year	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Communicate the minimum attainment level required to promote students for the school community	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Develop school level classroom practice policies requiring teachers to implement instructional practices that promote student achievement	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Communicate model behaviors and priorities for teachers and students in a face-to-face fashion	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. Maintain close contact with instructional process	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
*10. Be absent from school for different reasons	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Items	Responses for the Principal					Responses for the Assistant Principal				
11. Use school slogans or other symbolic activities to show school's emphasis on productive work and high achievement	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
12. Use different recognition or reward systems for greater achievement of students	5	4	3	2	1					

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW HOLD WITH SUPERVISORS

Zone: _____

1. Background Information

   1.1 Age _____

   1.2 Sex _____

   1.3 Year of experience (service) as:

   i) a teacher _____

   ii) a principal _____

   iii) a supervisor (supervisory member) _____

   1.4 Qualification Major _____

   1.5 Level of educational attainment _____

2. How often do your zone provide supervisory services for senior secondary schools in a year?

3. Which areas of principal's activities are treated in the supervisory service? Which aspects got due attention?

4. How do you see the currently employed selection/election of leaders for principalship position from professional point of view?