INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN SECOND CYCLE GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF ARADA SUBCITY

IN ADDIS ABABA

BY

GEZU BELETE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

AUGUST 2017

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Gezu Belete entitled " Instructional Leadership Effectiveness in Second cycle Government Elementary Schools of,Arada Subcity inAddis Ababa " is submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of Arts in school leadership.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Examiner (Internal)	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner (External)	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
HaileselassieW/Gerima (Asst. Professor)	_____	_____

_____

Chair of Department or Graduate Program Coordinator

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis entitled " Instructional Leadership Effectiveness in second cycle government elementary schools of Arada sub city in Addis Ababa" is my original work and has not been presented for a degree requirements by any other individual and all sources materials used for the thesis has been duly acknowledged.

Name: **Gezu Belete**

Signature: _____

Date: August 12/2017

Confirmed By:

Name: Haileselassie W/Gerima (Asst. Professor) Thesis Advisor

Signature:_____

Date:_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my Lord that enabled me start and finish this thesis which is just like interweaving both sore and enjoyable experiences. Though it will not be enough to express my gratitude in words to all those people who helped me, I would like to give many thanks to some these people. First of all, I'd like to give my sincere thanks to my advisor, Haileselassie W/Gerima(Asst. Pr.) for his punctuality and commitment to look through the main script of my paper and guiding me in the right direction. Special thanks are also given to those who dedicated their time to provide relevant data for the study. I am greatly indebted to my beloved family who are my reason to live and origin of my happiness. Their love and support without any complain or regret has enabled me to complete this MA Thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

Table of Contents ii

LIST OF FIGURE v

ABBREVIATIONS vi

ABSTRACT vii

CHAPTER ONE 1

1. Introduction 1

1.1 Background of the Study 1

1.2 Statement of the Problem 3

1.3 Research Questions 4

1.4 Objective of the Study 5

1.5 Significance of the Study 5

1.6 Delimitation the Study 6

1.7 Limitation of the Study 6

1.8 Organization of the Study 7

1.9 Definitions of Key Terms 7

CHAPTER TWO 8

2. Review Of Related Literature 8

2.1 Concept and Definition of Leadership 8

2.2 School Leadership 10

2.3 Instructional Leadership 12

2.4 Key Elements of Instructional Leadership 15

2.4.1 Defining the School Mission 15

2.4.2 Managing the Instruction 16

2.4.3 Creating Positive School Climate 17
2.5 Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 18
2.6 Teachers Leadership 20
2.7 School Leadership in Ethiopian Context 23
2.8 Summary of The related Literature ----- 25
CHAPTER THREE 25
3. Research Design and Methodology 26
3.1 Research Design 26
3.2 Source of Data 26
3.3 Data Collecting Tools 26
3.3.1 Questionnaires 26
3.3.2 Interviews 27
3.3.3 Focus Group Discussion 27
3.4 Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques 28
3.5 Data Analysis and Interpretation 29
3.6 Pilot Testing 30
3.7 Ethical Consideration 31
CHAPTER FOUR 32
4. Presentation And Analysis of the Data 32
4.1 General Characteristics of Respondents 32
4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of the Data 35
4.2.1 Principals Goal Setting Practice 35
4.2.2 Principals Goal Communication Practice 38
4.2.3 Principals Supervision and Evaluation Practice of the Instruction Process 41
4.2.4 Co-ordination of the Curriculum 43

4.2.5 Monitoring Student's Progress 45
4.2.6 Teachers Involvement in School Leadership 46
4.2.7 Factors That Hindered Principals Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 50
4.2.8 Recruitment and Selection of Elementary School Principals 53
CHAPTER FIVE 56
5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations 56
5.1 Summary 56
5.1.1 Normative Characteristics 57
5.1.2 Framing Instructional Goals 57
5.1.3 Communicating Instructional Goals and Mission of the School 57
5.1.4 Supervision and Evaluation Practices in the Instruction Process 57
5.1.5 Coordination of the Curriculum 58
5.1.6 Monitoring Student's Progress 58
5.1.7 Participation of Teachers in School Leadership 58
5.1.8 Major Challenges for Instructional Leadership Effectiveness 59
5.1.9 Recruitment and Selection of Elementary School Principals 59
5.2 Conclusion 60
5.3 Recommendations 61
References 63
Appendix I 66
Appendix II 72
Appendix III 73
Appendix IV 75

LIST OF FIGURE

Table 1: Summary of total population, sample size and sampling techniques 29

Table 2: Reliability Statistics 31

Table 3. Normative characteristics of respondents 33

Table 4. Responses on principal's goals setting practice (Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice..... 36

Table 5. Response on principal's school goals communication practice *(Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where x^- is average mean* 38

Table 6. Teachers response on supervision and evaluation practice of school principals on the instruction process *(Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where x^- is average mean*..... 41

Table 7. Respondents response on principal's practice in coordination of the school curriculum *(Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where x^- is average mean.* 43

Table 8. Teachers' responses on principals practice to monitor student's progress *(Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where x^- is average mea*..... 45

Table 9. Teachers response focusing their involvement in school leadership affairs *(Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where x^- is average mean* 47

Table 10. Respondent's opinions on factors that hinders principal's instructional leadership effectiveness (Remembering $0.0 \leq x^- 2.49$ is insignificant effect , $2.5 \leq x^- \leq 3.49$ is moderate effect and ≤ 3.5 $x^- \leq 5$ is chronic effect) where x^- is grand mean 51

ABBREVIATIONS

MoE	Ministry of Education
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
PIMRS	Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
GTP	Growth and Transformational Plan

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study was to assess instructional leadership effectiveness in government elementary schools of Arad Sub City in Addis Ababa. Recruitment and selection of principals, the extent of teacher's participation in school leadership, major factors that hinder principal's effectiveness and principals professional involvement in the three dimensions that are defining academic goals, managing the instruction and curriculum and promoting a positive learning climate were areas assessed in the study. Descriptive survey design was used to collect data from 5 purposively selected schools. 105 teachers, 5 principals, 10 deputy principals, 5 cluster supervisors and 5 human resource managers were sample members of the study which were selected by census and simple random sampling techniques. Open ended and closed ended questionnaire, semi structured interview and focus group discussion (FGD) were used as data collecting tools. Data obtained from respondents was analyzed using percentage, mean and standard deviation. Data obtained though interview and FGD were analyzed qualitatively through narration. The finding revealed that government Elementary school principals in Addis Ababa city Administration of Arada sub city were not effective in the practice of direction setting. This was confirmed with grand mean 2.8 Missions of schools and instructional goals were not effectively communicated with stakeholders. The emphasis given to support teacher's instructional practice through supervision and Post observation conferences focusing on teacher's instructional strength and limitations was resulted with arithmetic mean 2.4 which was poor practice. The study further attempted to identify major areas where teachers displayed their leadership roles and their desire to participate in different school affairs. Out of the total ten areas where teachers leadership roles were believed to be vital, only 2 (20%) of the areas were practiced by teachers at moderate level. Lastly it was identified that recruitment and selection practice of school principals was not merit based. Based on the findings, the following recommendations were forwarded. School principals and cluster supervisors should work together to incorporate stakeholders views on what should be achieved, how to be achieved and when to be achieved for effective goal setting practice. Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau and Arada Sub City Education Office in collaboration with nongovernmental organization need to build capacity of school principals by organizing seminars, workshops, and in-service trainings.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The continuous and intensive social economic changes have created the need of restricting educational practices as well as structure of the school." Schools have forever been vessels for their constituent dreams; Parents, students, tax payers educational reformers and Politian" (Donaldson, 2006:13).

In order to address those dreams school leaders are expected to mobilize resources in the school effectively. They are accepted as being constituent of achieving school improvements. Bossert (1982) states Principals who demonstrate instructional leadership needed to lift the school performance.

According to Hopkins (2003), today's principals must be instructional leaders if they need a style of leadership that promote, celebrate and enhance the importance of teaching and learning that contributes directly to school instructional improvement. They must be excellent teachers, who can communicate teaching excellence to others. They must be excellent organizers who can assist a team of instructors in organizing for instruction so that they are problem solvers.

Instructional leadership requires a substantive knowledge base that is grounded in the educational sciences in order to support teachers who are the key actors for student learning in-school. It is the teacher who organizes instruction, communicates learning goals, and assesses student's progress towards intended goals. This is supported with empirical research that shows among the many individual in-school factors that influence student achievement, two stand out as the prevailed, teacher impact is the single most important factor, accounting for 33% of school-level variation in achievement, closely followed by the influence of the principal at 25%. A host of other school-level factors, some of which cannot be adequately measured, account for the balance of 42%, *(Walters and etal, 2003).*

In relations to the tasks expected from 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) for instance conceptualized instructional leadership in terms of planning, staff and program development and evaluation activities. using such properties, however may not entirely capture the normative dimension of school as social organization without which the instructional leadership tasks of leaders could not influence the quality of instruction as well as student achievement.

Considering such limitation of Snyder's conceptual model, Hallinger and Murphy,(1987) developed a three conceptual frame work which embraces ten functional categories framing goals, Communicating goals, knowledge of curriculum and evaluating instruction, monitoring progress, setting standards, setting expectations, protecting instructions time and promoting improvement.

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

Concerning the current school leadership in Ethiopia, (MoE, 1994:29-30) in its new education policy states that educational management should be democratic, professionally coordinated, efficient and effective. In addition the management of teachers, other educational personal will be organized based on professional principle, professional code of Ethics. The policy further gives emphasis to the system of educational management that improves the leadership effectiveness through decentralization that devaluate power from the central government and empowered site based management (MoE, 1994: 16 – 17).

Since Nov. 2008,The government of Ethiopia gave high priority for quality education. It launched a nationwide program aimed to improve the quality of general education. The general education quality improvement package (GEQIP) is a comprehensive coverage of critical components that are believed for the realization of quality education. One of the components is leadership and management. Based on this component principals are expected to play important roles in planning, organizing , coordinating , monitoring and evaluating over all activities in

schools and creating different mechanisms that enables actual involvement of the community in the school affairs.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

"In today's climate of heighted expectations, principals are in the hot seat to improve teaching and learning. They need to be educational visionaries, and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians community builders, public relation experts budget analysts" De vita, (as cited in Davis 2005, P.i).

The school principal plays an important role in enhancing quality of the teaching learning process in the school. His/ her ability to plan coordinates, monitor and evaluate the implementation of the school Curriculum, interpersonal skills such as effective communication with teachers, students administrators and the local community are decisive.

As new leaders for new schools (NLNS, 2009), school leader's effectiveness is measured through their major areas: improving students' achievements, promoting their effectiveness and practicing effective leadership by actively involving stakeholders to achieve common goal and objective. To achieve the goal of education in general and the goal of school in particular, the school leaders need to be instructional leaders to effectively run the teaching and learning process.

Since 1994 E.C, the new educations and training policy has been implemented, Ethiopia has achieved remarkable results in expanding and making the general education accessible to its citizens. In doing so, the biggest challenge that the education sector has encountered is quality problem. Regarding the leadership, the policy clearly indicated the need of democratic, professional, coordinated, effective and efficient school leadership for the realization of the intended objectives. But several researches recently done on it revealed the shortage of well trained and professional school principals and the practices in their instructional leadership roles were poor (Ayenew,2012;Bogale,20014).

Teshale, (2014) in his thesis entitled leadership effectiveness of secondary school principals in segen area peoples revealed as principals were not participate staff members in the formulation

of mission, vision and goal statement in their school. He further indicated the absence of participatory decision making in daily operations.

On the other hand, Annual education abstract of Addis Ababa city administration education bureau (2007:40) shows that 64.78 % males and72.21 % females is the completion rate of the first cycle. Furthermore, the minimum score that 8th grade regional exam required for completing the cycle or to promote to grade nine was **32** in 2008 E.C. which clearly contradict with the policy that recognizes the minimum score must be 50% .

As a principal of both primary and secondary government schools, I have the past seven years of experience in managing and leading both teaching and non teaching staff. Local education authorities make school principals busy with daily routine tasks that have nothing to do with the instructional process. They set directions that clearly interferes the schools authority so that they enforce school leaders to be only "a man of yes". Bogale in his thesis (2014) also pointed 0ut that principals use only one–tenth of their time for instructional leadership.

Regarding recruitment and selection of school principals, the researcher observed that, the bases of assignment/selection of school principals were politically motivated rather than knowledge and skills of the individual. Besides, leaders training before assignment were non-existent. In addition to the above discussed experience based problems, the three reviewed related researches were conducted in secondary schools. None of them addressed practical problems in the practice of instructional leadership of elementary schools where children are expected to get core knowledge, values, attitudes and skills including skills in basic literacy, numeracy and critical thinking. Therefore the above discussed problems imposed the researcher to assess the current status of instructional leadership effectiveness in Arada sub city second cycle government primary schools.

1.3 Research Questions

The research attempted to answer the following basic research questions.

1. To what extent do school principals practice their instructional leadership roles?
2. What are the major areas where teachers involve in school leadership?

3. What are major factors that hinder school principal's instructional leadership effectiveness?

4. Do recruitment and selection procedures of school principals follow merit principles?

1.4 Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study was to assess second cycle elementary schools principals' instructional leadership effectiveness in some selected schools of Arada sub city. To this end the study was indented to address the following specific objective.

- To identify the instructional leadership dimension that most leaders perform strongly or weakly.

- To assess principals recruitment and selection procedures.

- To identify major factors that hinders second cycle elementary schools principals' instructional leadership effectiveness.

- To identify major areas of school leadership where teachers are participated.

- To identify major areas where teachers had strong desire to participate in school leadership.

1.5 Significances of the Study

In the current environment of dramatically shifting educational policies and divisive competing theories, the role of the school leader is more important than ever. School leaders today must have the tools to respond with alacrity and dexterity to emerging trends.

It is believed that the school leader must play an important role for the contribution of quality education in schools and they are the one who brings change in student's academic achievement. Therefore this study is designed with strong belief that;

- Principals may have clear insight how to become effective in their school leadership practices.

- Based on the findings and recommendations, decision makers and principals may have a clear insight in to the existing instructional leadership practices and the influencing factors so that they will take necessary corrective measures that leads to adequate instructional leadership.

- Researchers may benefit from the study with its additional findings to the existing facts to serve as a literature for related areas.

1.6 Delimitation the Study

This research would be more inclusive if it has been done at Addis Ababa city level. However, because of financial problem and time constraints, it is delimited to study in selected second cycle primary school of Arada sub city. Although instructional leadership roles can be held by assistant principals, department heads and homeroom teachers, the emphasis of this study was delimited to principal's instructional leadership effectiveness. Even if researchers have further defined instructional leadership to include different approaches, this research is delimited to Hallinger model where the principal is a sole holder of responsibility in setting goals, supervision and in developing instruction that enhances academic achievement.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

This study was not totally free of limitation. The tough challenge in leading today's school together with social responsibility for my family consumed many of my research time. About 9 questionnaires were not returned from teachers. Due to several meetings, many principals and vice principals were not available for necessary information in their office. However, the researcher used maximum effort to overcome these phenomena by using alternative time schedule for data collection.

1.8 Organization of the Study

The study was organized in five chapters. The first chapter covered the introduction, objectives statements of the problem and significance of the study. The second chapter was about related literature focusing on definition and concept of leadership, instructional leadership models school effectiveness, instructional leadership and school leadership development in Ethiopia. Research design and methodology was discussed in chapter three. Chapter four was set out to discuss the analysis and interpretation part while the last chapter elaborated the summary, conclusion and recommendations.

1.9 Definition of Key Terms

The followings are key terms and phrases which are used in the context of this research.

Sub city – an intermediate administration level between the Addis Ababa city administration and woreda.

Second cycle Government Elementary schools – In Ethiopia, primary education lasts 8 years and is split into grades 1-4 (primary first cycle) and grades 5-8 (primary second cycle) and fully run by the government as per proclamation No.260/1984

Instructional leadership – Refers to role behavior (or practices) of school leaders in defining the school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring students progress and promoting learning climate (Krug, 1992 : 58) .

Leadership Behaviors – is the manner of approach of leaders in schools in providing direction, implementing plans and motivating people.

Merit principle - is fair and open competition; fair and equitable treatment of employees; equal pay for equal work as well as rewarding excellent performance.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of The Related Literature

2.1Concept and Definition of Leadership

There is now a wide recognition in the international community that 'leadership matters' for growth and development, just as there was recognition some years ago that 'institutions matter'. Leadership is a concept which is often talked about, and which has generated a proliferation of literature, especially in the field of management and organizational science (Jones, 2005: 259). However, despite the almost unanimous agreement on the importance of leadership for the success of organizations and institutions, and the countless works on the concept, the field of leadership studies has not succeeded in articulating a coherent, paradigm-shifting model or approach that both scholars and practitioners can accept what leadership means.

As will be apparent from what follows, the study of leadership has largely been dominated by scholars and practitioners working in management and organizational science, psychology and other related disciplines (Lyne de Ver, 2008). As such, many of the conceptions of leadership in the literature are Western-oriented, Universalist or individualistic, and there are few conceptions which either incorporate apolitical understanding of leadership as a process or which have developmental salience. Moreover, apart from the many recent claims about the importance of leadership for growth and development, there has been little serious analysis of what this means in practice (and how it can be enhanced or supported) in the very often unstable, hybrid and evolving institutional contexts which characterize the condition of many developing countries.

Leadership must always be understood contextually, occurring within a given indigenous configuration of power, authority and legitimacy, shaped by history, institutions, goals and political culture. It regularly involves forging formal or informal coalitions, vertical or horizontal, of leaders and elites, in order to solve the pervasive collective action problems which largely define the challenges of growth and development. One of the foremost scholars of leadership, Barnard Bass, has described leadership as a "universal phenomenon"(1990). He defines leadership as an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves

a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perception and expectations of the members.

The followings are numerous definitions of leadership under different groupings:

***Leadership as a focus of group processes*:** This set of definition positions the leader as the hub, nucleus for group activity. For example, Cooley states that the leader is always the nucleus of a tendency (1902). "Influenced by the needs of their followers, he/she then focuses the followers' energies in a particular direction. The single leader embodies the collective will. Leadership is a function of needs existing, and is a relationship between leader and followers" (Bass, 1990:11).

***Leadership as personality and its effects*:** This set of definition tends to define leadership in terms of the personality attributes or the strength of character of the leader. For example, A. O. Bowden (1926) equated leadership with strength of personality. Indeed, the amount of personality attributed to an individual may not be unfairly estimated by the degree of influence he can exert upon others. Yukl asserts, "Possession of particular traits increases the likelihood that a leader will be effective, but they do not guarantee effectiveness. A leader with certain traits could be effective in one situation but ineffective in a different situation" (1998, p.236).This does not acknowledge the impact followers have upon leaders.

***Leadership as the art of inducing compliance*:** This set of definitions tends to cast leadership in terms of the molding of the group around the will, intention and or wish of the leader. Leadership is therefore cast from an induction compliance perspective, and influence is exercised from a single direction leader to followers without regard to the followers wish. B. V. Moore (1927) stated leadership as the ability to impress the will of the leader on those led and induce obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation.

***Leadership as the exercise of influence*:** A set of definitions of leadership appears to employ the concept of influence as distinct from dominance, control or forcing of compliance. This reflects a move towards generality or abstraction. J.B. Nash (1929) saw leadership as influencing change in the conduct of people. Stogdill (1950) stated that leadership as the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement. This is a more interactive view of the relationship between leaders and followers. Hemphill (1949), state

that an individual's effort to change the behavior of others is attempted leadership. When the other members actually change, this creation of change in others is successful leadership. If the others are reinforced or rewarded for changing their behavior, this evoked achievement is effective leadership. This allows for a less dominating role for the leader. Leaders serve as models for the followers. As Gandhi suggested, "clean examples have a curious method of multiplying themselves", "Thus, managers are leaders only when they take the opportunity to exert influence over activities beyond what has been prescribed as their role requirements" (Bass, 1990: 14).

***Leadership as an act or behavior*:** The followers of this perspective hypothesize that identifiable leadership behaviors exist that distinguishes an effective leader from an ineffective. Fiedler (1967), By leadership behavior we generally mean the particular acts in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of his group members.

Leadership as a combination of elements: Many combine several definitions to cover a larger set of meanings. For example, for Jago (1982) leadership is the exercise of non coercive influence to coordinate the members of an organized group to accomplishing the group's objectives. Leadership is also a set of priorities attributed to those who are perceived to use such influences successfully.(Bass, 1990:18). For Tichy and Devanna (1986), also, the combination of power with personality defines the transformational leader as a skilled, knowledgeable change agent with power, legitimacy, and energy. Such a leader is courageous, value driven, and able to deal with ambiguity and complexity (Bass, 1990: 18). In addition to Bass's collection, there are also many other different attempts to define 'leadership' as a concept, which have had very different results.

2.2 School Leadership

Studies on school development and improvement emphasize the importance of school leaders, especially in the view of the continuous improvement process targeted at an individual. For all phases of the school development process, school leadership is considered vital and is held responsible for keeping the school as a whole in mind, and for adequately coordinating the individual activities during the improvement processes. Furthermore, it is required to create the internal conditions necessary for the continuous development and increasing professionalization

of the teachers. It holds the responsibility for developing a cooperative school culture. Regarding this, Barth (1990) emphasizes the “modeling” function of the school leader.

New demands on schools and school leadership Of course, the school leader’s role has also to be seen in relationship to the broad context in which the school is operating. As schools are embedded in their communities, and the country’s educational system, and this again is embedded in society, schools and their leaders have to react, to cope with and to support economic and cultural changes and developments.

Altered social environments at work and at home as well as a growing multi-cultural world based on the versatility of a pluralistic, post-modern and globalised society, result in an increase in complexity in many areas of daily life. The accumulation of knowledge , an information market which is not easily manageable and which features an ever-increasing supply of extracurricular information opportunities (via radio, TV, print media and, most of all, the Internet) and a growing diversity and specialization of the working environment are further aspects of this radical change (Kru¨ger, 1996).

Hence, the school as an institution cannot any longer be regarded as simply imparting traditional knowledge within a fixed frame. Rather, it is becoming an organization which needs to renew itself continuously in order to take present and future needs into account (Dalin and Rolff, 1990). This imposes the necessity on school leadership to consider itself as a professional driving force and mediator for the development of the school towards a learning organization, an organization which develops its own reforming and changing powers and re-invents itself (Fullan, 1993, 1995).

Additional stress within the range of tasks for school leadership is brought about by the changed structures of the education system, which inevitably strongly affect the individual school and therefore the role of school leadership as well. Tendencies towards decentralization, transferring more decision power from the system level to the school level, result in an extended independence of school (Bullock and Thomas, 1997).

Besides decentralization, there are increasingly corresponding efforts to centralize. There is a legislative movement towards stronger central influence and control by means of intensified

accountability, quality control through school inspections or external evaluation, a set national curriculum with national standardized tests, which allow for a direct comparison of pupil and school performances, and so on.

Hence, the roles and functions of school leaders have changed in many countries of the world. As a result, school leaders are confronted with an altogether new range of demands and challenges.

A complex range of school leadership tasks The managing and leading tasks of school leadership are both complex and interrelated, so that there is no clearly defined, specific "role" of school leadership, but at best a colored patchwork of many different aspects. Some areas or role segments relate to working with and for people, others to managing resources like the budget. All are part of the complex range of tasks the school leader faces in the 21st century (Huber, 1997, 1999d).

2.3 Instructional Leadership

Scholars gave attention to the study of instructional leadership and its possible contribution to learner achievement for the past two decades. A considerable body of literature which deals with variables related to school effectiveness and improvement, leadership and different leadership practices, and the challenges faced by school principals with regard to poor performance of learners, has been produced.

During this period, a large number of studies have reflected a growing interest by various researchers and leadership practitioners in the school leadership domain. In particular, research has revealed different views that exist between scholars as to whether instructional leadership practices of principals have a measurable effect on learner performance.

Instructional leadership has been conceptualized in many different ways by various scholars and researchers. Mullan (2007:23) refers to curriculum leadership and conceptualizes it as the jurisdiction of the principal who, as the head of the organization, must be a "master generalist,"..... "one who knows curriculum management and the change processes for the whole school". In the school effectiveness literature there is a distinction between *instructional*

leadership and *administrative* leadership. It is appropriate to analyze this construct by splitting it into its component parts, namely *instruction* and *leadership*, in order to gain a better understanding of what each of the two concepts implies;

Instruction, according to Calitz, (cited by Kruger 1995a:43), concerns itself with the selection and arrangement of learning content, setting goals and objectives, the unfolding of knowledge, the transfer of skills and attitudes, and the provision of feedback to pupils in terms of their learning achievements. For Fraser, Loubser and Van Rooyen (1993), cited by Pitsoe (2005:62), the concept *instruction* is associated with the transfer of knowledge, skills, techniques and proficiencies, while Laska (1984:9) viewed instruction as "referring to formal education which occurs in a school or comparably structured setting.... it comprises those elements of an instructional activity that represent the delivery system for the curricular content."

Leadership, according to Yukl (2002), is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives. From this definition of leadership, it follows that there must one person who wields the power and ability to influence others, and in this case it is the principal. The definitions of instructional leadership provided below should be suffice to merge the meanings of instruction and leadership.

Hopkins (2001:114) contends that instructional leadership is about creating learning opportunities for both learners and teachers. This definition puts the development of both teachers and learners at the centre, and further proposes that developmental programs for educators should be put in place.

Weller (1999:36) adds more dimensions into the definition by referring to instructional leadership as *"the high visibility and involvement of the principal in every phase of the school program"*.

Instructional leadership is a model of leadership which focuses on students learning and achievement through development of others, and also invests in capacity building by developing social and academic capital for students and all intellectual, professional capital for teachers (Harris et al, 2005; Leithood et al, in Dimmock, 1993).

Wingert in McEwan (2003) also sighted as: instructional leadership is the creation of climate where the principal, faculty, students, parents, and school board are able to work together to accomplish the task of education. From the thoughts of scholars, one could deduce that instructional leaders (principals) should have to play instructional role to make the school effective. To do so, the Principal should provide or arrange programs for teachers' professional development programs and must be knowledgeable about learning theories, effective instruction, and curriculum with the goal of improving teaching and learning activities to be performed.

Hallinger and Murphy (1998) states that instructional leadership comprises three broad categories: Defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting the school climate conducive .It is also used to refer creating learning opportunities for students and teachers Hopkins (2003:56). Blase and Blase's(1998) research of 800 principals in United States elementary, middle and high schools suggests that effective instructional leadership behavior comprises three aspects: talking with teachers, promoting teachers' professional growth, and fostering teacher reflection.

Murphy(1988)classified the definition of instructional leadership in to narrow and broad. The narrow definition focuses on instructional leadership as a separate entity from administration**.** In the narrow view, instructional leadership is defined as those actions that are directly related to teaching and learning. The broader view entails all leadership activities that affect students' learning. Instructional leadership refers to leadership that is directly related to the teaching process, involving the interaction between teachers, and the curriculum. Keefe and Jenkins (2002) also define instructional leadership as the role of principal in providing directions, resources and supports to teachers and students in order to improve the teaching and learning in schools.

Instructional leadership refers to a series of behaviors designed to affect classroom instruction. Such behaviors include principals informing teachers about new educational strategies and tools for effective instruction, and assisting and critiquing them to determine their applicability in the classroom Leithwood (as cited in Sindhvad, 2009).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001) defines instructional leadership as leading learning communities, in which staff members meet on a regular basis to

discuss their work, collaborate to solve problems, reflect on their jobs, and take responsibility for what students learn. In a learning community, instructional leaders make adult learning a priority, set high expectations for performance, create a culture of continuous learning for adults, and get the community's support for school success.

According to King (2002) anything leaders do to improve teaching and learning by gathering evidence of student achievement that demonstrates improvement. Hopkins (2003) also declares that instructional leadership is about creating learning opportunities for both teachers and students. Blase and Blase, (2000) defines instructional leadership in specific behaviors such as making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching. More recently, DuFour (2002) the definition of instructional leadership has been expanded to include deeper involvement in the core business of schooling, which is teaching and learning how it has impacted on the changing role of the principal from being a manager and school administrator, to being an instructional leader and ultimately sharing this role with all educators in a school.

2.4 Key Elements of Instructional Leadership

Phillips (2009:2), in his analysis of instructional leadership, administration, and management, argues that instructional leadership involves three dimensions. These are;

2.4.1 Defining the School Mission

The dimension of defining the school mission includes the principal job descriptors of framing school goals and communicating school goals. Principals demonstrate framing school goals by working with parents and staff to identify the areas of improvement within the school and developing performance goals to these areas (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The function of communicating school goals refers to the ways the principal expresses the importance of the school goals to staff, parents, and students. This can be achieved through the use of formal or informal communication (e.g., handbooks, staff meetings, school assemblies, conversations with staff or students, bulletin boards, and teacher and parent conferences).

Caldwell (2002:26) associates the concept of a vision with what he calls “strategic leadership” which is defined as seeing the “big picture; discerning the megatrends”; understanding the implications and ensuring that others in the school can do the same; establishing structures and processes to bring vision to realization, and monitoring the outcomes. It follows that a principal must prioritize the provision of a clear sense of mission, vision, goals and objectives that are understood and supported by all groups and by key decision makers.

Chang (2001:7) indicates that an instructional leader is a person with a vision who is able to assess the needs of the school and community. Such a leader is able to articulate his/her vision into a plan of action in which all parties can participate and feel a sense of ownership that will enable quality learning to occur. According to Chang (2001), giving life to the vision of a school depends on the commitment of the instructional leader (the principal) to empowering his/her staff, to ensuring that each individual can build his/her own self esteem; and where all the components of the school become part of the whole.

The view of Chang (2001) is shared by Lashway (1995:2) who contends that whilst the setting of high expectations for teachers and learners, establishing academic goals and creating a vision, were traditionally the role of the instructional leader, recent views and discussions emphasize the collaborative aspects of the process. The instructional leader therefore has a duty to articulate, publicize, and promote the vision and goals of the school by engaging all parties concerned (teachers, learners, parents and community) in continuous dialogue on the vision and goals of the school. This dialogue will ensure that all parties are aligned with the vision and goals of the school. It will further provide a platform on which the vision of the school can be contested and altered, in line with its changing circumstances.

2.4.2 Managing the Instruction

Managing the instructional program dimension involves working directly with teachers in areas related to curriculum and instruction (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Job functions included in this dimension consist of supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress. Supervising and evaluating instruction comprises activities that provide instructional support to teachers, monitor classroom instruction through informal classroom visits, and aligning classroom practice with school goals.

The success of any school depends squarely on what happens in the classrooms. What the teachers do in the classrooms with their learners (curriculum delivery and instruction) will be reflected in the performance of learners. Research on the role of the principal as instructional leader shows that principals must possess an array of skills and competencies in order to lead schools effectively towards the accomplishment of educational goals and one of these skills is monitoring the curriculum and instruction.

According to (Erlandson and Witters- Churchill ,1990:123) a successful principal must Understand the dynamics of the classroom; identify and apply effective instructional strategies. This understanding will enable the principal to implement educational programs/curriculum development. The principal must also be able to master and coordinate the auxiliary services that support instruction, and also establish productive relationships with parents and the community."

With regard to instruction, the principal needs to know about different models of teaching, the theoretical reasons for adopting a particular teaching model, and the theories underlying the technology-based learning environment (Jenkins, 2009:36). In support of Hallinger (2002; 2003) Jenkins (2009), emphasizes the importance of classroom visits by the instructional leader to work with teachers and learners, and the participation of the principal in curriculum-related meetings to assist in the development of effective teaching and learning strategies. This enables the principal to provide instructional resources and professional development opportunities that improve learning, teaching, and assessment practices.

2.4.3 Creating Positive School Climate

Promoting a positive school learning climate dimension encompasses principal behaviors that protect instructional time, promote professional development, maintain high visibility, provide incentives for teachers, develop and enforce academic standards, and provide incentives for learning (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The principal's job functions consist of mostly indirect activities that help create a positive learning environment. Principals can influence student and teacher attitudes through the creation of a reward structure that reinforces academic achievement and productive effort; through clear, explicit standards embodying what the school expects from students; through the careful use of school time; and through the selection and implementation of high-quality staff development programs (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985, p.223).

The concept of professional development and its relationship with instructional leadership has been touched on a number of times by Sweitzer (2009), Lashway (2004), and Blasé and Blasé (2000). Professional development in the instructional leadership paradigm is concerned with the role of principals as instructional leaders in influencing the professional development of educators in their schools and also the responsibility of principals to develop themselves professionally in order to be able perform their new role. Banfi (1997:15) views professional development as comprising those activities in which professionals are engaged for the purpose of achieving professional competence. It is further perceived as a variety of activities in which educators are involved to be able to improve their practice. For this particular study, the researcher gave more emphasis on assessing the status teachers' leadership roles in their respective schools as one of principal's professional development activity.

2.5 Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

Effective instructional leadership breeds effective schools which, in turn, produce successful learners. Educators and other educational researchers believed that the school and characteristics within the school could affect students in reaching high levels of achievement. This hypothesis led to the school effectiveness achievement regardless of socioeconomic conditions and family background. Weber's (1971) studies of four effective inner city schools directly opposes Coleman (1966) and Jencks' (1972) findings. Weber defined an effective school by its ability to educate poor children as well as middle class children.

All four of the schools earned scores above the national averages on standardized norm-referenced assessments. His findings delineate seven factors that were crucial to the effectiveness of the schools: strong leadership, where the principal was influential in setting the tone of the school, high expectations for students, an orderly and quiet atmosphere, emphasis on reading skills and phonic awareness, frequent evaluation of skills to guide instruction, additional reading personnel, and individualization of instruction.

Purkey & Smith (1983) conducted an extensive review of more than 100 school effectiveness studies. Their review was limited to studies that determined or examined school-level factors associated with school effectiveness. The review differed from other reviews of the school effectiveness literature in three ways: their orientation was skeptical; evidence gathering was

extended to include outlier studies, case studies, surveys, and evaluations as well as studies of program implementation and organizational theories (Purkey & Smith, 1983). They concluded that an "academically effective school was distinguished by its culture: a structure, process and climate of values and norms that emphasize successful teaching and learning" (p.442). Purkey & Smith (1983) delineated specific characteristics associated with the structure and process.

The organizational structure variables identified in academically effective schools included instructional leadership, school-site management, staff stability, curriculum articulation and organization, school-wide staff development, parental involvement and support, school-wide recognition of academic success, maximized learning time, and district support (Purkey & Smith, 1983). These organizational factors do not ensure that a school will be an academically effective school; however, if these factors are in place it is more likely that a school will be more effective in educating all students regardless of family background or socioeconomic status.

The four process variables that defined the school culture and climate include collaborative planning and collegial relationships, a sense of community, clear goals and commonly shared high expectations, and order and discipline (Purkey & Smith, 1983). These factors alone do not ensure a culture and climate that yields a productive school, but, "a school's culture, or more specifically its climate, seems to be the determining factor in its success or failure as a place of learning" (Purkey & Smith, 1983, p. 444). Purkey & Smith's review (1983), as well as the other studies discussed (Weber, 1971; Edmonds, 1979), provide significant evidence that instructional leadership impacts the technical core of schools. The influence that an instructional leader has on the teaching and learning is extensive. Researchers have studied this influence with positive results . The controversy in the concept of leadership also rises in effectiveness. This is because educational leadership is said to be effective in terms of the goals it sets to itself (Bundre. et al, 2003; p. 133)

However, for whom are the goals themselves effective? Are all goals equally morally acceptable? For example, in Germany, (in the period of Hitler) an effective school leader is one who helps to produce young fascists for the rich In Presbyterian church schools, the head's leadership style consist of doctrine Macbeth to cut out the "immoral" bits, showing how the Bible prove evaluation to be wrong, rejecting sex education of any kind and using corporal

punishment to restrict the innate sinful tendencies of children, Ghouri, cited in Brundret, 2003; P. 134).

Fiedler,(1987; P. 43) has developed a contingency model which says that leadership effectiveness is the result of an interaction between the style of the leader and the characteristics of the environment in which the leader works. Drawing on the contingency theory of leadership effectiveness frame work bases its notion that no single style is effective in all situations but rather the situation determiners the style that will most likely be effective (Sutcliffe, 1997; p.1)

Ayalew (2000; p. 24) also stresses that different situations require different style and effectiveness of a style depends on the situations in which it is used. Therefore, effectiveness is context based because it depends on the situation in which it is used and the leader acts.

For an organization to be successful in the achievement of its goals, functioning variables are required. However, the organization of the proper functioning of these inputs lies on the capability and competence of the leader. If the leader is capable to influence subordinates in using appropriate leadership styles in accordance with their level job maturity, it is most likely that organization goals will be achieved. Thus, the attainment of organizational goals is attributed to the effectiveness of the certain organization is a success.

On the other hand Zenebe, (1992; p.19) observes that effectiveness is an expression of a given quality of performance. Effectiveness refers to a level of achievement that result in high employer moral and attainment of organizational goals. In educational institution, particularly in Secondary school leader effectiveness is defined in terms of the extent to which strategic constituencies are satisfied in consistent with a cultural and interpretive view of the organization. (Birnbaum, 1992; p. 56) contends that a “leader who is able to command support constituent has met the needs of multiple and conflicting stake holders and has acclaim to be considered a good leader” and thus effective.

2.6Teachers Leadership

Collaboration between teachers has been found to be a necessary concomitant of school improvement and change as well a contributory factor to school effectiveness (Rosenholz, 1989).

The shared goals and values at the core of teacher leadership is also an important influential factor in generating effective schools (Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000). Ovando (1996) suggests that where teachers are placed in leadership positions they are able to contribute more directly to organizational effectiveness and improvement. Some authors suggest that schools need to move from a hierarchical, top-down structure towards a more democratic model, in which teachers can directly influence development and change (Katzenmeyer and Moller 2001).

A study of over 600 teachers found that teacher participation in decision making was positively related to school effectiveness (Taylor and Bogotch, 1994). Similarly, a longitudinal qualitative study of teachers who had taken on teacher leadership roles in restructuring schools found that teachers responded positively to their increased participation in decision making and that this directly contributed to school effectiveness.

In a study of British secondary schools, teachers generally felt that leadership was more effective where subject leaders and department heads were more strongly involved in decision making (Glover et al, 1999). Pellicer et al (1990) similarly found that in the most effective schools, leadership was a shared responsibility of teachers and heads. Other studies have also reported positive effects of teacher participation in decision making. For example, Rosenholz, (1985) and Sickler, (1988) found that teacher involvement in decision making led to a decrease in teacher absenteeism and an increase in school effectiveness. Wong (1996) found that in schools with strong collaborative teacher-principal leadership there was evidence of significant gains in pupil learning and achievement.

An element of schooling that is attracting increasing interest is that of democratic learning. If schools are to support democratic values, and encourage pupils to function as critical and active citizens, they themselves should model democracy through collaborative and democratic leadership (Hackney and Henderson, 1999). Too often, pupils are expected to obtain democratic values through lessons on citizenship, while the example they are given within the school is that of strict hierarchy and autocratic leadership, in which neither they nor their teachers participate (Beane 1998; Barth 1999). If, as Blegen and Kennedy (1999) point out, what we do is likely to more powerfully affect pupils that what we say, this is a highly unsatisfactory situation. This

means that for schools to foster democratic learning requires moving away from traditional top-down management and getting teachers to take responsibility and accountability.

Research has shown that effective schools place an emphasis upon the teaching and learning processes and invest in teacher development time. Of all the school level characteristics, it is those that relate to teaching that have the most empirical support (Scheerens, 1992:17). It is those factors that are most immediately proximal to, and therefore most immediately experienced by students (i.e. teacher behaviors in the classroom) that will most immediately affect student achievement (Muijs & Reynolds, 2001a).

As Smylie (1995) points out, teacher leadership can improve teacher effectiveness in a number of ways. The emphasis on continuous learning and excellence in teaching can improve the quality of teachers, while the emphasis on spreading good practice to colleagues can lead to increasing the expertise of teachers throughout the school. The increased expertise and confidence of teachers, coupled with the greater responsibilities vested in them, will make teachers more willing to take risks and introduce innovative teaching methods, which should have a direct positive effect on teacher effectiveness.

Research by (Katzenmeyer and Moller 2001) suggests that empowering teachers through teacher leadership improves their self efficacy in relation to pupil learning. Teacher expectations directly relate to pupil achievement hence strengthening self-efficacy is an important contributory factor of teacher leadership (Muijs and Reynolds, 2001b). A study by Ovando (1996) found that when teachers took on leadership roles it positively influenced their ability to innovate in the classroom and had a positive effect on student learning outcomes. Some studies have found that taking on leadership roles can improve teacher motivation. For example, in their study of teacher leadership, Lieberman et al (2000) report that teachers felt that the experience had improved their confidence in their own abilities and had taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults. Similarly, in their survey of 42 teacher leaders, O'Connor and Boles (1992) reported improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.

There is a body of evidence that demonstrates that teachers work most effectively when they are supported by other teachers and work collegially (Hargreaves, 1994). Collegial relations and collective practice are at the core of building the capacity for school improvement (Hopkins, 2001). It has been shown that the nature of communication between those working together on a daily basis offers the best indicator of organizational health. Hopkins et al (1996: 177) Building the capacity for school improvement means extending the potential and capabilities of teachers to lead and to work collaboratively.

Distributing the responsibility and power for leadership widely throughout the school, sharing decision making power with staff, allowing staff to manage their own decision making committees, taking staff opinion into account , ensuring effective group problem solving during meetings of staff, providing autonomy for teachers ,altering working conditions so that staff have collaborative planning time, ensuring adequate involvement in decision making related to new initiatives in the schools and creating opportunities for staff development were suggested mechanisms by (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; Helm, 1989) how school leaders provide opportunities for teachers to participate in decision and lead in school development.

2.7 School Leadership in Ethiopian Context

According to Ahmed, the history of principal ship in Ethiopia at its early stage was dominated by foreign principals. In all government owned schools that were opened before and few years after the Italian occupation expatriates from France, Britain. Sweden, Canada, Egypt and India were assigned as school principals. After the restoration of independence in 1941, education was given priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country, As there was not enough educated Ethiopians to teach and run schools, most of the teachers and principals in schools were from foreign countries such as UK, USA, Canada, Egypt and India (ICDR 1990).

According to MOE (2002) prior to 1962, expatriate principals were assigned in the elementary and Secondary Schools of different provinces of Ethiopia during the 1930's and 1940's. During this time Indian was given the principal ship position which may be for their higher educational level and experiences in principal ship. However, the history had developed in to a new phase where Ethiopians began to replace expatriate which started in 1964, According to Teshome (in Ahmed 2006). This new phase of principal ship started with supervising principals such a person

was responsible not only for one school but also for the education system of the community where the school was located from the second half of 1940's, documents prove that Ethiopian school Heads were directly assigned in elementary schools without competition among candidates. Only educational level and teaching experience were given highest priority of principal ship. After 1960 it was known the Ethiopians who graduated with B.A /BSC degree in any field were assigned as principals in schools by senior officials of the ministry of education. The major selection requirement were education level and work experience (MOE, 2002; p. 42)

However, during the first few years of 1960's it was understood that those graduate of B. A degree in pedagogy was directly assigned in secondary schools. On the other hands career structure, promotion that secondary school principals were those who held first degree, preferably in educational management field and those who had at least worked for a limited time as a unit leader or department head, or teacher. It is also stated in the job description of the MOE issued in 1989 that secondary school administration and supervision including sufficient work experiences.

Currently (MOE), use different criteria to select School principal, especially to lead general secondary schools, principals should have MA Degree in EDPM./school leadership/ and primary school principals B.A in EDPM.

Since the formulation of new education and training policy (1994), Ethiopian Government has made different educational reforms and implementing the newly launched school improvement program. The main objective of the program is to maximize students learning outcomes by improving the conditions might have impact on it. The program focuses on four major domains of the school namely improving the teaching and learning, creating conductive learning environment, improving school leadership and enhancing community participation in school affairs. The basic objectives of the school improvement program in the manual are congruent with dimensions of instructional leadership (MOE, 2007).

2.8 Summary of The Related Literature

This chapter has focused on the review of literature on instructional leadership effectiveness in order to enable the researcher and the readers to gain a better theoretical understanding of this study. The literature reviewed includes, basic concepts in leadership, literature about instructional leadership construct and how it manifests itself in the school context. Scholarly articles that were reviewed reiterate the fact that principals' instructional relationship roles are key for learner's achievement and how the school principal, in developing a vision for the school, develops the culture and climate of the school.

The 21st century context of education is different from that of previous centuries and on this basis, different types of leadership preparation are necessary to produce a new breed of school leaders who are able to address the 21st century educational context. Equipping principals with necessary skills and knowledge for quality leadership is a key factor in determining the success or failure of schools.

A considerable body of literature in the domains of instructional leadership has reiterated the power of the influence of principals on the instructional practices of teachers. The principals 'instructional leadership behaviors were seen to have a significant influence on how teachers performed in their classes. Teaching and learning are the core business of schools and the main focus of this study is to establish the extent to which principals (instructional leaders) impact on these activities to improve learner achievement.

This review has been a vehicle through which the researcher has established what other researchers and leadership practitioners contend about the role of school principals as instructional leaders. Furthermore, literature review assisted the researcher to develop a focus in attempting to answer the research questions that are the focus of this study.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research primarily ventures out to assess the effectiveness of leadership of school principals on teaching and learning process and students' achievements. In doing so, an assessment was made to select available tools that help to evaluate leadership effectiveness of school principals and the descriptive survey design was employed in this study since the intention of the study is to assess the existing instructional leadership effectiveness. According to Creswell (2002) survey design determines and reports the way things are: it involves collecting numerical data to test hypothesis or answer questions about the current status of the subject of the study.

3.2 Source of Data

Both primary and secondary sources were used for the study. The primary sources are teachers, principals vice principals, cluster supervisors and human resource managers. Secondary sources of the study are 8^{th} grade regional examination results of students, brochures that show schools vision mission and goals. Different proposal prepared for training purpose, checklists prepared for control and support were used as source of data.

3.3 Data Collecting Tools

3.3.1 Questionnaires

To examine principal's instructional leadership effectiveness, closed ended questionnaires containing four different parts which were capable of measuring principal's involvement in three dimensions of instructional leadership that are defining the school mission, managing the instruction and creating positive school climate were developed for teachers. The first part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain information on personal characteristics of the respondents 19 items in the second part were used to obtain information on the critical job related behaviors of principals in the three dimensions of instructional leadership. They were adopted from Hallinger's Principals' Instructional leadership Management Rating Scale (PIMRS). The study conductor selected Hollinger's model for the frame work of the study since Over 110 empirical

studies have been completed using this model as reliable instrumentation and important contributions have been made by researchers in the North America, Europe, and Asia. (Hallinger & Heck, 1996a; 1996b; Heck & Hallinger, 1999).

According to MOE (2013), one of the expected competencies of Instructional leader is to lead and develop individuals and teams. Based on this fact 10 items of the third section of the questionnaire was made to be linked with teachers leadership roles expected to be displayed in schools and made to be rated by teachers using five point rating scale. Very low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, high = 4 and very high = 5.

The last part (part IV) of the questionnaire filled by teacher respondents contain considerable factors that hindered principals instructional leadership effectiveness, teachers were made to rate selected 10 factors based on experience and literature where the study conductor believed that those factors may adversely affected the effectiveness of the instruction. The parameters were five point likert scale where, Very high=5, High=4, Medium =3, Low=2 and Very low =1

3.3.2 Interviews

Interviews are best suited for understanding people's perceptions and experiences. As Flick (1998, p.222) puts it: "Practices are only accessible through observation; interviews and narratives merely make the accounts of practices accessible".

In addition to the questionnaires, interview and document analysis were used to substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire. For this study, a semi structured type of interview was prepared for principals, vice principals cluster supervisors and human resource administrators of respective schools on the assumption that a completely structured interview is akin to a questionnaire, in that all questions are pre determined, Although a variety of answers may be expected; a completely Unstructured interview is more like a conversation, albeit one with a particular focus and purpose. Semi-structured interviews fall between these poles.

3.3.3 Focus Group Discussion

According Krueger & Casey (2000), Social science researchers can derive multiple benefits from using focus groups. One is that focus groups are an economical, fast, and efficient method for

obtaining data from multiple participants thereby potentially increasing the overall number of participants in a given qualitative study (Krueger, 2000). In addition, the sense of belonging to a group can increase the participants' sense of cohesiveness (Peters, 1993) and help them to feel safe to share information. Furthermore, the interactions that occur among the participants can yield important data (Morgan, 1988), can create the possibility for more spontaneous responses (Butler, 1996), and can provide a setting where the participants can discuss problems and provide possible solutions (Duggleby, 2005).

Based on the above opinion, focus group discussions were made using two groups each with seven and eight teachers which created advantage of collecting a wealth of detailed information, deep insight and variety of shared understanding from these interacting individuals. The study conductor Organized the times, locations and recording materials in advance and served as a moderator.

3.4 Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

According to 2008 E.C annual statistical report of Arada sub city education office, there wre 15 governmental elementary schools (Grade 5-8) in 10 Woredas. Out of these 15 elementary schools, five of them selected as a sample members of the study. They are Mehale Ginfile, Biherawi Bethemengist, Meskerem, Africa Andinet and Dagmawi Minilik. These schools were selected using purposive sampling technique since they experience different contexts. The geographical environment, the number of students and teachers in the school and achievement level of the school were used for judgmental criteria to select school as sample members.

The data sources of the study were teachers, principals, vice-principals, supervisors, and Human resource managers. 90 teachers were selected randomly (lottery system) for questionnaire respondents and 15 additional teachers were made to be involved in Focus Group Discussion (FGD). ,5 (33.3%) Principals, 10(32.2%) Vice Principals and 5(100%) cluster Supervisors, which were included through availability sampling technique made to be sample members of the study assuming that they provide more information about leadership practices.

In addition to this, 5 Human resource administrators of the sample member schools were included by census to collect relevant data through both structured and unstructured interviews regarding the practice in recruitment and selection of principals.

Finally, out of 485 (100%) total population of teachers that each grade 5-8 , 105 (22%) of them were selected through simple random sampling technique; particularly through lottery method with the assumption that all teachers would have equal chance of being selected and to obtain representative sample. The researcher believed that the sample of 22% is sufficient to secure the validity of the data obtained from teacher respondents. The number of sample member teachers from each selected schools were determined proportional to the size of teachers in each schools. Moreover, the representations of teachers from different departments were considered to increase the reliability of responses.

Table 1: Summary of total population, sample size and sampling techniques

No	Type of Respondents	Total population		Sample size		Sampling Techniques
		No	%	No	%	
1	Teachers	485 *	100	105	22	Simple random sampling/lottery
2	principals	15	100	5	33.3	Availability
3	Assistant principals	36	100	10	27.7	Simple random sampling
4	Cluster supervisors	5	100	5	100	Availability
5	Human resource administrator	15	100	5	33.3	Availability
	Total	556	100	130	23	

* *Indicates no. of teachers that teach grade one to five only*

3.5Data Analysis and Interpretation

Data collected through questionnaire was analyzed quantitatively using statistical tools (percentage, mean, average mean, standard deviation and chi test). Responses from teachers through FGD and , data collected through interview from supervisors, principals and human resource administrators were separately narrated to review differences. Mean scores at each

dimension were calculated to understand principal's instructional leadership effectiveness in each dimension. Average mean of each functions analyzed. For simplicity, average mean value $\geq$ 4.00 high or very good practices, average mean value 3.00-3.99 average or moderate practice, and average mean value below 3.00 low or poor practice were used to interpret the data obtained. Respondent's behaviors (work experience, educational background, sex and age) and recruitment and selection practices of school principals were utilized to organize responses.

3.6 Pilot Testing

Pilot study was conducted in Atse Naod and Tibeb Ediget Primary Schools using 24 teachers prior to the final administration of the questionnaires to all respondents to secure the validity and reliability of the instruments with the objective of checking whether or not the items included in the instrument can enable the researcher to gather relevant information. The participants of the pilot test were also given firsthand information about how to evaluate and give feedback on the relevance of the contents, item length, and clarity of items and layout of the questionnaire. Based on the reflections, the instruments were improved before they were administered to the main participants of the study so that irrelevant items were removed lengthy items were shortened and unclear items were made clear.

The internal consistency reliability estimate was calculated using Cronbach's Coefficient of Alpha for the questionnaires. The researcher found the Coefficient of Alpha ($\propto$) to be 0.816, which is regarded as strong correlation Coefficient (Jackson, 2009). Further George and Mallery (2003) and Cohen, L, et al. (2007) also suggest that, the Cronbach's Alpha result >0.9 excellent, >0.8 good, >0.7 acceptable, $\propto$ < 0.6 questionable, and < 0.5 poor. The table below shows the computed internal reliability coefficient of the pilot test.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

SN	Variables	No. Items	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Principal's goal setting practice	4	.803
2.	Principal's goal communication practice	4	.910
3.	Principal's supervision and evaluation practice	3	.946
4.	Principal's practice in coordination of the curriculum	6	.786
5.	Principal's practice in monitoring students progress	4	.809
6	Teachers leadership involvement	10	.798
7	Factors that hinders Principal's instructional leadership	10	.795
Total Reliability Coefficient		41	.816

3.7 Ethical Consideration

The purpose of the study was explained to the participants and the study conductor has asked their permission to answer questions in the questionnaires, interview and focus group guide. He also informed the participants that the information they provided was only for the study purpose. Accordingly, the researcher used the information from his participants only for the study purpose. Taking this reality in mind, any communication with the concerned bodies were accomplished at their voluntarily consent without harming and threatening the personal and institutional wellbeing. In addition, the researcher ensured confidentiality by making the participants unnamed.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Presentation And Analysis of Data

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from the respondents through questionnaire, interviews and focus group discussion (FGD). Thus quantitative and qualitative analysis of data was utilized in this chapter. The qualitative parts ware interviews designed for principals, vice principals, supervisors and FGD members reports.

The study covered five (5) primary schools that are found in Addis Ababa Arada sub city. The data was collected from 90 teachers using questionnaire with returning rates of 98%. More over five principals, ten vice principals, five cluster supervisors and 5 human resource administrators were interviewed to strengthen the data. In addition to this 15teachers selected from each school where made to participate in FGD with two groups.

The data collected was organized and compared using percentages and mean . Standard deviation of each item was calculated to analyze instructional leadership effectiveness of principal focusing on three dimensions of Halliger's instructional leadership model..

4.1 General Characteristics of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their background information in terms of sex, age, years of experience, educational back ground and field of study. The detail of their characteristics was indicated as follows:

Table 3. Normative characteristics of respondents

	Items	Questionnaire		Interview								FGD	
		Teachers		Principals		Vice principals		Supervisors		Human resource add.		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
sex	Male	51	56.7	3	60	7	70	3	60	1	20	9	60
	Female	39	43.3	2	40	3	30	2	40	4	80	6	40
	Total	90	100	5	100	10	100	5	100	5	100	15	100
age	≤ 20	3	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	21 – 30	50	55.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	13.3
	31 – 40	22	24.4	-	-	8	80	5	100	5	100	9	60
	41 – 50	12	13.3	5	100	1	10	-	-	-	-	3	20
	≥ 51	3	3.3	-	-	1	10	-	-	-	-	1	6.7
	Total	90	100	5	100	10	100	5	100	-	100	15	100
experience	1 – 10	57	63.3	2*	40	7*	70	5*	100	-	-	2	13.3
	11 – 20	18	20	3*	60	3*	30	-	-	5	100	7	46.7
	21 – 30	9	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	26.7
	≥ 30	6	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	13.3
	Total	90	100	5	100	10	100	5	100	-	100	15	100
Edu.	Diploma	44	48.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	100	1	6.7
	1st Degree	45	50	4	80	9	90	5	100	-	-	14	93.7
	2nd Degree	1	1.1	1	20	1	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	90	100	5	100	10	100	5	100	-	100	15	100

* Indicates service years only as school principal

Sex distribution of respondents under item 1 of table one (1) indicates, 51 (56.7%) of the teachers were males while 39 (43.3%) of them were females. With similar trend, 13 (65%) supervisors, principals and vice principals were males. The study conductor observed that females involvement in teaching and school leadership areas was not proportional with males.

As shown under item 2 of table 1, majority of the respondents 83 (78%) of the teachers were found in age ranges of 21 – 40. With reference to the age of the interview groups, 8 (80%) of vice principals were found between 41 and 50 years of age. 5(100%) principals and 3 (2.8%) of teachers found between the age of 41 and 50. This shows that majority of the respondents were matured enough to understand their respective school and hence provide pertinent and detailed information about instructional leadership practices and the challenges the leadership has been facing.

With regard to work experience, majority of the teachers 75 (83.3%) had served 1 – 20 years in teaching. 15 (16.6%) of the teacher had more than 20 years of teaching experience. When coming to the interview and FGD respondents the trend looks slightly different. That is 9 (60%) of the principals and vice principals had 1-10 years of experience as school leader and the rest 6(40%) of them served for more than ten years. Therefore it is possible to argue that such experience might help them to understand instructional issues and those challenges hindering their effectiveness.

Regarding educational level, 45 (42.8%) of the teachers were Diploma Graduates while 59 (56.2%) of them have Bachelor of Education Degrees and one teacher had Masters Degree during the research time. This indicated that all teachers met the academic qualification of the level they were teaching. Therefore the distribution can be taken as unbiased since all respondent met requirements and were in possession of teaching qualification to provide relevant data regarding instructional leadership practices and challenges in their respective schools. But for principals, vice principals and supervisors only 1 (6.7%) of the principal has Masters Degree in Educational planning and management. The rest 14 (93.7%) principals have first Degree with different discipline such as English language, Chemistry, Mathematics and Geography. This finding contradicts with policy document. A blue print of teachers development program (MOE, 2007 P.60) has stated that the school principals need to have adequate knowledge, skill and

attitude in the area of education management. Furthermore, the standard set for school principals M0E (2013) clearly indicates the three domains namely school vision and community leadership, instructional leadership and administrative leadership where principals are expected to make a difference.

4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of the Data

As discussed in chapter 2 of this study, the three dimensions of instructional leadership which the study conductor believe they accurately define what a school principal entails where made to be evaluated using slightly adapted Hollinger's standardized questionnaires to assess the extent to which those dimensions were implemented by school principals as in instructional leader.

4.2.1 Principals Goal Setting Practice

According to MoE (2013), principals are expected to help and create shared vision and clear goals for the school and ensure continuous progress toward achieving the goals. Hallinger & Murphy, (1985) further stress the need of principals to demonstrate framing school goals by working with parents and staff to identify the areas of improvement within the school and developing performance goals to these areas. Based on this concept the study conductor intended to collect relevant information that reflects current situation.

Table 4. Responses on principal's goals setting practice (Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice

No	Item		Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high	Mean	S. D
1	Develop a focused set of annual school wide goals.	N	3	14	57	14	2	2.9	0.54
		%	3.3	15.6	63.3	15.6	2.2		
2	Frame the school goals in terms of staff responsibilities.	N	2	11	45	23	9	3.2	0.57
		%	2.2	12.2	50	25.6	10		
3	Use need assessment or other formal or informal methods to secure staff inputs.	N	12	19	41	13	5	2.7	1.07
		%	13.3	21.1	45.6	14.4	5.6		
4	Use data on student performance when developing school academic goals.	N	3	28	42	11	6	2.7	0.86
		%	3.3	31.1	46.7	12.2	6.7		
	Grand average							2.8	0.76

As indicated in table 2, respondents of item one confirmed that the rate at which principals develop a focused set of schools academic goals was 14(15.6 %) high and 2(2.2) very high respectively. Although more than half of the teachers (57) (63.3%) indicated average level of focused goal setting, the mean value of item 2 was 2.9 which was less than average mean value of the likert scale(3.0) . This confirmed that the extent to which one of principals major role, that is direction setting to ensure the school runs on clear, measurable and time bounded goals was practiced inadequately.

Item 2 of table 2 depicted that 45(50%) of the teachers believed that their perspective principals distributed the required responsibility for the staff to achieve the intended academic goals. But 13(14.4%) of them argued that the extent of framing academic goals with respect to staff responsibility was unsatisfactory (low, very low). The mean value (3.2) of item 2 confirmed that the extent school principals strive to align school goals with staff responsibility was moderate.

Respondent's response on table 2 of item 3 showed that the extent to which principals strive to secure human, physical and financial resources for the realization of the school's academic goals was rated 13.3 % very low and 21.1 % low respectively. Significant number of teachers (21%) of rated that the resources allocated in their perspective schools to achieve goals were at appreciable level. But the mean value of item 3 (2.7) was an indication that elementary schools lack necessary resources for the realization academic goals of their schools.

Response on item 4 of the table revealed arithmetic mean 2.7 with standard deviation 0.86 .From this, the study conductor observed that the practice of linking students performance data with academic goal development process to set data driven goals was not satisfactory.

FGD reports on goal setting practice strongly emphasized the importance of staff participation in academic goal setting since real participation creates understanding and sense of ownership. The summarized report on this issue indicated that principals goal setting practice was not participatory.

One of the participants in FGD said that

> *"---what is common in today's school goals is, the principal receives goals from its Upper hierarchy (Addis Ababa education bureau and or sub city education office) and staff to discuss on it without considering the schools context. The principal tries to convince the staff members , pressurizes if not as the goals to be accepted". He further said those goals "imposed goals".*

The qualitative data obtained through interview of school principals vice principals and cluster supervisors on goal setting practice in respective schools show almost similar phenomena. One of the school principals said that

> *"---as a school leader I develop school goals (academic goals) by participating necessary stakeholders. I did my part to make these goals to be known by all school community. There are goals directly came from Addis Ababa Education Bureau and or Arada Sub City Education office these goals have nationwide nature and are taken from strategic plans like Education sector development program (ESDP) and Growth and transformation plan (GTP)".*

The interview conducted with principals and supervisors confirmed partly similar response with FGD reports. Both principals supervisors agreed that some school goals like dropout rate and promotion rate with grade 8 regional exam were directly imposed from Addis Ababa education bureau. But principals rejected the critic raised by teachers in pressurizing the staff to accept those goals.

To sum up, the grand mean of the 4 items focused on principals practice on academic goal setting was ($x^- = 2.8$) which indicated the poor practices of principals goal setting. The grand standard deviation of the above 4 items was (S.D=0.78) indicating the values of data set were spread over at a distance of 0.78 standard unit from the grand mean indicating relatively reproducible data.

4.2.2 Principals Goal Communication Practice

Table 5. Response on principal's school goals communication practice *(Remember: $x^- \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq x^- \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $x^- \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where x^- is average mean*

No	Item		Very low	Low	average	High	Very high	Mean	S. D
1	Communicate school's mission to members of the school community.	N	10	16	44	14	6	3.1	1.08
		%	11	17.8	48.9	15.6	6.7		
2	Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers of staff meetings.	N	3	4	45	27	11	3.4	0.78
		%	3.3	4.4	50	30	12.2		
3	Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers.	N	7	20	42	13	8	2.9	1.04
		%	7.8	22.2	46.7	14.4	8.9		
4	Ensure that the schools goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school.	N	6	17	30	25	12	3.2	1.23
		%	6.7	18.9	33.3	27.8	13.3		
	Grand mean							3.15	1.03

According to table 3 of item 1, respondents opinions regarding the extent to which principals communicate the why of the school with stakeholders were highly dispersed. (S.D=1.08) This might be because of wide range engagement between principals in internalization of clear, honest and shared mission of their respective schools.

Out the four items which were intended to assess the extent to which principals communicate schools mission and goals effectively with school community, item 2 of table 3 had arithmetic mean=3.4 with standard deviation =0.78 that indicated relatively strong reproducible data . From the finding the study conductor observed that the practice to create consensuses on school goals was moderate. (30% high,12.2% very high)

Referring item 3 of table 3, 7 (7.8%) and 20 (22.2%) of the teachers indicated that the extent to which principals refer the school's academic goals when they made curricular decision was very low and low respectively. Furthermore the mean of respondent's opinions on item 3 was 2.9 with high standard deviation of 1.04. This confirms principal's poor practice in linking decisions on daily operations with curricular objectives.

Regarding responses on item 4 of table 3 , 6(6.7%) and 17 (18.9%) of the teachers believed that the manner at which school goals displayed in their respective schools were not in away to remember and understand them easily.

FGD report on principals goal communication practice indicated that there were staff meetings focused on clarity of annual academic goals. But usually the staff fails to reach at consensus because some goals were not data driven and also unable to consider context of the school. One of the FGD members stressed the issue by saying;

> *"---- practically the dynamic nature planning forces us to revise our plans based on the context we experience ,learning progress of students etc. But today's schools lack this scientific approach which was critically important to have contextualized and internalized academic goals ".*

Similar to goal setting practice, the summarized report of principals and vice principals contradicts with FGD responses. The interview haled with principals and vice principals revealed

as successive meetings were conducted to incorporate stakeholders say about academic goals. One of the school principals stressed the issue by saying;

> *"…I as a school leader, I arrange meetings focusing on schools academic goals which were set based on strategic plan of the school. No teacher will go to practice unless he/she informed them…".*

When we come to responses of interview respondents, 5(100%) cluster supervisors support FGD reports. One of the cluster supervisors stressed as *"--- schools mission and vision are written in school using bold letters ,but principals are not playing their roles to publicize to the required stakeholders so that mission and vision serve as guide line to concentrate pupils efforts".*

8 (80%) of *vice principals* responded that the practice and effort made to have shared vision and missions in their respective schools were at moderate levels . One of the respondents acknowledged the problem by saying;

> *"---schools cannot be lead by force or only by do's and do not's, rather principals must have necessary skills and knowledge to influence teachers and administrative staff .Therefore what we lack is the necessary skill and knowledge to effectively communicate vision and mission in our schools to stakeholders".*

To sum up ,the grand mean of the four items designed to assess principals goal communication practice revealed a magnitude 3.15 that confirmed moderate practice in the respective schools. Qualitative data also showed as principals lack the necessary skill and knowledge how to communicate school goals effectively to stakeholders.

4.2.3 Principals Supervision and Evaluation Practice of the Instruction Process

Table 6. Teachers response on supervision and evaluation practice of school principals on the instruction process *(Remember: $\bar{x} \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $\bar{x} \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where $\bar{x}$ is average mean*

No	Item		Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high	Mean	S. D
1	Point out specific strength/weakness in teachers instructional practices in post observation feedback.	N	8	49	15	11	5	2.4	1.02
		%	8.9	54.4	16.7	12.2	5.5		
2	Conduct informal/formal observations in class rooms.	N	3	8	34	31	14	3.5	0.94
		%	3.3	8.9	37.8	34.4	15.6		
3	Ensure that classrooms priorities are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	N	12	37	28	9	4	2.5	0.99
		%	13	41.1	31.1	10	4.4		
	Grand mean and SD							2.8	0.98

According to Hallinger, managing the instructional program requires the principal's active participation in stimulating, supervising, guiding and monitoring teaching – learning process in the school. With this regard, responses obtained from item 1 and 2 contradict each other. When we see item 1, more than half of the teachers 49(54.4%) rated that the extent they got professional support from their respective principals focusing the instructional process through class room observation on regular base was low. But response collected on item 2 of table 4 revealed that principals conducted class room observation either formally or informally at appreciable rate. (34.4% high and 15.6% very high)

All FGD participants 15(100%) revealed that principals must consider the individual teachers level of development, expertise and commitment. They also pointed that supervision is one the major responsibility of school principal. He/she has to conduct it aiming professional development and instructional improvement. According to FGD report, the real practice of principals supervision in their respective schools had the following problems;

" … principals conduct class room observation but fail to discuss the analysis of observation and provide necessary feedback for teachers. They suggested possible reasons such as lack of time, (since they are obsessed by routine tasks) , lack of commitment---".

One the cluster supervisor also strengthened the issue by saying:

"….they may did it for the sack of report rather than strengthening teachers capacity. Sometimes lacks objectivity. That is principals mix character with performance. If a principal believe that a given teacher is ethical and respect his authority, then that teacher would be considered as professionally competent even if he was under achiever".

The summarized data collected from the interview of vice principals, principals and cluster supervisors on principals instructional supervision and evaluation practice reveals that the emphasis given to support teachers by identifying instructional limitations in the class room was low. The practice did not enable to identify teacher's strength and limitations on instructional matters through regular supervision. They rather used clinical supervision that was planned once in a semester which was difficult to indicate proper solution how teachers progressively improve their instructional limitations.

When we see teacher's responses for item 3, more than half of them (54.1%) indicated that the extent school principals provide support and follow up in linking pedagogically accepted classroom priorities with direction and goals of the school was not satisfactory.(Mean=2.5)

With this regard, FGD respondents clearly showed that school principals are reluctant to have firm stand and support for the realization of classroom priorities such as class room discipline, motivation, protecting learning time, inclusiveness, inputs and established standards of behavior that promote students learning such as coming prepared to learn, communicate effectively, respect each other.

To sum up, the grand mean of the extent to which principals involved in supervision and evaluation of the instructional process was 2.8 with grand standard deviation of 0.98. This confirmed the practice was poorly displayed in schools.

4.2.4 Co-ordination of the Curriculum

Table 7. Respondents response on principal's practice in coordination of the school curriculum *(Remember: $\bar{x} \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $\bar{x} \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where $\bar{x}$ is average mean.*

No	Item		Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high	Mean	S. D
1	Ensure the timely allocation of resources (human, material and financial) necessary for instructional process	N	10	21	38	13	8	2. 8	1.24
		%	11.1	23.3	42.2	14.4	9		
2	Monitor the classroom contents to see that it covers the schools curricular objects.	N	11	24	29	17	9	2.8	1.35
		%	12	27	32	19	10		
3	Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the schools achievement tests.	N	13	41	24	7	5	2.4	0.77
		%	14.4	46	27	8	5.6		
4	Actively follow up evaluation of curricular material (text books, teaches guide) in the school.	N	6	20	34	19	11	3.2	1.20
		%	6.7	22.2	37.8	21.1	12.2		
	Grand Mean							2.8	1.14

As depicted in table 5, except item 4, all the rest items under this dimension showed mean value 2.7 which confirms principals poor practice in coordination of the school curriculum. Research results on this issue indicated that the leadership role of principals is the most crucial indicator of the success and failure of the curriculum NeNeil (1981:145). Regarding evaluation of curriculum materials like text books, teaches guide etc. the mean of principal's involvement was 3.2 that showed moderate practice.

The FGD respondents indicated that principals were not unable to handle properly curriculum related problems like shortage teaching materials (laboratories, chemicals, equipments, teaching aids). They do not allocate reasonable financial resources for training teachers that enable them to deliver the curriculum with necessary current knowledge and skills.

As the school leader, principals should play their pivotal role in managing the curriculum to make sure learners receive the best knowledge and good attainment of skills from educators. But more than half of the teachers 13(14.4 %) and 41(45.5%) responses on item 3 of table 8 revealed that the extent to which principals relate students' achievements with the already intended curricular objectives was very low and low respectively.

To sum up, the grand mean of responses collected based on the four items to assess the extent at which principals were involved in coordination of the curriculum was 2.8 indicating poor practice. But, their moderate practice in follow up during evaluation of curriculum materials (text books, teacher's guides) was confirmed with arithmetic mean3.2.

4.2.5 Monitoring Student's Progress

Table 8. Teachers' responses on principals practice to monitor student's progress *(Remember: $\bar{x} \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $\bar{x} \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where $\bar{x}$ is average mea*

No	Item		Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high	Mean	S. D
1	Discuss test/exam results with staff to identify strength and weakness.	N	6	11	52	12	9	3.0	0.9
		%	6.7	12.2	57.8	13.3	10		
2	Regularly meet teachers to discuss on students academic progress	N	5	9	54	15	7	3.1	0.79
		%	5.6	10	60	16.7	7.7		
3	Regularly talk with parents regarding students academic progress	N	16	32	31	7	4	2.4	1.04
		%	17.8	35.6	34.4	7.8	4.4		
4	Regularly collects classroom information from students focusing teaching learning	N	4	16	51	13	6	3.0	0.77
		%	4.4	17.8	56.7	14.4	6.7		
	Grand mean							2.8	0.87

Four items that show school principals role and responsibility in the area of student progress in learning teaching process were used to collect relevant data. Out of these, except item 3 which shows below satisfactory level (M = 2.4), all the rest were practiced by the school principal moderately. But more than half of the teachers (53.4%) believed that principal's involvement in participating parents in academic progress affairs was below satisfactory level.

On the other hand FGD respondents reported that, principals set a meeting focusing on student's achievement once in a semester or twice a year. But these sessions were intended to pressurize teacher adversely rather than deeply identifying the root cause of achievement failure. One teacher particularly stated:

"----- principals better defend their instructional leadership problem, resource scarcity and other barriers, at the end, teachers were forced to take corrective actions that were intended to improve students achievement and this leads to artificial results of the students Where students get good marks for easy tasks by doing different activities which were set below their profile ".

To sum up, teachers' responses collected using four items that show school principals role and responsibility in the area of student progress in learning teaching process were confirmed poor practice with grand mean 2.4 and grand standard deviation 0.87. Particularly the extent at which school principals discuss student's progress with parents on regular bases was rated very low (17.8%) and low (35.6%). On the other hand Principals were moderately practiced activities like, Test /exam /results discussion with staff (M=3.0, S. D=0.9) and collecting focused class room information from students (M=3.0, S.D=0.77).

4.2.6 Teachers Involvement in School Leadership

This part of analysis was made to focus on one of the domains of principals set by Ministry of Education. According to MOE (2013) principal's domains are: school vision and community leadership, instructional leadership and Administrative leadership. According to one of the competency of Instructional leadership, principals are expected to lead and develop individuals and teams.

Practically principals need to be creative and committed so that they entertain different mechanisms that enables teacher to be skilful and change advocators. Research results (Taylor and Bogotch, 1994) recommend, paving active participation of teachers through different mechanisms results in teachers' professional development and consequently schools become center of excellence.

According to Kat Zenmeyer and Moller (2001) teachers leadership in schools is key to transform in to professional learning communities and to empower teachers to become involved closely in decision making within the school, thus contributing to democratization of school. Teacher leadership roles in today's schools are identified as staff developers, leaders of school improvement team, setting standards for pupil behavior, deciding school budget, evaluation of

teacher performance … The important point emanating from literature is that the teacher leaders are in the first place expert teachers who spend at the majority of the time in the classroom but take on different leadership roles at different times (ask and persall 200)

Based on this fact, the study conductor believes that participating teachers in school leadership is critically important for setting effective instructional leadership. Therefore ten major areas where teachers leadership in schools were expected to be demonstrated were selected and made to be rated using five point rating scale by teachers. Very low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, high = 4 and very high = 5. In addition to this, questions that enabled FGD members to reflect their opinion regarding teachers involvement in school leadership were posed to collect relevant data.

Table 9. Teachers response focusing their involvement in school leadership affairs *(Remember: $\bar{x} \leq 2.99$ is low or poor practice, $3.00 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.99$ is moderate and $\bar{x} \geq 4$ is high or very good practice) where $\bar{x}$ is average mean*

No	Item	Present participation				Desired participation			
		N	Mean	S.D	Rank	N	X(mean)	S.D	Rank
1	Academic goals setting	90	2.48	1.18	5	90	4.45	0.84	1
2	School policy setting	90	2.17	1.79	9	90	4.39	0.81	2
3	School budget planning	90	2.25	0.82	8	90	4.36	0.73	3
4	Staff development	90	2.82	0.95	3	90	3.97	1.23	5
5	Hiring new staff	90	2.37	0.88	7	90	3.82	0.96	7
6	Community participation	90	2.48	1.17	5	90	3.29	0.71	9
7	Staff grievance resolution	90	2.81	1.64	4	90	3.78	0.92	8
8	Evaluating team member performance	90	3.21	0.78	2	90	4.34	0.61	4
9	Co – curricular programs	90	3.42	1.26	1	90	3.86	0.84	6
10	Reform facilitator	90	2.12	0.98	10	90	3.24	0.95	10
	Grand average		2.61	1.14			3.95	0.86	

N=no. of respondents S.D=standard deviation

Ten items of scores (Arithmetic mean scores) were summed up to a mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 2.61 and standard deviation (S.D) of 1.14 for preset degree of participation. The dispersion of the response about their mean value 2.61 was measured by a standard deviation of 1.14. That was on average each item score was located at a distance of 1.14 standard units from the grand mean 2.61. This implies the degree of scatter was high indicating greater degree of dispersion in the weighted mean scores.

Regarding present participation of teachers in different school leadership areas, except in two activities, the finding indicated that teacher's involvement in school leadership is less than average. Teachers participation were appreciable in the area of co – curricular programs ($\bar{x}$ = 3.42) and evaluation of the team member performance ($\bar{x}$ = 3.21). This finding confirmed that out of the total ten areas where teachers leadership roles were believed to be vital, 8(80%) of the areas were practiced poorly.

On the contrary respondents indicated high desire to participate in the leadership areas like school's academic goal setting, school's policy setting and school's budget setting. The average mean of the desire to participate in these three areas of school leadership was (4.4).

Based on this finding, providing meaningful opportunities for teachers to work together on pressing issues of common interest insures implementation since they know the overall plan of the school and what particular contribution he/she is supposed to make towards the realization of the school plan.

Research results on this issue indicated that participative leadership in schools plays great role in democratization of the school working environment by involving teachers, parents students, and administrative staff members… to contribute their part for the success of the school. Conway (1976) stresses this issue by summarizing the benefit: participation increases morals, productivity and effectiveness of the organization.

From the data (table 10) The mean and standard deviation values of desired level participation for the items were 3.95 and 0.86 respectively. All items have mean value that falls above the minimum satisfactory level of participation ($x^- = 3.0$). As indicated in table 10, the grand mean score ($x^- = 2.61$) of the present level of participation was much less than the grand mean score ($x = 3.95$) of teachers desire to participate.

Using chi- square test, strong relationship between the data that recognizes present participation of teachers and desired participation was confirmed. That is $x^2 = 18.98$ is larger than the critical value of $x^2 = 1.841$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence there is statistically a significant difference between the present and desired participation of teachers in different school leadership areas. It further indicated that the desire to participation in the selected ten leadership areas was significantly higher than to the present level of involvement.

FGD group respondents indicated that their participation in different school leadership areas were differing according to the schools' principals effort to create participatory approach. Similar to teachers response, majority of the responders 11(73%) confirmed that co curricular and team member performance evaluation areas where areas most teachers contribute the leadership roles in their respective schools. One of the 12 year experienced teacher said

> *"… I have never been invited to participate in area like school policy setting , school budget planning and school grievance resolution in those schools I thought. Even the schools had no such structured approach to involve teachers in such affairs ".*

The interview conducted for principals and vice principals reported perceptions teacher involvement in different school affairs impacted positively on the instructional process at their schools .Their summarized report revealed that the actual participation level of teachers in their respective school was encouraging in the areas of leading their department, as homeroom teacher and in different committees. But they criticize teachers because of lack of interest to heartily involve in different school leadership areas which contradicts with FGD report that blames principals because of their failure to create initiating structures and activities that facilitates teachers involvement.

One of the school principal said that:

> *"----currently teacher's desire to participate in different school activities is not encouraging. Even those who are participating are not intrinsically motivated to challenge problems that the school experiences .they lack commitment…".*

To sum up respondents opinions clarified that, teachers involvement in school leadership is instrumental for shared decision making. Regarding current involvement, Leadership areas such as co-curricular activities, team member performance evaluation and staff development were the first three areas where teacher's leadership was displayed significantly while reform facilitator, school policy setting and school budget planning were the last three activities where teachers leadership was poorly practiced.

4.2.7 Factors That Hindered Principals Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

In order to identify considerable factors that hindered principals instructional leadership effectiveness, teachers were made to rate some selected 10 factors based on experience and literature where the study conductor believed that those factors may adversely affected the effectiveness of the instruction. The parameters were five point likert scale where, Very high=5, High=4, Medium =3, Low=2 and Very low =1. To strengthen the data, teachers were made to list other considerable factors in their respective schools using open ended questionnaire. In addition to that FGD with teachers and Interview with principals and cluster supervisors were carried out.

Table 10. Respondent's opinions on factors that hinders principal's instructional leadership effectiveness (Remembering $0.0 \leq \bar{x} 2.49$ is insignificant effect , $2.5 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.49$ is moderate effect and $\leq 3.5\ \bar{x} \leq 5$ is chronic effect) where $\bar{x}$ is grand mean

Item		Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Mean	S.D
Turnover of principals/ teachers	N	6	12	58	9	5	3.0	0.73
	%	6.7	13.3	64.4	10	5.6		
Lack of shared vision	N	21	49	19	1	-	4.0	0.49
	%	23.3	54.4	21.1	1.1	-		
Lack of skill and knowledge for the instruction process	N	8	42	31	6	3	3.5	0.76
	%	8.9	46.7	34.4	6.7	3.3		
Interference by woreda /subcity officials	N	4	18	44	17	7	2.9	0.88
	%	4.4	20	48.9	18.9	7.8		
Lack of courage /commitment	N	17	39	26	6	2	3.70	0.86
	%	18.9	43.3	28.9	6.7	2.2		
Lack of instructional Materials	N	9	16	54	8	3	3.2	0.75
	%	10	17.8	60	8.9	3.3		
Heavy work load	N	3	21	42	18	6	2.9	0.84
	%	3.3	23.3	46.7	20	6.7		
Lack of clear goals	N	13	51	25	1	-	3.8	0.44
	%	14.4	56.7	27.8	1.1	-		
Un scheduled Meeting	N	5	8	55	17	5	2.9	0.72
	%	5.6	8.9	61	18.9	5.6		
Lack of reward for excelled performance	N	8	39	27	10	6	3.3	1.04
	%	8.9	43.3	30	11.1	6.7		
Grand average							3.32	0.75

As indicated in table 11, respondents indicated the extent of effects by those factors with arithmetic mean of each item varying from less significant effect , an item with mean value 2.8 to an item with a more significant effect with mean value 4.0

Teachers response on item one of table 11 revealed that turnover of principals and teachers had significantly affected (X^{-} =3.0) the principals instructional process in their respective schools. 6(6.7%) and 12(13.3%) of the teachers rated very high and high respectively. More than half of the teachers 58(64.4%) confirmed medium effect of the factor. The finding was supported by the Arada Sub city nine month compiled report that indicated 1 school principals and 9 teachers were left their job for undetermined reasons during the research time.

In the same table item 2, lack of shared vision in their respective school was the most powerful factor with more significant effect (X^{-} = 4.0) identified by teachers. More than half of them 49(54.4%) rated as extent of the effect was high and 21(23.3%) very high.

FGD showed similar phenomena on the issue. Their summarized opinion confirmed as visions were written in their respective schools and displayed on boards .but those visions were not properly placed in the hearts the entire staff member to provoke high commitment and professional growth.

There is no doubt that instructional leadership requires the school principal to wear many hats. At varies times principals must be Administrators, Managers, Diplomats, teachers and curriculum leaders. They must be proficient in all of these areas.

Concerning principals skills and knowledge utilized for the instructional process in their respective schools, respondents believed that principals contributed an adverse significant share for the realization of effective instructional leadership .That was indicated by the mean value 3.5 where 8(8.9%) and 42(46.%) of the teachers confirmed as lack of the required knowledge and skills by principals affected the instructional process in their schools moderately .

Another factor in which respondent teachers believed with its more significant hindering effect on the instructional process was lack of clear goals in their respective schools. With this regard 13(14.4%) and 51(56.7%) of the respondents rated its effect as it was very high and high

respectively. according to the data organized in table 11, the factor ranks second with its extent of effect next to lack of vision.

FGD report disclosed that when goals were developed in respective schools, the important factor , school context was not fully considered. To sum up ,out of the ten selected factors in which the study conductor believed they may hindered instructional leadership effectiveness in sample members schools ,lack of shared vision ,lack of clear academic goals ,lack of courage/ commitment by the principal ,lack of skill and knowledge by the principal, lack rewarding structure for excelled performance in the school, un scheduled meeting and turnover of principals and teachers were confirmed factor according to the decreasing power of effect. Factors such as heavy workload on principals, un necessary interference by woreda/ sub city officials and lack of instructional materials were factors confirmed with less significant effect .

4.2.8 Recruitment and Selection of Elementary School Principals

As stated in the literature, the early stage of principal ship in Ethiopia was dominated by foreigners. After 1960,Ethiopians who granted B.A (Bachelor of Arts) and B.Sc.(Bachelor of science) in any field were assigned as principals in schools by senior officials of the ministry of education based on education level and work experience

The new education and training policy (1994) has given attention to the management in schools to strength the teaching and learning process. The evolution of decentralization, efficient and professional, coordinated, participatory approaches are key areas where the school leadership encompassed.

Based on this guide line, MoE in different strategic documents (Education Sector Development ,ESDP IV,ESDP V) indicated how principals are recruited and developed from academically qualified ,motivated and ethically fit teachers for the realization of effective leadership in schools.

"---any teacher aspiring to become a leader will receive support from the school and training from the local network of school supervisors." (ESDPV) Furthermore, MoE in ESDP V expressed its concern; teachers and leaders development strives to turn teaching into a

profession of choice and improving skills in teaching, school leadership, and supervision and management.

From the above policy document overview, the study conductor observed that MoE, has strategically focused on internal recruitment approach to draw potential candidates in to the profession.

But research conducted on recruitment and selection of secondary school principals indicated several challenges like adequateness of development strategies for principals, the presence of merit based recruitment and selection. It is easy to understand that assessing these challenges and taking corrective actions will have contribution for the realization of effective instructional leadership.

Therefore, the study conductor prepared an interview for 5 human resource managers who were working in sample member schools and 15 teachers for FGD in order to collect data qualitatively.

Regarding the frame work, all the human resource administrators 5(100%) of the respondents indicated that there was no guide line that serves as a cornerstone to recruit and select school principals at school level. They argued that both principals and vice principals are recruited basically from teachers that have experience about the teaching learning process.

On the other hand the researcher observed that human resource administrators in the schools were not actively participated in the recruitment and selection of school principals although they do it for other administrative workers and teachers. It is the woreda capacity building office together with woreda education office who are currently running the recruitment and selection rolls for principals and vice principals.

FGD (100%) report on this regard revealed that the strong claim on clarity and transparency of recruitment and selection of school principals. One of the participants stressed the issue by saying;

" …I have been working as a teacher for the past 12 years. I was amazed with the issues of recruitment and selection procedures done with lack of clarity and transparency leading to the failure of injecting of competent individuals to the leadership dimension."

Another respondent replied that;

> "…as far as my experience is concerned (He thought for more than 30 years), we do not have strategically developed frame work that is clear and transparent enough to convince us. In fact vacancy will be post that invites competent individuals, but fail to meet its target. This might be because of friendship, political affiliation…"

One of the principals explained that;

> *"In principle I believe that recruitment and selection of school principals need to be merit based. qualification, experience knowledge and skill of competent individuals are critically important for today's schools. But for me, this alone does not guarantee effective leadership. Schools are very complex areas which require commitment. that is why government reflects its interest in selection and recruitment procedure although it contradicts with civil service proclamation. It is all about trust and realization of the policy ".*

To sum up 100% of both human resource administrators and FGD members confirmed the absence of clear guide line that serves as a cornerstone to recruit and select principals at school level. All human resource administrators participated in interview showed that they never participated in selection and requirement process of school principals. Finally 80% of the human resource administrators and 100% FGD respondents believed that principals recruitment and selection process was not merit based.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Summary

The main purpose of the study was to assess instructional leadership effectiveness of government elementary schools in Addis Ababa Arad Sub City. Principals professional involvement in the three dimensions that are defining academic goals, managing the instruction and curriculum and promoting a positive learning climate, Recruitment and selection of principals, the extent of teacher's participation in school leadership and major factors that hinder principal's effectiveness were areas assessed in the study.

Descriptive survey design was used to collect data from 5 purposively selected schools. 105 teachers, 5 principals, 10 deputy principals, 5 cluster supervisors and 5 human resource managers were sample members of the study which were selected by census and simple random sampling techniques. Open ended and closed ended questionnaire, semi structured interview and focus group discussion (FGD) were used as data collecting tools. Data obtained from respondents was analyzed using percentage, mean and standard deviation in order to answer the following basic research questions.

1. To what extent do school principals practice their instructional leadership roles?
2. What are the major areas were teachers involve in school leadership?
3. What are major factors that hinders school principals instructional leadership effectiveness
4. Do recruitment and selection procedures of principals properly implemented as per merit principles?

The analysis based on pertinent and reliable data collected from respondents led to the following findings:

5.1.1 Normative Characteristics

Female's participation at primary level was reasonably less than males. 4(40%) of school principals and 39(43.3%) of teachers were females. Most of the respondent teachers (55.6%) were in the age of 21-30 years and (80%) of the leaders were in the age 31-40. Majority of principals were relatively energetic and matured enough to take responsibilities.

All teachers 105 (100%) of the sample member fulfilled the minimum requirement of qualification needed at primary school level, 59 (56.1%) of them had first Degree, 45(42.8%) had Diploma and 1 (0.9%) masters degree. But regarding school principals 1 (10%) has Masters Degree in EDPM, 1(10%) has first Degree in EDPM and all the rest 8(80%) had first degree in different disciplines.

5.1.2 Framing Instructional Goals

The study has revealed that principals in primary schools of the sub-city were not effective in goal setting practice. This was supported by average mean and standard deviation of the four items (x^{-} =2.8, S.D=0.76) respectively. More specifically, principals practice in developing focused set of annual goals was poor (M=2.9), the extent to use student performance data to set the academic goals was also poor (M=2.7) .

5.1.3 Communicating Instructional Goals and Mission of the School

The grand mean of the four items designed to assess principal's goal communication practice revealed a magnitude 3.15 that confirmed moderate practice in the respective schools. Missions in the schools were communicated at moderate level (M=3.1). Annual academic goals were discussed with teachers at moderate level (M=3.4).But principals practice to align goals with daily curricular decisions was poor (M=2.9). Qualitative data also showed as principals lack the necessary skill and knowledge how to communicate school goals effectively to stakeholders

5.1.4 Supervision and Evaluation Practices in the Instruction Process

The grand mean of four items prepared to indicate extent to which principals involved in supervision and evaluation of the instructional process was 2.8 with grand standard deviation of

0.98. This confirmed the practice was poorly displayed in schools. The extent school principals conducted class room observations was moderate (M= 3.5 S.D=0.94). But post-observation conferences, critical part of the supervision process were poorly implemented (M= 2.4 S.D=1.02). The research further revealed that the school leaders were reluctant to ensure class room priorities such as student's discipline, protecting learning time and established standards of behaviors.(M= 2.5 S.D=0.99)

5.1.5 Coordination of the Curriculum

The grand mean of responses collected based on the four items to assess the extent at which principals were involved in coordination of the curriculum was 2.8 indicating poor practice. Principals were not able to ensure timely allocation of human, material and financial resources.(M=2.8, S.D=1.24) But, their moderate practice in follow up during evaluation of curriculum materials (text books, teacher's guides) was confirmed with arithmetic mean 3.2.

5.1.6 Monitoring Student's Progress

Teachers' responses collected using four items that show school principals role and responsibility in the area of student progress in learning teaching process were confirmed poor practice with grand mean 2.4 and grand standard deviation 0.87. Particularly the extent at which school principals discuss student's progress with parents on regular bases was rated very low (17.8%) and low (35.6%). On the other hand Principals were moderately practiced activities like, Test /exam /results discussion with staff (M=3.0, S. D=0.9) and collecting focused class room information from students (M=3.0, S.D=0.77).

5.1.7 Participation of Teachers in School Leadership

Teachers leadership contribution was moderate only in the area of co – curricular programs (x^- = 3.42) and evaluation of the team member performance evaluation (x^- = 3.21). Out of the total ten areas where teachers leadership roles were believed to be vital, only 2 (20%) of the areas were practiced by teachers at moderate level. 80% areas where teachers leadership roles believed to be vital were practiced poorly. On the contrary, teachers indicated high desire to participate in the leadership areas like school's academic goal setting (M=4.45), school's policy setting (4.39)

and school's budget planning (M=4.36). The average mean of the desire to participate in these three areas of school leadership was 4.4 Teachers criticized school principals because of narrowing the doors of teachers' involvement in different school leadership areas but principals link the issue with lack of interest by teachers.

5.1.8 Major Challenges for Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

The research has shown that out of the ten selected factors in which the study conductor believed they may negatively affects the instructional leadership effectiveness ,the first three identified with top adverse effect were;

- *Lack of shared vision ($\bar{x}$ =4.0 S.D= 0.49)*
- *Lack of clear academic goals ($\bar{x}$ =3.8 S.D= 0.44) and*
- *Lack of courage/ commitment by the principal, ($\bar{x}$ =3.7 S.D= 0.86).*

Factors such as;

- *Heavy workload on principals , ($\bar{x}$ =2.9 S.D= 0.84)*
- *un necessary interference by woreda/ sub city officials ($\bar{x}$ =2.9 S.D= 0.88) and*
- *Lack of instructional materials ($\bar{x}$ =2.4 S.D= 0.7)* were factors contributed less significant effect.

5.1.9 Recruitment and Selection of Elementary School Principals

100% of both human resource administrators and FGD members confirmed the absence of clear guide line that serves as a cornerstone to recruit and select principals at school level. All human resource administrators participated in interview of this research showed that they never participated in selection and requirement process of school principals. Finally 80% of the human resource administrators and 100% FGD respondents believed that principals recruitment and selection process was not merit based.

5.2 Conclusion

1. Although MoE in its policy document gave strong emphasis to turn school leadership to a profession of choice for the realization of effective schools, during this research time majority of elementary school principals were not qualified with school leadership. The practice to inject potential candidates to school principal ship lucks clarity and transparency.

2. Elementary school principals in Addis Ababa city Administration of Arada sub city were not effective in the practice of direction setting. There was no sense of owner ships for academic goals of schools. Missions of schools and instructional goals were not effectively communicated with stakeholders. As a result principals were unable to ensure that schools continuously runs on clear, measurable, and time bounded goals.

3. The practice of supervision and evaluation, one of instructional leadership function which demands expertise as well as commitment by the principal was displayed insufficiently. Post observation conferences focusing on teacher's instructional strength and limitations were minimal. Principals were not able to handle curriculum related problems such as shortage of teaching aids, laboratory equipments, chemicals and relevant training that enables teachers to deliver technology assisted teaching.

4. strong believe in actual participation of teachers in different school leadership is not a choice but a must to create conducive instructional process ,the study attempted to identify major areas where teachers displayed their leadership roles and their desire to participate in different school affairs. Accordingly, it has been found that co- curricular activities and team member performance evaluation were areas teachers displayed their leadership roles significantly. Although teachers show strong desire to contribute their leadership in the areas like academic goal setting, school policy setting and school budget planning, their participations in these areas during the research time were insufficient.

5. Regarding factors that negatively affects the instructional process in elementary schools of Arada sub city, the research revealed that the first four dominant identified factors were lack of shared vision, lack of clear academic goals, lack commitment/courage by the

principal and lack of skill and knowledge for the instructional process. Factors such as heavy work load on principal, un necessary interference by woreda/sub city and unscheduled meetings were identified with less significance effect.

Finally, it can be concluded that though the government emphasis the need of democratic, professional, coordinated, effective and efficient school leadership for the realization of the intended objectives, Government Elementary school principals in Addis Ababa city Administration of Arada sub city were not effective in their instructional leadership.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion reached, the following possible solutions are recommended so as to improve the effectiveness of the instructional leadership in elementary schools of Arada sub city, Addis Ababa city administration.

As evidenced by the study, the actual involvement of the stakeholders in direction setting, (school's mission and goals), goals communication to all school communities to enhance internalization and the commitment, requires professional interventions. Thus, the school leaders and cluster supervisors are advised to incorporate stakeholder's views on what should be achieved, how to be achieved and when to be achieved.

- Since students learning is primary functions of schools, effective supervision of the instructional process has to be the center of attention for school leaders. To this end, Addis Ababa city Administration education bureau, and Arada sub city education office in collaboration with Nongovernmental organizations need to build capacity of school leaders using short and long term actions. This can be achieved by organizing seminars, workshops and in-service trainings that enables the leaders to have minimum of B.A in Educational Planning and Management (EDPM).

- Shortage of necessary instructional materials hinders instructional leadership effectiveness of school principals. Therefore, for quality instruction, the sub city finance office and sub city education office in collaboration with other stakeholders need to work together for provision of adequate instructional materials. Ministry of finance and Addis

Ababa education bureau need to work together to create rules and regulations that enables schools to be engaged in income generating activities.

- A principal who is committed to practicing collaborative leadership is essential in today's education system where the demand of quality education by the society is at elevated level. The research pointed out that minimal involvement of teachers in school leadership affairs. Ministry of Education (MoE), Addis Ababa education bureau and other educational experts need to broaden the horizontal structure in schools. This might be done by strengthening autonomy and responsibility of department heads and injecting relevant competitive advantages that inspires them.

- Although principal leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping the school culture and driving organizational changes that ultimately lead to a more effective learning environment, the research indicated that recruitment and selection practice of school principals and vice principals was not merit based. All (15) of them were assigned by the sub city capacity building office.

- Furthermore the practice was against policy documents. The Ethiopian civil servants proclamation No.515/2007 which was ratified to provide the legal ground for the implementation of the overall HRM reform including recruitment and selection, the proclamation, in its Article 13, Sub-Article 2, states, "a vacant position shall be filled only by a person who meets the qualification required for the position and scores higher than other candidates" (FDRE civil servants proclamation 2007).Therefore, Addis Ababa city Administration and Addis Ababa city Civil service Agency need to work together to create recruitment and selection framework to ensure that Schools attract, select and retain the most suitable candidates by using efficient, fair, open and effective methods of attracting and selecting candidates.

References

Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau (2014) Annual Abstract, Addis Ababa.

Ahmed, Aragawe, (2006). A comparative study of managerial effectiveness between government and private high school of Addis Ababa. AAU: Unpublished MA thesis.

Ayalew, Shibeshi, (2000). Theories of Educational management, (EDAD 611). Addis Ababa University: unpublished teaching material.

Barth, R. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make a difference. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Blasé, J & Blasé J. (1999b). Effective instructional leadership through the teachers' eyes. High School Magazine, 7 (1), 16-20.

Blasé, J & Blasé, J.(1998). Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bookbinder, R. (1992). The principal: Leadership for the effective and productive school. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Bossert,(1982), The Instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administrational quarterly, 18 (3) 34 – 64.

Davis, B. (**2003)**. Developing leaders for self-managing schools: The role of a principal center in accreditation and professional learning. Lisse, Netherlands

Decision Making. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16(3), 302-319.

Edmonds, R. (1979) Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 15-27.

Eric Michel (n.d) Definition of leadership taken from **https://harvardership.wordpress.com**

Gordon A. Donaldson (2006) cultivating leadership in schools (2nd edition), New York.

Hallinger, P & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behaviors of Principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86 (2), 217-247.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of the empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational Administration Quartelry,32 (1), 5-44.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies (pp 179-201). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: Form managerial to instructional to transformational leader. Journal of Educational Administration, 30 (3), 35-48.

Hemphill, J. & Coons, A. (1950). Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus: Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University.

Hopkins, D.(2001) School Improvement for Real, London Falmer Press

Hoy, A. & Hoy, W. (2003). Instructional leadership: A learning-centered guide. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Katzenmeyer, M. and G. Moller (2001). Awakening the Sleeping Giant. Helping Teachers

Krug, S.E (1992). "Instructional Leadership. A constructivist" Education administration of quarterly Vol 28, No 3, P. 430 – 443

Larson-Knight, B (2000). Leadership, culture, and organizational learning. In Understanding schools as intelligent systems. (Ed. Leithwood, K). pp. 125-140. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Locke, E. & Latham, G. (1990). A theory of goal setting and task performance. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.

Miles, M. (1969). Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In F. Carver & T. Sergiovanni (Eds.). Organizations and human behavior. (pp.375-391). New York: McGraw-Hill. Ministry of Education (1994).

MOE (1994) Educational and Training policy. Addis Ababa. EMPDA

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. Advances in Educational Administration, 1 (B: Changing perspectives on the school), 163-200.

Rosenholz, S. (1989). Teachers' Workplace: the Social Organization of Schools. New York:

Sheppard, B. (1996) Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 42 (4), 325-344.

Snyder, K.K (1983) "Instructional Leadership for productive schools." Educational leadership. Vol. 40, No 5, P.32 -37

Stogdill, R. (1948) Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology. 25, 35-71.

Stogill, R. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature. New York: Free Press.

Taylor, L. and Bogotch, I. E. (1994). School Level Effects of Teachers' Participation Teachers College Press.

Teddlie, C. & Stringfield, S. (1993). Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10-year study of school effects. New York. Teachers College Press.

Teddlie, C. and Reynolds, D. (2000). International Handbook of School Effectiveness

Wong, K. (1996). Prospects. Special Analyses. Final Reports. Chicago, Illinois: US Department www.education.cu.portland.edu May15/2017/

Yukl (1998). Leadership in organizations. (4th Ed.). Upper Saddle River ,NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zenebe Baraki, (1992). Leaders role Behaviors of Senior Secondary School Principals in Ethiopia Unpublished thesis

Appendix I

Addis Ababa University

School of graduate studies

College of education and behavioral studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire for teachers

This questionnaire is designed to assess principal's instructional leadership effectiveness. The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used for academic purpose. Your careful and honest response determines the success of the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your response will be kept confidential.

Please read the instructions and each items in the questionnaire carefully before you give your response. If you want 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.

Name of the school _____

Woreda _____

Part I. Personal Data.

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

1. Sex: M _____ F _____
2. Age: a. below 20 _____ b. 21 – 30 _____ C. 31 – 40 _____

d. 41 – 50 _____ e. above 51_____

3. Years of experience in teaching

a. 1 – 10_____ b. 11 – 20 _____c. 21 – 30 __ d..31 and above _____

4. Educational Background

a. Diploma _____ b. B.A/BSc/BEd _____

c. M.A./M.Sc/ _____ d. Specify other _____

5. Specify your qualification (specialization)

Major _____ Minor _____

Part II

Instructional leadership Dimensions.

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.

This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of principal leadership. It consists of 19 behavioral statements that described principal job practices and behaviors based on the standard set by MOE (Ministry of Education). You are asked to consider each question in terms of your observations of the principal's leadership over the past school years. ***Circle the number*** that best fits the specific job behavior or practice of the principal in your school. For the response to each statement,

5 = Very high 4 = High 3 = Medium 2 = Low 1 = Very low

No	I. Frame the school goals Principal	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high
1	Develops a focused set of annual school – wide goals	1	2	3	4	5
2	Frames the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Uses need assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Uses data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals.	1	2	3	4	5
	II .Communicate the school goals **Principal**	**Very low**	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**	**Very high**
5	Communicates the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	1	2	3	4	5
6	Discusses the school's academic goals with teachers at staff meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Refers to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers.					
8	Ensures that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school	1	2	3	4	5
	II. Supervise & evaluate instruction **Principal**	**Very low**	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**	**Very high**
9	Point out specific strength/weakness in teachers instructional practices in post observation feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Conduct informal/formal observations in class rooms.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Ensure that classrooms priorities are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	1	2	3	4	5

	IV. Coordinate the curriculum **Principal**	**Very low**	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**	**Very high**
12	Ensures the timely allocation of resources(human, financial and physical) necessary for instructional process.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Monitors the classroom contents to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	1	2	3	4	5
14	Assesses the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement tests	1	2	3	4	5
15	Participate actively in the review of curricular materials.	1	2	3	4	5
	V. Monitor student progress **Principal**	**Very low**	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**	**Very high**
16	Discusses test/exam results with staff to identify strength and weakness.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Regularly meets teachers to discuss on students academic progress	1	2	3	4	5
18	Regularly discusses with parents regard students academic progress	1	2	3	4	5
19	Regularly collects classroom information from students focusing teaching learning	1	2	3	4	5

Part III

Teachers Involvement in school leadership

The Following 15 statements are believed to be areas where teacher's leadership roles are displayed in schools. Against each statement or item, please indicate the left hand column the degree to which you think teachers, either individually or as a group at present (now) participate in leadership areas , and in the right hand column indicate the degree to which teacher's desire (want/need) to participate in your school.

5 = very high **4 = high** **3 = average** **2 = low** **1 = very low**

No	Item	Present participation					Desired participation				
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1	Academic Goal setting	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2	School policy setting	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3	School budget planning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
.4	Staff development(training, mentoring, coaching)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5	Hiring new staff	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6	Community participation planning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8	Staff grivance	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9	Evaluating teachers performance	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10	Co-curricular programs	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Please specify other major areas where teacher's leadership role in your school is vital.

_____

_____

_____

Part IV

The following questions are about the challenges that affect principals instructional leadership roles in your school. Please rate each item from ***very high to very low*** by putting √ in the columns provided.

VH=very high H=high M= medium L= low VL= very low

No.	Item	VH	H	M	L	VL
1	Turnover of principals, teachers					
2	Lack of shared vision					
3	Lack of skill in the area of instruction					
4	Interference by woreda education heads/experts					
5	Lack of courage and commitment by instructional leader					
6	Lack of instructional materials					
7	Heavy workload on instructional leader					
8	Lack of clear goals					
9	Un scheduled external meeting					
10	Lack of reward for excel performance					

Please list other factors that you believe they are affecting instructional leadership in your school._____

_____

_____

What possible solution do you suggest to make the instruction process effective?_____

_____

_____

Thank you.

Appendix II

Part II Interview for principals and vice principals

1. Is there clear and transparent system of recruitment and selection procedures for principals?

2. Do merit principles (qualification, work experience, knowledge, skills and other capabilities are utilized during selection and recruitment of school principals?

3. Is there fair and open competition during recruitment and selection of principals?

4. What different roles do you practice as instructional leader in your school:

   A/in developing mission and school goals?

   B/ in managing curriculum and instruction?

   C/ in promoting an academic learning climate?

   D/ monitoring student's progress?

5. What roles do teachers play in your school :

   A/in developing mission and school goals?

   B/ in managing curriculum and instruction?

   C/ in promoting an academic learning climate?

   D/ monitoring student's progress?

6.What are the major factors that affect instructional leadership effectiveness?

7. what possible solutions do you suggest to have effective instructional leadership in your school?

Appendix III

FGD questions for teachers

I. **Recruitment and Selection of principals**

1. Is there clear and transparent system of recruitment and selection procedures for principals? If not why?

2.Do merit principles (qualification, work experience, knowledge, skills and other capabilities are utilized during selection and recruitment of school principals?

3.Is there fair and open competition during recruitment and selection of principals? if not why?

II. The followings are functions of instructional leaders expected to be accomplished by school principals.

Considering your school, answer the questions stated under each function.

A/ developing academic goals.

1. Who sets the goals?
2. How goals are internalized by the staff?
3. Are goals data driven?
4. How goals are communicated?

B/ Managing curriculum and instruction.

1. Does the principal conduct regular class room supervision?
2. Does the principal conduct post conference to set out strength and weakness identified through supervision? If not why?

3. How principals insure the overlap between curriculum objectives with students' achievements?

4. How principals insure class room priorities consistency with school goals?

C/ Monitoring student's progress?

1. Does the principal discuss exam and test results with the staff to identify strength and weakness? If not why?

2. Does the principal involve parents in discussion regarding student's academic progress regularly? If not why?

3. What is/are the challenge/s in students' achievement analysis and remedial actions?

Part III.

1. What are the major factors that affect instructional leadership effectiveness in your school?

2. What possible solutions do you suggest to have effective instructional leadership in your school?

3. What is /was your/your colleague's role in the following school leadership areas?

a. Academic goal setting b. School policy setting

c. School budget planning d. Staff development

e. Hiring new staff f. community participation

g. staff grievance resolving h. evaluating team member performance

i. co-curricular programs j. reform promotion

please indicate the reason if you were not involved in any of those activities

Appendix IV

Interview for Human Resource Administrators

1. Would you tell me your responsibility in this school?
2. How many Vice principals are there?
3. Can you tell me the academic qualification and experience of principals and vice principals?
4. Is there a frame work or guide line that indicates how school principals are recruited and selected?
5. Who is responsible in recruiting and selecting school principals?
6. What is your role or contribution in recruitment and selections of school principals?
7. Do you believe that there is merit based recruitment and selection process of school principals? If not why?
8. What do you suggest for better way of recruitment and selection practice of school principals?

Thank you for your kindly co-operation!