

**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND
CHALLENGES IN GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF
WOREDA FIVE IN ARADA SUB CITY**

BY

TADESSE ATNAFU

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

JUNE 2014

ADDIS ABABA

**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND
CHALLENGES IN GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF
WOREDA FIVE IN ARADA SUB CITY**

BY

TADESSE ATNAFU

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOLAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING &

MANAGEMENT

JUNE 2014

**Addis Ababa University
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Tadesse Atnafu Workineh entitled: *The Instructional Leadership Practices and Challenges in Government Primary Schools in Wereda Five Arada Sub City* and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of degree of Masters of Arts (Educational Planning and Management in Educational Leadership and Management) complies with the regulation of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Approved by the Examining Committee

- | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|
| 1. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| CHAIRMAN OR DEPARTMENT
OF GRADUATE COMMITTEE | Signature | Date |
| 2. <u>KENENISA DABI (Ato)</u> | _____ | _____ |
| ADVISOR | Signature | Date |
| 3. <u>YEKUNOAMLAK ALEMU (PhD)</u> | ----- | ----- |
| INTERNAL EXAMINER | Signature | Date |
| 4. <u>ABDUALAZIZ HUSSEN (PhD)</u> | _____ | ----- |
| EXTERNAL EXAMINER | Signature | Date |
-

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to God, for His love, His grace, and His countless blessings. Next, my acknowledgment goes to all of my instructors in Addis Ababa University School of Graduate Studies Department of Educational Planning and Management of Educational Leadership and Management. I am very much grateful to my thesis advisor, instructor Kenenisa Dabi, for his continuous follow up, encouragement, and guidance.

I would like to thank Ato Tibebu Mekonen (Cluster Supervisor in Yeka Sub City) with his wife Woynishet, for his endeavor to provide me comments and support in coordination of the data collection procedures from the start to the end. God bless you. I am very much grateful to Arada sub city Woreda Five government primary school principals and teachers for the permission, provision of general information about schools, and filling in my questionnaire, respectively.

I would like to thank my wife, Tiruye Alemu for her patience throughout my study. It was her understanding and support that enabled me to continue this through completion. Bereket and Hiwot, my son and daughter, have been my source of inspiration. Thanks to God.

Tadesse Atnafu

Table of Content

	Page	
List of Tables		I
Abstract		II
CHAPTER I		
1. Introduction		
1.1. Background of the study		
1.2. Statement of the problem	4	
1.3. Basic Research Questions	6	
1.4. Objectives of the Study	6	
1.5. Definitions of Terms	7	
1.6. Significance of the study	8	
1.7. Delimitations/ Scope / of the study	10	
1.8. Limitation of the study	10	
1.9. Organization of the Study	10	
CHAPTER II		
2. Review of Related Literature		
2.1. Overview	11	
2.2. Leadership Concepts	12	
2.3. Instructional Leadership	14	
2.4. The Role of Supervision	17	
2.4.1. Supervision in the Context of Ethiopia	19	
2.4.2. Concepts of Clustered Schools	22	
2.5. The Practice of Supervision in Instructional Leadership	24	
2.5.1. Clinical Supervision.	24	
2.5.2. Observation and Evaluation	25	
2.5.3. Conceptual Instructional Leadership	26	
2.5.4. Developmental Supervision	28	
2.5.5. Differentiated Supervision	29	
2.5.6. Contextual Supervision	30	
2.6. Findings on Instructional Leadership	31	
2.7. Challenges of School Leadership	36	
2.8. Summary of Supervision in Instructional Leadership	37	

Chapter III

3. Research Design & Methodology

3.1. Research Design & Methodology	39
3.2. Research Design	39
3.3. Population	39
4.3.1 Sample size	40
4.3.2 Sampling Technique	40
3.4. Source of Data	41
3.4.1. Primary Data Source	41
3.4.2 Secondary Data Source	42
3.5. Data Collection Instrument	42
3.5.1. Questionnaires	42
3.5.2. Interview	44
3.5.3. Document Analysis	44
3.6. Method of Data Analysis	44

Chapter IV

4. Data presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

4.1. Characteristics of respondents	47
4.2. Data Presentation and Interpretation	48
4.2.1. Teacher's observation and evaluation	49
4.2.2. Encouraging concern for achievement	52
4.2.3. Allocation of instructional resource	55
4.2.4. Development of academic climate	57
4.2.5. Coordination of Instructional Programs	59
4.2.6. Support at different teachers rank level	62

Chapter V

5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Summary of Findings	70
5.2. Conclusion	73
5.3. Recommendations	76

Reference

Annex

LIST OF TABLES

List of Tables	Page
Table 1: Distribution of Sample Respondents in Primary Schools	41
Table 2: Respondents in percent	44
Table 3: Likert Scale	45
Table 4: Characteristics of respondents	47
Table 5: Teacher's observation and evaluation	49
Table 6: Encouraging concern for achievement	52
Table 7: Allocation of instructional resources	55
Table 8: Academic Climate for instructional purpose	57
Table 9: Coordination of Instructional Program	59
Table 10: Response at different Teaching Rank	62

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to identify the instructional leadership practices and challenges in government primary schools “woreda five”. Concept of instructional leadership in the study emphasized on collegial classroom observations and specifically focuses on support, guidance, and encouragement of reflective teaching. Leadership for instruction emerges from both the principal and the teachers. In this thesis, lead teachers, the assigned cluster supervisor and principals are part and parcel of the instructional leadership of schools, since they all are needed to involve in providing support for novice collaboratively at various level. Current trends appear to indicate that there is a quality challenge still left unsolved in primary education of the Woreda, Often the instructional leadership (supervision) implement identical supervisory approach for all teachers’ despites the fact that some approaches are suited to a particular situation. The study strived to answer the extent of instructional leadership involved in supervision, in providing supervisory support at different level of experience, and the challenges. Total population of the study was 180. A descriptive survey research with both probability and non-probability sampling methods were employed. 90 respondents for the questionnaire and 31 respondents for the semi-structured interview questions were selected. The sample was drawn from all groups of staff members the beginners, proper and lead teachers. Standard questionnaire and open ended questions, and interviews with varied group of respondents were employed for data collection. Frequency, percentage and mean were used for data analysis and interpretation. The analysis made on the bases of six factors, that are observation and evaluation, encouragement, development of instructional programs, resource allocation, development of learning climate and differentiated teachers supervision (instructional leadership). As a result of the findings of the study, insufficient supervisory involvement was revealed and practiced occasionally (sometimes) by the instructional leadership. The supervision support provided for teachers at different experience level /rank/ were happened rarely (infrequently), and was seen the greatest challenge for all the schools. Participation of senior teachers in the school instructional leadership, observation of teachers, and staff development programs were major recommendations based on the findings.

Key words: SUPERVISION; LEADERSHIP; INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP; INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP SUPERVISION.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

In Ethiopia, primary education lasts eight years and is split into grades 1-4 (primary first cycle) and grades 5-8 (primary second cycle), and the same is true in Addis Ababa City Administration. Education in the country comprises formal and non-formal basic Education opportunities as a system to expand access and as part of an ongoing effort to provide education to its citizens. Side by side, the issue for improving the quality of education at school level is one of the priorities that requires due attention and has been given unlimited involvement by the higher officials and people in the world of academia. Through the provision of necessary inputs to schools and other institutions, achievements have been registered in the form of increased access to education at all levels. However, despite the progress made in improving the quality of inputs, there is an even greater need to improve the quality of the teaching-learning process through a regular and constant school support and guidance to better and enhanced educational outcomes.

There have been several calls on the instructional leadership on how to make the education system to be vibrant in the quality of products after several quantity of mass failure and half-baked products of various educational institutions around the world including our country Ethiopia. The quality issue over the years has generated a lot of debate and argument among Ethiopians on the newspapers, radio and television programs, including parents, religious bodies and non-governmental organizations.

It is well understood that effective instructional leadership is essential for improving quality education. The recognition that the task of improving instructional leadership in schools and raising the performance of both teachers and pupils rests with all the key performers in the education institution including head teachers, assistant principals, supervisors and parents. This study identified the supervisory practices and challenges of the instructional leadership (head teachers, principals, and cluster supervisor) in primary schools of “Woreda Five” by analyzing sampled data in all the government schools of the Woreda.

Instructional leadership is often defined as a blend of several tasks, such as supervision of classroom instruction, staff development, and curriculum development (Smith & Andrews,

1989). Taken together, Glickman (1985) and Pajak (1989) succinctly conceptualize and illuminate the responsibilities and activities of what is broadly referred to as instructional leadership. Glickman (1985) defined the five primary tasks of instructional leadership as direct assistance to teachers, group development, staff development, curriculum development, and action research. He notes that it is the integration of these tasks that unites teachers' needs with school goals. Pajak's (1989) research on what functions "should" be a part of instructional leadership generated a similar list of tasks, but also included planning, organizing, facilitating change, and motivating staff.

Likewise, Schön's (1988), concept of instructional leadership emphasizes collegial classroom observations and specifically focuses on support, guidance, and encouragement of reflective teaching. Glickman (1992) described ideal instructional leadership as a collaborative endeavor enacted in a supportive environment that leads to an all-school action plan. Reitzug and Cross (1993), have discussed an inquiry-oriented practice of instructional leadership (i.e., "critical collaboration") that encourages teacher voice and acknowledges diverse contexts as well as the complexity of teaching; the principal's role is one of facilitating a teacher's thinking about practice. By comparison, Smyth's (1997) approach is more inclusive; he conceptualizes instructional leadership as a discursive, collaborative, and critical study of classroom interaction to achieve a just and democratic world.

The emphasis for school improvement today is on student achievement, and on identifying students' needs and creating various mechanisms through which these needs can be met. In defining quality, Schonberger and Knod (1997) point to the lack of clear definitions of the term and infer that quality denotes a desirable characteristic in output of goods and services, as well as processes that make and deliver those outputs in ways that please customers. In spite of differences in meaning however, the concept of quality reflects how scholars think about quality, and issues that leaders (managers) at all levels needed to be addressed if quality is to happen. In its basic sense, Fry, Stonier and Hattwick (2001) refer to quality as the ability of a product or service to consistently meet or exceed customer expectations. While McShane and von Glinow (2000) define quality as the value that the end user perceives from a product or service, Mondy & Premeaux (1993) describe quality as the degree of excellence of a good or service. The implication is that a product or service has quality when its features satisfy and anticipate student needs and expectations, and conforms to a standard.

If we look at some of the changes that have occurred in instructional leadership (supervision) since the early days, we can a bit arbitrarily establish historical time frames for the evolution of

instructional leadership. The term supervision is derived from word “Super video” meaning to oversee, Adepoju (1998). It is an interaction between at least two persons for the improvement of an activity. It is also a combination or integration of processes, procedures and conditions that are consciously designed to advance the work effectiveness of individuals and group. Adepoju (1998) defines school supervision as the process of bringing about improvement in instruction by working with people who are working with pupils. It has also been described as a process of stimulating growth and a means of helping teachers to achieve excellence in teaching. Supervision in school therefore is a vital process and combination of activities which is concerned with the quality of teaching and improvement of teaching for students learning in the school framework.

The success or failure of any educational enterprise depends among other factors upon the supervision of such enterprise be it a school or an organization. Thus the provision of quality education success of any school achieving its goal and objectives depends on the professional responsibilities and role of the supervisors (instructional leadership). In the school system, both auxiliary and trained teachers are faced with various problems. The problems which may be personal, administrative, if not checked could lead to non-achievement of the school predetermined objectives. In view of this, it now becomes necessary that the principal and lead teachers as immediate supervisors, always available in schools with a supervisory role to play in order to enable the teachers solve instructional problems and the achievement of pre-determined objectives (Babson, 2005).

In Addis Ababa City Administration (in Ethiopia) from the perspective of supervision as a role, is considered as official activity performed by supervisory personnel (cluster supervisors) and school administrators. However from the perspective of supervision as a process, not only supervisory personnel (cluster supervisors) and school administrators, but also staff members do perform supervisory function by giving advice and guidance to other staff members in a school. From this perspective, supervision is not a monopoly practice of supervisory personnel. In this research, instructional leadership is supervision that is regarded as shared activity among staff members including cluster supervisor, principal, department leader, and teachers, on the basis of mutual trust and understanding in a school.

1.2. Statement of the problem

The principal purpose of this research paper was to identify practices and challenges of instructional leadership in “Woreda Five” governmental primary schools that are organized in one cluster. Instructional leadership (Supervision) is a way of stimulating, guiding, improving, refreshing, encouraging and overseeing certain group with the hope of seeking their cooperation in order for the supervisors to be successful in their task of supervision, Ogunsaju (1983).

Instructional leadership in schools needed to draw on a body of professional knowledge to respond to the wishes of school community within the educational contexts. Instructional leaders must understand school contexts, and how the contexts affect the students’ continuous learning. They should be able to demonstrate their knowledge and skill on how to structure the support (observe and evaluate) to meet the physical, social, conceptual and intellectual development of teachers and characteristics of the students at schools.

The school instructional leadership should be able to encourage learning environment, and provide guidance of teachers at different level accordingly. These are supposed to be majority of the problems facing a huge number of schools in the city administration as far as quality of education is concerned in the school system. Insufficient supervisory support by the instructional leadership in the teaching learning process appeared to be a difficulty probably not only in “Woreda Five” primary schools; undeniably it can be said a problem in all other sub cities and regions as well.

School instructional leadership (supervision) should be able to promote, support and create conducive environment for effective learning and teaching activities at schools. They are also expected to be able to create and maintain safe, inclusive and challenging learning environments and promote fair and equitable behavior management system. They need to use simple and appropriate communication techniques; to have a repertoire of effective supervisory work strategies and use them to implement well-designed support .They should regularly support and guide all aspects of their practices to ensure how they are meeting the needs of the school communities.

The researcher has lived in the this Woreda around Betelhem School and has got the opportunities to observe the practice of supervisory support and guidelines provided by the schools leadership in place, but which was happened without differentiating the type of supervision required in varied situations.

Greenfield (1985), defines instructional leadership in the broad sense by stating, “instructional leadership involves actions undertaken with the intention of developing a productive and satisfying working environment for teachers and desirable learning conditions and outcomes for children” (p. 56). Instructional leaders need to understand the practice and theoretical underpinnings of contemporary leadership and apply that knowledge in school improvement. They should be well versed in the latest research and development in pedagogy, curriculum, observation, and assessment.

The thesis could also verify the gap on how the supervisors and teachers themselves know and utilize the concept and technique of supervisory practices with regard to classroom follow up and observation procedures. There has to be clear understanding on how the instructional leadership importantly practicing instructions and the teachers have got conceptual awareness of the roles of supervisory instructional leadership and even skills of the supervisors. We need to know the instructional leaderships (cluster supervisor, principals and senior teachers hence all perform ipso facto are supervisors) have the understanding how to facilitate and practicing supervision opportunities with the teachers.

Current trends appear to indicate that there is a quality challenge still left unsolved in primary education of the Woreda, not only in the form of deterioration of student achievement but also in the form of decline in the quality of teacher and school instructional leadership professional performance. Weakness in the latter critical input in school instructional leadership is usually manifested in poor supervision practice or leadership process in the school system which in turn will negatively affect the effectiveness of classroom teaching learning delivery.

The thesis deals with identification of practices and challenges of the schools instructional leadership supervisory roles on the bases of the above mentioned facts that can commonly appear as major problems of the learning environment. It aspires to manipulate when and how frequently the instructional leadership provide support for teachers at different experience level and how adequately has been conducted to enhance students leaning achievement.

1.3. Basic Research Questions

- To what extent do the instructional leadership involve in its role of supervision?
- To what extent does the instructional leadership provide relevant support for teachers at different experience level?
- What are the challenges of the instructional leadership in improving instructions?

1.4. General Objective

The principal purpose of this study was to identify instructional leadership practices and challenges in government “woreda Five” clustered primary schools.

Specific Objectives

- To explore the school instructional leadership practices in support of the teaching learning environment.
- To explore the relevance of supervisory support to teachers at different rank/career/.
- To find out the instructional leadership supervision effectiveness in the schools.

1.5. Definition of Key Terms

Clinical supervision: is a process for the improvement of professional growth, which usually consists of several phases, such as conference, observation by a supervisor, and post-conference (Glatthorn, 1990).

Cognitive coaching: is a nonjudgmental process in which supervisor attempts to facilitate teacher learning through a problem solving approach by using questions to stimulate the teacher’s thinking (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

Government Schools: Primary schools which are under financial and administrative control of the Ministry of National and Regional Education.

Instructional leaders: in this context, are defined as school personnel who are responsible for instructional leadership of supervision of teaching and learning performance within the school.

Instruction leadership- in this context, is supervision that encourages a continuous involvement of all school personnel in a cooperative attempt to achieve the most effective school program, through classroom observation, encouraging teachers, allocation of resource, development of academic climate and coordination of instructional programs.

Leadership - Define and establish a sense of mission, **and** a responsibility rather than a rank and to earn and keep the trust of others.

Peer coaching: Process of supervision in which teachers work collaboratively in pairs and small teams to observe each other’s’ teaching and to improve instruction (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000).

Professional development: is a major component of ongoing teacher education concern with improving teachers’ instructional methods, their ability to adapt instruction to meet students’

needs, and their classroom management skills, leading to the professional growth of the teacher (Wanzare& Da Costa, 2000).

Role- Set of behavior that is characteristics of supervisors in instructional leadership

Supervision-Is instructional leadership that relates perspectives to behavior, clarifies purposes, contributes to and support organizational actions, coordinates, interacts, provides for maintenance and improvement of the instructional program, and access goal achievements.

Supervisors: Are school personnel's involved in conducting instructional leadership (the principals, department heads, senior teachers, and appointed by the Woreda education office).

1.6. Significance of the study

The instructional leadership of the schools must have relevant knowledge of national and regional development policies and strategies. School leaders could play a great role in the development and improvement of quality of education, and give appropriate and collaborative service to the society members' as well as to teachers in particular. Moreover, leadership styles affect teachers' job performance in the school area. Accordingly, because of the inappropriate support and guidelines delivered to school teachers, the teaching learning process necessarily will affect the quality of classroom interactions. Concomitantly, the instructional leadership support and involvement in supervising the teaching learning development basically can lead to a considerable student leaning improvement.

The supervision provided by the instructional leadership, has to be employed objectively through identified and targeted problem solving initiatives through practicing supervisory options in instructional leadership, through employing contextual, conceptual, clinical, developmental and differentiated supervision approaches for teachers at different level of experience.

The school leadership responsiveness in delivering different leadership styles as per the situation and readiness level of teachers, determinedly will take the larger part of action need to achieve school goals. Teachers perform well and might not perform effectively because of the leadership style employed on them. If the instructional leadership cannot meet the teacher's needs; the entire teaching experience may not be as effective as it could have been.

It is expected that from the finding of this study the educational leadership of primary schools and other co-managerial bodies in the Woreda may get some inputs about the practices and challenges of instructional leadership applied on teachers' cognitive effect and thereby students learning outcomes. The thesis finding will be helpful for the City, the zone and at district level on how the school instructional leadership supervisory roles can be carried out collaboratively by

the cluster supervisor, principals and senior teachers, and how to apply their instructional leadership style to achieve educational objectives. It may give cognizance to the principals on how their leadership style can affect the teachers' motivation positively or negatively. The study provides reliable findings on what kinds of leadership and feedback has to be delivered to school principals and teachers in primary school.

Besides the above mentioned significance, as far as the schools recorded documents are concerned, there has no research that has been conducted about the instructional leadership collaborative roles of supervision specifically in these 5 primary schools of the cluster ("Woreda Five"). For this reason, the research findings will provide an insight into the valuable existence of instructional leadership in the institutions.

The supervisory role of instructional leadership is primarily to create opportunity for teacher's professional knowledge and skill development and thereby resulting in the advancement of student learning. Hence this study is intended to identify the basic role of instructional leader's supervision in Addis Ababa city administration of Arada Kifle ketema, "'Woreda Five" government schools", thus, the study has greater importance to enhance the instructional leadership (supervision) performance and can be used at the schools level for efficient delivery of educational policy issues.

- Teachers and supervisors will be capable of realizing where the real practice and of challenges of the instructional leadership (supervision) can be affected, and can identify the appropriate way of delivering classroom observation and evaluation for the improvement of instructions. Thereby, the writer believes that the schools personnel unquestionably can develop positive attitude towards the style of instructional leadership.
- It is believed that the school leadership will attempt to utilize their skills and potentials in solving instructional problems by providing the necessary facilities, allocation of instructional resources, and learning environment, meetings and workshops for instructional purpose at the school level of the success of educational goals.
- It is also believed that, the educational officials at higher level consider the values and impact of instructional leadership to the teachers' job satisfaction, pupils learning quality of education, and take the necessary measures such as facilitating in service program to develop the capacity of the participants and instructional leadership practices.
- The study findings can be used to improve the instructional leadership of primary schools.

- The study can initiate other researchers to undertake detailed researches on its positive aspects or the challenges at regional level.

1.7. Delimitations/ Scope / of the study

The study was carried out in Addis Ababa city Administration Arada Kifle Ketema of “woreda Five” government primary schools because of the closeness of the schools with the researcher working place, so that some of the activities of the leadership there in the schools were inviting to carry out the research. Total number of government schools in the Woreda is 5, and all the schools that are assembled in one cluster were included under the study. However, only these schools were used to be sources of data to find out relevant data. Moreover this descriptive survey research was delimited to government primary schools of the Woreda, for the sake of in depth analysis concomitant with the time provided.

1.8. Limitation of the study

Several limitations are intrinsic in this study. In the Woreda all primary school instructional leaders have to be invited as a respondent in the study. Yet, this study is limited to government primary schools only because of time and financial limitations. However, quality improvement quests are not restricted alone to these schools only since both are used to be learning centers for school aged children.

It would have been more preferable if the study embraces some other Woreda:s and even privately owned schools as mentioned and so that would make the finding more complete. On the other hand, participants responding to the survey questions in an honest and unbiased manner were impossible to control.

1.9. Organization of the Study

The study comprises five chapters. The first chapter is the introductory part which includes the background information of the study, statement of the problem, aims of the study, significance, delimitations, limitations and objectives of the study. The second chapter presents literature review pertinent to the area of the instructional leadership, different approaches to supervisory process, leadership styles and their connection with the students learning outcome.

The third chapter details the research design and methodology employed in the study. Analysis and interpretation of the research findings are presented in the fourth chapter. Lastly, discussions, conclusion and recommendations are presented in chapter five.

2. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP /SUPERVISION/

2.1. Overview

There are many different definitions of instructional leadership. The definition depends on the source and philosophy of the researcher that is reporting the definition. Instructional leadership supervisory process includes heads of institutions and their assistants, heads of department, master teachers, subject coaches, lead teachers, program directors, associate and assistant superintendents. Glickman, and others (2004).

In this research paper, the entire meaning of instructional leadership is in school supervision, which is regarded as shared activities among staff members including cluster supervisor, principal, department leader, and teachers, on the basis of mutual trust and understanding. Instructional leadership is one of the functions of education that offers opportunities for schools to improve teaching and learning and the professional development of teachers (Kutsyuruba, 2003; Arong & Ogbadu, 2010). Improving supervision of instruction in school is of great concern to educational authorities worldwide.

In this chapter the literature review deals on several conceptual approaches in instructional leadership and more importantly literatures related to instructional leadership roles of the supervisory process. The literature discussed on the concepts in relation to the context of supervision in Ethiopia, clustered schools, and supervisory background and practices of the study site Addis Ababa city administration. Accordingly, a review on the role of Supervision, instructional leadership and finally supervisory options and summary of supervisory options for instructional leadership is presented.

2.2. Leadership concepts

Leadership is defined differently by different authors; Terry called it “the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for group goals”. In the context of this definition the knowledge, values, structure, and skills are necessary for a principal as a leader to inspire all members of the school community to work together toward the goal of an excellent education for all students. According to Thomson, Leadership is best defined as “getting the job done through people”. This definition means that two things are necessary for effective leadership: accomplishment (getting the job done) and influencing the others (through people).

On the other side, according to Weber, leadership is described as power granted with the will of the followers. It is authority readily invested in a trusted person and thus qualifies as a kind of moral and transformational power over the organization.

In most definitions of leadership the two functions are generally considered indispensable to its meaning: setting directions and exercising influence. Each of these functions can be carried out in different ways, with such differences distinguishing the many models of leadership from one another. Yukl comments, leadership influences “the interpretation of events for followers, the choice of objectives for the group or organization, the organization of work activities accomplish objectives, the motivation of followers to achieve the objectives, the maintenance of cooperative relationships and teamwork, and the enlistment support and cooperation from people outside the group or organization”. He further explained the popular distinction between “doing things right” (management) and “doing right things” (leadership) as largely meaningless: accomplishing success as a leader, requires “doing right things right.”

Leading is establishing direction and influencing others to follow that direction. But this definition isn't as simple as it sounds because leadership has many variations and different areas of emphasis. Common to all definitions of leadership is the notion that leaders are individuals who, by their actions, facilitate the movement of a group of people toward a common or shared goal. This definition implies that leadership is an influence process. In this research the distinction between leader and leadership is important, but potentially confusing. The leader is an individual; leadership is the function or activity this individual performs and an influence process.

The word leader is often used interchangeably with the word manager to describe those individuals in an organization who have positions of formal authority, regardless of how they actually act in those jobs. But just because a manager is supposed to be a formal leader in an organization doesn't mean that he or she exercises leadership. *“Not all leaders are managers, nor are all managers leaders”*. An issue often debated among business professionals is whether leadership is a different function and activity from management. Harvard's John Kotter says that management is about coping with complexity, and leadership, in contrast, is about coping with change. He also states that leadership is an important part of management, but only a part; management also requires planning, organizing, staffing, and controlling. Management produces a degree of predictability and order. Leadership produces change. Kotter believes that most

organizations are under led and over managed. He sees both strong leadership and strong management as necessary for optimal organizational effectiveness.

To help managers refine these skills, leadership-training programs typically propose guidelines for making decisions, solving problems, exercising power and influence, and building trust. Peter Drucker, one of the best-known contemporary management theorists, offers a pragmatic approach to leadership in the workplace. He believes that consistency is the key to good leadership, and that successful leaders share three abilities which are based on what he refers to as good old-fashioned hard work: To define and establish a sense of mission, to accept leadership as a responsibility rather than a rank and to earn and keep the trust of others.

In Drucker's words, "Effective leadership is not based on being clever; it is based primarily on being consistent." Very simply put, leading is establishing direction and influencing others to follow that direction. Keep in mind that no list of leadership traits and skills is definitive because no two successful leaders are alike. What is important is that leaders exhibit some positive characteristics that make them effective managers at any level in an organization. (Source: Internet www.Cliffsnotes.com, By Ellen A. Benowitz, M Ed Cliffs Quick Review *Principles of Management*. Copyright © 2001 Hungry Minds, Inc.).

2.3. Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership is defined by DeBevoise (1984) as those actions that are taken by a principal or allocated to others that facilitate student learning. Calabrese (1991) defines instructional leadership as defining and promoting the school's mission, establishing parameters and goals for the school's instructional program. It can reasonably be ascertained that there is no single definition of instructional leadership. Several researchers have identified gauges that can be used to identify instructional leaders. In his 1991 study, Calabrese identifies several indicators that can be used to identify instructional leaders within schools. The indicators include: visibility, problem solving, and community awareness, support of staff, vision communication, and use of school resources, teacher in-service, school schedule and promoting a positive school climate.

The concept of 'instructional leadership' has had a long history. Its origins can be traced back to the 19th century under the inspection systems that existed in North America, England and Australia. It rose to prominence again in the United States in the 1970s when the instruction dimension of the role of the principal was emphasized. Since the 1970s the concept has continued to evolve, although its definition remains somewhat confusing. From the 1960s onwards, definitions ranged from any activity in which the principal engaged in order to improve

instruction, to certain types of activities or actions such as classroom observation (Gorton, 1976:72-3). During the 1970s and early 1980s, textbooks on educational administration focused on 'supervision'. The literature promoted the view that effective supervision of instruction could improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom. Supervision existed for the primary purpose of improving instruction (Neagley & Evans, 1976: 104).

In a broader view, instructional leadership also refers to all other functions that contribute to student learning, including managerial behaviors (Donmoyer & Wagstaff, 1990; Murphy, 1988). Whereas the principal remains the educational leader of the school, teachers, who have requisite expertise or information, exercise leadership collaboratively with the principal. Collaborative inquiry supplants principal-centered supervisory practices (Reitzug, 1997). As teachers inquire together, they encourage each other toward answers for instructional problems. Leadership for instruction emerges from both the principal and the teachers. Principals and teachers discuss alternatives rather than directives or criticisms and work together as "communities of learners" in service to students (Blasé & Blase, 1999). Principals contribute importantly to these communities when they promote teacher reflection and professional growth. When teachers interact with principals as they engage in these activities, the teachers report positive changes in their pedagogical practices, including using various and innovative techniques and being willing to take risks (Blasé & Blase, 1999).

Current definitions of *instructional leadership* are richer and more expansive than those of the 1980s. Originally, the role involved traditional tasks such as setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. Today, it includes much deeper involvement in the "core technology" of teaching and learning, carries more sophisticated views of professional development, and emphasizes the use of data to make decisions (Deborah King, 2002). Attention has shifted from teaching to learning, and some now prefer the term "learning leader" over "instructional leader" (Richard DuFour 2002).

Typically, supervision in instructional leadership include heads of institutions and their assistants, heads of department, master teachers, subject coaches, lead teachers, program directors, associate and assistant superintendents. (Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, 2004),

The theorists believe that managers choose leadership styles based on leadership situations. Managers adjust their decision-making, orientation, and motivational approaches based upon a unique combination of factors in their situations: characteristics of employees, types of work,

organizational structures, personal preferences, and upper-level management's influences. Fred E. Fiedler's contingency theory centers on the belief that there is no best way for managers to lead.

Different situations create different leadership style requirements for managers. The style that works in one environment may not work in another. Situational leadership, developed by Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (2001), has been a platform used for leadership development in several educational organizations. Hersey and others (2001) Situational Leadership Model has three major components: 1) the relationship behavior of the leader, 2) the task behavior of the leader, and 3) the readiness level of the follower(s). Task behavior is defined by Hersey and others (2001) as "the extent to which a leader engages in spelling out the duties and responsibilities for the group" (p. 173); relationship behavior defined as "the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multi way communication" (p. 173); and readiness is defined as "the extent to which a follower demonstrates the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task" (p. 175). In the Situational Leadership Model, the task and relationship leadership behaviors are matched with the readiness of the follower to form four main categories. Those categories are 1) telling 2) selling 3) participating, and 4) delegating.

During the telling phase of the model, the leader must give specific instructions and closely supervise followers. The followers at this level do not display the necessary knowledge or skill to perform a particular task and therefore are not confident in their abilities. As the model progresses into the selling phase, followers still do not display complete knowledge or skill for a particular task, but they have become more confident or committed toward the work environment. The leader must still provide guidance but must also include the opportunity for dialogue with followers. The participation phase for the leader shifts from a directive role to an encouraging and communicating role. The followers at this level understand the tasks to be achieved but now may lack motivation and/or commitment. The final phase, delegating, allows the leader to observe/monitor followers. In addition, the leader provides opportunities for followers to take responsibility and to implement tasks. The followers in this phase have the required knowledge and skill to perform a particular task. Additionally, they are confident and motivated.

Leadership, in addition to being situational, should be a developmental process. Human development, accredited to the cognitive scientist Piaget, changes as individuals encounter new and different situations (Wlodkowski, 1985). This developmental process progresses through four stages: sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete operations, and formal operations (Ginsburg

& Oppen, 1979). The latter two stages are more applicable to adults. Adults at the concrete operations stage can perform logical functions (Glickman and others. 2001). Adults at the formal operations stage can rationalize and formulae abstract concepts (Glickman and others. 2001). In addition to the formal operations stage, a fifth stage, post formal operations, has been added (Kitchener, Lynch, Fischer, & Woord, 1993). The post formal operations stage describes adults that are engaged in scholarly thought. Instructional leaders that understand this type of developmental process may establish a better professional relationship with teachers (Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1998).

According to the intentional focus of the thesis writer, instructional leaders are found in a variety of educational venues: peer coaches, master teachers, principals, cluster supervisors, and senior and lead teachers. All are supervising individuals and assisting with the development of teaching and learning process. Often instructional leaders implement identical supervisory approach for all teachers in spite of the fact that some approaches are more or less suited to a particular situation. Aspiring varied supervisory option for instructional leadership has becoming challenging to explore a variety of approaches to aide in the development of all types of teachers.

Encouraging teacher development can be challenging; however, the school system hinges on the effectiveness, knowledge, and openness of an instructional leader (Reiman &Thies- Sprinthall, 1998). As noted by Glickman and others. (2001), effective supervision is the glue that holds together individual teachers' needs and school goals. Glickman and others (2001) also noted, "Glue, if functioning properly, cannot be seen" (p. 9). Likewise, when supervision functions properly, it also goes unnoticed; but when glue quits sticking, as in the case of inadequate supervision, the object (the school system) will collapse.

Supervision provides an opportunity to promote teacher efficiency, abstract thought, and a reflection on the teacher's own instructional methods (Glickman and others., 1995). If the instructional leadership lacks adequate knowledge of supervision and does not know how to meet the needs of the teacher, then an unproductive working relationship may be established (Acheson & Gall, 1980). The teacher could spend time being upset with the instructional leader and might not devote sufficient effort toward teaching students, more importantly, students' desire, ability, and levels of learning may be affected (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). When the instructional leader cannot meet the teacher's needs, the entire teaching experience may not be as effective as it could have been (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988).

2.4. The role of Supervision

Looking at the way specialists in supervision have defined the term may help us in our quest for a viable definition. Hennis wrote: “Supervision of instruction is what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching process employed to promote pupil learning”. More of that as it has been indicated in the book of “Supervision for Today’s Schools” by Peter F. Oliva and others offered a comprehensive definition of supervision: Supervision is instructional leadership that relates perspectives to behavior, clarifies purposes, contributes to and support organizational actions, coordinates interacts, provides for maintenance and improvement of the instructional program, and access goal achievements.

William H. and others; gave supervision broader interpretation, viewing it as a technical service requiring expertise, the goal of which is improvement in the growth and development of the learner. Stressing the helping nature of supervision, Jane Franseth stated, “Today supervision is generally seen as leadership that encourages a continuous involvement of all school personnel in a cooperative attempt to achieve the most effective school program.”.

To vary degrees, many occupations outside education use the supervision services and supervisors, whether as office boss, telephone supervisor, floor manager, construction foreman, department store head or assembly line supervisor. These individuals carryout the task of supervision in the original sense of the Latin word which is supervidio, “to oversee”, they demonstrate techniques, offer suggestions, give order, evaluate employees ‘performance and check on results.

The role of educational supervisors is practically different from some other organizations in its contextual service delivery, but is not at all clear from locality to locality and from state to state. Even with in localities, supervisory roles are often poorly delineated. The titles of supervisors are almost as varied as their roles. Depending on the area of supervision one wishes to emphasize, the responsibilities of a supervisor are varied and multi-faceted. A supervisor works on human relations, curriculum decisions, instructional strategies, staff development and orientations, budget concerns, assessment and evaluation. Wiles and Bondi 2000 affirm thus: “We see supervision in schools as a general leadership function that coordinates and manages those activities concerned with learning.” Hence supervisors must have vision and willingness to help changes take place in the schools entrusted under their professional watchful care.

As to the Federal Ministry of Education supervisors professional competency standard draft guideline (December, 2012), School supervisors are responsible for ensuring that decisions about curriculum, instructional strategies, assessment, and professional development are based on sound research, best practices, appropriate data, and other contextual information. They should confirm that observations and collaborations are used to design meaningful and effective experiences that improve student achievement. School supervisors (instructional leaders) must also capitalize on diversity to create a school culture that promotes respect and success for all students. They must be able to identify, clarify and address barriers to student learning and communicate the importance of developing learning strategies for diverse populations. They must be learners who model and encourage lifelong learning, too. Besides, they are expected to establish a culture of higher expectations for themselves and other school community members. (Ministry of Education, Draft supervisors' standard Guideline, 2012).

They are expected to create and facilitate communications between schools and Woreda and Zone Education Offices, Regional Education Bureaus and Federal Ministry of Education vertically in one hand and a horizontal relation amongst schools and the community on the other hand. They should regularly evaluate all aspects of their practices to ensure they are meeting the needs of the school communities.

Supervision as presented in the above mentioned thoughts is conceived as a service to teachers, and instructional leadership both as individual and in groups. To put it simply, supervision is a means of offering to teachers specialized help in improving instruction. As to the case of Ethiopia, supervisors are special service personnel to be found on the staff of administrators at the state (inspectors), district, and school level. Supervisors are often referred to as auxiliary personnel or staff, although titles and responsibilities of these auxiliary personnel differ from state to state and from school district to school district. The presence and effectiveness of supervisor is felt more keenly on the local than on the state level. The state supervisors/Inspectors' areas are so large to provide support and responsibilities so many that they cannot possibly make the rounds of the schools and teachers demanding services. Consequently, local supervisors especially around and at the schools level become key people in the school system.

2.4.1. Supervision in the Context of Ethiopia

In Ethiopia the Ministry of Education has been making concert efforts to ensure the quality of education by providing considerable support and guidance to the teaching learning process

through various mechanisms, including professional development of teachers, which is a key input to education delivery. The Ministry of Education in 2012 has established Supervisory structure which is concerned for educational quality improvement and assurance as an external eye named as Inspection Directorate at federal level. In a similar manner some of Regional Education Bureaus has employed the same structure and some others also started to work on the structural adjustment to separate the out of school external supervision /inspections/ from the in school and cluster level supervision. On the other hand, the writer of this thesis has got the chance to observe the establishment of clustered school centers in all regions. All over the Regions at local level clustered schools supervision has been introduced two decades ago and it is viable to see the clustered schools shared responsibilities in providing guidance and support towards educational quality improvement especially among primary schools.

Schools are the central places where children and youth get access to formal education. The fundamental purpose of a school is improvement of student learning. According to Sergiovanni And Starratt (2007), when a school's instructional capacity improves, teaching improves, leading to improvements in student performance. In many countries including Ethiopia officers responsible for supervision are classified as external and internal (school-site). Officers operating from outside the school are termed external supervisors or school inspectors.

In Ethiopia, supervision /inspection/ was first introduced in 1941/42 to the education system out of the need to coordinate and control the increasing number of schools, and has been conducted under the name of 'inspection'. The tasks of the inspectors were focused on inspecting financial matters and educational programs. A series of training programs was organized and conducted in Kokebe Tsibah School with course duration of one year. Statistics reveal that 124 inspectors were trained in these training undertakings. A change in policy in 1962/63 laid emphasis on the profession of support rather than on the financial regulatory tasks of inspection. Along with the change in the role of the service was labeled as 'supervision'. In addition to the supervisors trained by the AAU all inspectors those are active in the service were retrained as supervisor. The training program which was sustained up to 1968/69 was augmented by a summer program which was gradually transformed in to the summer program. This training program was maintained up to 1972/73. (Supervision Manual, Ministry of Education, 1995 E.C)

The overall governmental policy changes in 1973 again claimed for the reestablishment of inspection structure in the education sector at the department level and stayed functional from 1981 up to 1993. The concepts of "supervision" and "inspection" have been changed frequently in Ethiopian education system and the reason was not clearly pedagogical (Haileselassie, 2001).

Haileselassie stated that “with the name changes made we do not notice any significant changes in either the content or purpose and functions”.

From 1994 onwards, in order to improve the quality of teaching learning process and to achieve the intended objectives of the educational policy, supervision is determined to have dual approach that needs to be carried out by two different structured officials: the out-of school (external) supervision and school-based supervision.

The out-of school supervision has to be carried out by external inspectors / supervisors /, those who are concerned with the school monitoring and support in a periodic and time interval manner in light of accepted educational objectives (standards), studying the teaching-learning situation to determine the antecedents of satisfactory and unsatisfactory pupil growth and achievement, and to identify and make known (recommend) the missing or bottleneck quality issues in the school improvement. In other words, it is to provide an independent external evaluation of the school’s performance and making recommendations to promote its improvement. The National School Inspection guideline defines the basis of national system for the inspection of schools and actually has been introduced in 2011. The National Framework for the Inspection of Schools sets out the schedule of standards that all schools are expected to meet (Ministry of Education, 2014).

The latter and in fact the focus of this thesis is school based supervision that attempt at bringing about improvement in the quality of instruction and involve staffs as essential part of the process. This type of school-based (in-school supervision) will done by the school personnel’s (principals, lead teachers and cluster supervisors), aimed at providing guidance and support to teachers for their professional development and improvement in the teaching-learning process. Supervision at school level is the role that needs to be carried out by the schools instructional leadership.

Supervisors are advisers to teachers. Supervisor provides constructive advice to teachers so that the quality of education in schools may improve. Bartky (1973), a supervisor must be frank, honest and should be able to give proper advice to raise the standard of teaching and learning in schools. He must be strong, consistent and fair in dealing with other people. Adesina (1981) posited that supervisor should possess experience, have helpful attitude, genuinely enthusiastic about his job, and have zeal and vigour required dealing with problems occurring in schools. It therefore, presupposes that a good supervisor must be sincere, firm, approachable, and ready to

help people solve their problems and encourage others to work in harmony to achieve the goals and objectives of the school system. The supervisor must learn how to guide and direct efforts of the supervisee. This is also true in Addis Ababa city administration of Arad Kifle Ketema, in which the supervisors has to involve in learning about many factors that motivate teachers, understanding the learning and teaching environment and methods of supervision that are known to be effective.

2.4.2. Concepts of Clustered Schools

A cluster is a group of schools that work together to share experience, resources and training and resolve common problems in order to create opportunities for continual professional development, most of the training and development comes from the teachers themselves (Ministry of Education,2000).

As Dettmar and vivward (2002) stated, a cluster is a group of schools that are geographically as close and accessible to each other as possible. Each cluster normally consists of between three to five or five and seven in case of Ethiopia. Some regions have larger number of schools in a cluster based on the decision may be made by regional states. In this or that way, in all the Regions (in Ethiopia) as to the existing work experience of the writer and the usual clustered schools practice of the country, one school in each cluster has been selected to serve as the cluster center that should be as central and accessible as possible to its satellite (nearby) schools. It should have adequate facilities, the principal of the cluster center needs to be strong and committed manager, with vision and that can extend beyond her or his school to the needs of all schools and the community in the cluster.

According to Lind (1995) the term cluster was pioneered in 1960 in England where small rural and urban schools were in short of subject expertise, one in which small schools have sought to enhance their educational provision and overcome these challenges have been to form a collaborative group of schools which were called clusters.

School clustering exists in most Latin America, African and in many other countries, including India, Malawi, Nigeria, Thailand, Vietnam, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and so on. Some countries have not formalized the cluster structure as such, but have teacher resource centers, which serve the schools in the neighborhood. This is the case in Botswana, Gambia, and Tanzania. In some countries school clusters come about in to being spontaneously because of the schools and teachers felt the need to meet and exchange of resources and information. In other countries, however, school cluster resulted from government and non-government initiatives. In most

countries the role of clusters has been used for in service teacher training and as a mechanism for enhanced inspection and supervision of teachers (Dettimar and Vivward, 2002).

Based on Addis Ababa city administration Education office draft supervision guideline all schools are organized in to clusters numbered from five to seven. It is evident that the number of schools in a cluster needs to be three to five as to the Ministry of Education, however in Addis Ababa city administration because of the nearby accessibility of primary Schools the number of schools in a cluster is determined to be different. For that matter some other regions are also have varied number of schools in a cluster as to their own educational office discussion and availability of trained man power.

Since it has been understood and widely accepted in which the teaching and learning process is not statistics, it is evident that new concepts, research findings, current classroom approaches and methods have to be combined to take on new forms. Teachers have to assimilate and implement new trends and therefore need to acquire the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitude. After their completion of short term to long term training program provided in the teachers' education institutions the graduates are responsible to teach the school curricula without difficulty as required and the way in which the students acquire relevant learning objectives. As the increase of their service years of teachers the professional skills of teachers undoubtedly will be improved, however, teacher must need to keep informed themselves with the rapidly growing science and technology and learners need in the country where only very few teachers have the opportunity to attend professional development programs.

2.5. The Practice of Supervision in Instructional Leadership

Although several instruction of supervision (leadership) models and approaches for leaders were mentioned in a variety of literatures, this article is based on supervisory models (clinical, conceptual, developmental, contextual, and differentiated), which acknowledged a developmental process for both the instructional leaders and the teachers. Instructional leadership in this context is defined as any individual who is involved in instructional leadership of the school, supervision of teaching performance and student learning.

2.5.1. Clinical Supervision

It a form of inquiry designed to encourage reflection and analysis of supervisory methods and to develop and test hypotheses about what is effective and why (Cook, 1996). Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1993) and Cogan (1973) identified five major steps in clinical

supervision: 1) Planning conference 2) Classroom observation/data collection 3) Analysis/strategy 4) Post observation conference and 5) Post conference analysis.

There are several procedures to follow within the five major steps that can help direct the instructional leader. The planning conference is designed to inform the instructional leader of the objectives for the lesson. The teacher prepares a detailed lesson plan for the instructional leader to critique and provide a basis for suggestions (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer and others., 1993).

During the classroom observation/data collection step, the instructional leader observes the teacher teaching the lesson outlined in the lesson plan. The instructional leader should use an observation instrument to collect data on the lesson being taught (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer and others., 1993). This procedure provides written information for the teacher in the post observation conference.

The analysis/strategy stage is the core of clinical supervision; the instructional leader conceptualizes what was observed in the classroom and converts the analysis into readable data for the teacher (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer and others., 1993). The teacher then has a representation of how the instructional leader perceived the lesson.

The post-observation conference allows the instructional leader to dialogue with the teacher on the observed lesson (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer and others., 1993) and allows the teacher to give input on the lesson. In addition, the instructional leader and teacher work together to establish goals to be met at the next observation date.

The post-conference analysis is primarily for the instructional leader, who must analyze if the best supervisory practices were used with the teacher. This analysis provides a reflection exercise to help the instructional leader to improve the next supervisory conference (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer and others., 1993).

2.5.2. Observation and Evaluation in Instructional Leadership

Supervision, or instruction of supervision, has often been coupled with the evaluation of teachers. Though supervision and evaluation are certainly associated processes, they do not share the same intents (Glanz, 2000) writing about the differences between supervision and evaluation stated:

One of the most persistent problems in supervision is the dilemma between (1) evaluating a teacher in order to make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, and (2) working with the teacher as a friendly critic or colleague to help develop skills the teacher wants to use and to expand the repertoire of strategies that can be employed. (p. 209). Instructional supervision is an

ongoing formative process with the improvement of a teacher's instructional practices as its intent.

Evaluation, on the other hand, is summative and results in a rating or judgment of the teacher's professional performance. The intents of instructional supervision are bundled under the construct of teacher development, and Zepeda (2003), reported the work of many in her synthesis of the intents of instructional supervision. In short, the intents of instructional supervision according to her are to promote: Face-to-face interaction and relationship building between the teacher and the supervisor; Ongoing learning; Improvement of students' learning through improvement of the teacher's instruction; Data-based decision making; Capacity building of individuals and the organization; Trust in the process, each other, and the environment; Change those results in a better developmental life for teachers and students and their learning.

Talking about the nature of and discrepancy between supervision and evaluation, Zepeda (2003) contend that instructional supervision is an ongoing formative process with the improvement of a teacher's instructional practices as its intent, whereas, evaluation is summative and results in a rating or judgment of the teacher's professional performance. These some authors believed that supervision could be —the heart of a good evaluation system. However, according to Sullivan and Glanz (2000), most teachers fail to reap the benefits of instructional supervision since it is often replaced with evaluation.

The most important task of instructional leadership is teachers' supervision and evaluation. Instructional leadership means very little unless leaders are willing and able to observe teachers, offer advice about problems, and make formative evaluations that support and pinpoint areas to improve. Supervisors must have the knowledge of curriculum and instruction to know what to look for. According to Gardner, "To help others believe in themselves is one of a leader's highest duties". Following are some tips that are effective for supervision. Classroom observations will be used to observe what is actually going on in the class rooms. What is the performance of the teacher and how are the students performing. Meets with teachers after each visit to discuss what was observed. Encourages teacher to express feelings and opinions about observational data and class activities; Offers teacher alternatives teaching techniques and explanations of class room events; Give praise for specific development of teacher's skill if observed; Recommends resources and training programs in areas in which teacher need to improve.

2.5.3. Conceptual Instructional Leadership

This approach emphasizes the need for instructional leaders to familiarize themselves with influences affecting the teaching process. The conceptual approach is supported by the organizational theory which emphasizes that individuals are unified by a common set of ethics and that they work together within a system of structure to accomplish specific goals and objectives (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989). The key to the conceptual approach is for instructional leaders to understand the system of structure which they are leaders for. The components of the school structure (environment, fellow colleagues, administrators, etc.) influence the performance of the teacher.

The conceptual approach is based on the supervisory steps of clinical supervision and the collaboration established by the instructional leadership and teacher. In addition, the instructional leader considers other factors that may affect teaching. Edmeirer and Nicklaus's (1999) conceptual approach outlines organizational factors (e.g., work load, classroom climate, support of colleagues, decision making, role conflict, and support from instructional leader via supervision) and personal factors (e.g., life stage, teaching assignment, interpersonal, intrapersonal, conceptual level, experience in education, and knowledge of subject) that can affect a teacher. These factors influence teacher commitment and trust in the teaching system as well as the performance quality of the teacher. An instructional leader should understand how factors a teacher can and cannot control might affect teaching effectiveness.

All the important factors that appear to affect students' learning possibly having the greatest influence is the set of beliefs, values, and attitudes that administrators, teachers, and students hold about learning. So important is learning climate that it has been defined as the standard, viewpoint, and attitudes reflected in institutional patterns and behavior routine that improve student learning. The attitude that students shape about academic learning come, at least in part, from the adults in the school. It is clear that the norms for learning come from the staff's requirement of students: the amount of time needed for studying, the amount of work assigned, the degree of independent work that students can do, the degree of attentiveness students feel about the work given to them. High expectations are the fulcrum point that instructional leaders can use to get involved teachers, students and parents away from unhelpful un-encouraging attitudes.

The instructional leader and teacher set certain benchmarks based on personal and organizational factors influencing the teacher's performance. Changes in organizational and personal factors should be made when possible, and improvements toward the benchmarks evaluated in each

supervisory visit. For example, if the teacher is preoccupied with the notion that other teachers do not like him or she, the teacher's teaching effectiveness may suffer. The instructional leader should help the teacher with these feelings, whether they are warranted or not, because in the teacher's mind they are reality. This type of approach builds on a relationship between the instructional leader and the teacher and is initially used to develop trust.

2.5.4. Developmental Supervision

Glickman and others (2001) define developmental supervision as “the match of initial supervisory approach with the teacher or group's developmental levels, expertise, and commitment” (p. 197). The instructional leader operating in developmental supervision gives three types of assistance: 1) Directive 2) Collaborative, and 3) Nondirective.

Teachers who have low conceptual thinking, expertise, and commitment to their teaching will be matched with directive assistance. Teachers at earlier stages of development often have problems making decisions and defining problems, and they have learned few ways of responding to problems. Directive supervision places the instructional leader as the expert in charge of writing goals for the teacher. Teachers at moderate levels of abstract thinking, expertise, and commitment are best matched with collaborative assistance (Glickman and others. 2001). With this type of assistance, the instructional leader and teacher establish goals, identify how they will be achieved, and as a team note when the achievement should be noticed.

The teachers who think abstractly and demonstrate high expertise and commitment to teaching are best matched with nondirective assistance (Glickman and others. 2001). Nondirective assistance allows the teacher to be in control of how and when the goals will be achieved. The instructional leader is still involved, but takes a more passive role in the supervisory process. Glickman and others (2001), identify the behaviors of the instructional leader in this role as listening, reflecting, clarifying, encouraging, and problem solving. Developmental supervision was conceived by Glickman as comprising alternative approaches for helping teachers improve instruction.

Proponents of supervision portrayed supervision as developmental, requiring the supervisor to identify the developmental stage of the teacher and then to use appropriate techniques to assist the teacher's professional growth. They stress that; —Effective supervision must be based on matching orientations of supervision with the needs and characteristics of teachers. This statement is in agreement with what teachers are referred to as change agents. Basically,

education is meant for bringing change in the learner the same as supervision is also meant for bringing change in the teacher's behavior.

2.5.5. Differentiated Supervision

According to educational scholars, differentiated supervision would allow teachers to choose from a menu of both supervisory and evaluative options. Some of them expected regardless of experience or competence; all teachers will be involved in three related processes for improving instruction: teacher evaluation, staff development, and informal observations. Differentiated supervision, to be successful, needs an environment conducive to nurturing collegial relationships that are based on cooperation and mutual assistance.

Differentiated supervision is particularly teacher-driven and allows the instructional leader to become more of a mentor to the teacher. Additionally, the instructional leader can focus efforts where they are needed most (Glatthorn, 1997). Glatthorn (1997) suggests four options for differentiated supervision: 1) Intensive development (a special approach to clinical supervision), 2) Cooperative professional development, 3) Self-directed, and 4) Administrative monitoring. The teacher chooses one of the supervisory options; the instructional leader and teacher then focus on that area. Glatthorn (1997) suggests that intensive development, the first option of the differentiated supervisory model, is a process which requires many instructional leader observations which focus on learning outcomes instead of teaching methods.

Cooperative professional development is a mutually respectful process in which a small group of teachers agree to work together to facilitate their own professional growth (Glatthorn, 1997). The teacher becomes part of a two – or – three teacher teams undergoing the mentoring process together. The teachers observe each other's classes and give feedback on each other's' teaching. This type of supervision is less time consuming for the instructional leader because the teachers conduct the supervisory process, and the instructional leader serves only as a resource. Cooperative professional development can be used with more experienced teachers who seek collegiality (Showers & Joyce, 1996) or a beneficial mentoring experience.

Self-directed, Beach and Reinhartz (2000) state that self-directed supervision enables the individual teacher to work independently on professional growth and allows the instructional leader to have a more relaxed supervisory role. In this case, the teacher develops and carries out individualized plans for professional growth with the instructional leader as a resource. This technique is specifically for the teacher who prefers to work alone, yet seeks the aid of the instructional leader as a mentor (Glatthorn, 1997). Glatthorn (1997) and Beach and Reinhartz (2000) state that the teacher self-evaluates his/her teaching using videotape, inventories,

reflective journals, or portfolios to critique his or her teaching procedure. The instructional leader does not need to evaluate the lesson, but through individual conferences the instructional leader could provide feedback on improving the instruction if the teacher so desires.

Administrative monitoring is the final option available to teachers utilizing differentiated supervision. Glatthorn (1997) defines administrative monitoring as a process by which the instructional leader monitors the teacher's classroom with brief, unannounced visits. This option is used to monitor activity in the classroom and enables the instructional leader to be aware of any problems the teacher might be having.

2.5.6. Contextual Supervision

Contextual supervision matches supervisory styles with the teacher's development or readiness level to perform a particular teaching task (Ralph, 1998). Readiness levels are a function of the teacher's confidence and competence. Competence is the extent of the teacher's knowledge, skill, and ability to perform a certain task while confidence is the degree of self-assurance, willingness, motivation, interest, or enthusiasm to become engaged in the task (Ralph, 1998). Contextual supervision requires that the instructional leader have the ability to provide different leadership styles to match the teacher's developmental level of teaching. The contextual approach provides four quadrants for the instructional leader to use in determining the readiness level and confidence of the teacher (Ralph, 1998).

- Labeled high confidence and low competence. Here the teacher is energetic toward teaching but is not completely proficient with the material taught. The instructional leader establishes low support and high task for the teacher. Ralph (1998) refers to support as the amount of encouragement/ motivation given to the teacher and task is the amount of guidance provided in subject matter areas.
- Labeled low confidence and low competence. In this case the teacher is not energetic about teaching and not proficient in a particular subject area. The instructional leader provides the teacher with high support and high task.
- Labeled low confidence and high competence .In this quadrant, the teacher is not confident in his/her teaching abilities but is knowledgeable about the subject taught. The instructional leader would provide high support and low task to the teacher.
- Labeled high confidence and high competence. The final quadrant of contextual supervision is labeled high confidence and high competence. The teacher is enthusiastic about teaching and is proficient in the subject area. The instructional leader merely provides feedback to the teacher if there were any immediate concerns.

Accordingly, the instructional leadership contextual supervisory option, it is highly required to provide support and tasks in subject matter areas for teachers. This has to be on the bases of the teacher readiness level to perform the task which is said to be the level of confidence and should be provided based on the knowledge, skill, and ability of the teacher to perform a certain task which is identified as competences.

2.6. Findings on Instructional Leadership

It has been seen that an instructional leadership requires a substantive knowledge base that is grounded in the educational sciences if he/she is to be the resource envisaged by the role. We know that teachers are the most important determinant of student learning in-school. It is the teacher who organizes instruction, communicates learning goals, assesses students' progress towards those goals, and adjusts the content and interaction of the classroom in response. However, if all students are to reach proficiency, the country needs effective schools, not just effective classrooms. If a student moves from the classroom of an effective teacher to that of an ineffective one, their achievement gains are typically negated (Kane & Staiger, 2008; Sanders & Rivers 1996). Conversely, if a student is placed in the classrooms of effective teachers in consecutive academic years, their achievement is far more likely to accelerate. Further, teachers are more effective when their peers are more effective; indeed, teachers consistently report that peers have the greatest impact on their practice.

Consequently, it is the collective community of teachers, led by the principal, that is key to promoting school wide learning. In fact, empirical research shows that 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 others, 2003*)

In previous research, Cogan's (1973) argument was "the difficulties teachers face in learning how to teach and in improving their teaching on the job is at the root of the major problems in the pre service and in service education of teachers." The teacher education institution, however, can simply offer an introduction to instruction, providing a foundation and limited practice in demonstrating teaching skills. These skills become refined as a teacher gains experience on the

job. All teachers, no matter how long they have taught, can develop new skills improve old ones. As more becomes known about the instructional process with every passing year, newer and better ways of providing instruction continuously develop. The supervisors (the school leadership) function is to assist teachers in becoming familiar with newer approaches to instruction and in developing and improving instructional skills.

Besides, findings from Nampa's study likewise indicate that there is a significant relationship between performance-related feedback and teacher's performance. Proponents of instructional supervision consider post-conference in which feedback is given in supervision as an instructional dialogue type. The idea of providing feedback after supervision is pretty significant as it solely involves both parties sharing what was observed and experienced during supervision. According to Hunsaker and Johanna (2009), improving employees 'performance depends on balanced and considerate feedback. To this end, Nampa contends that there is need to take the concept of providing feedback as important as teachers themselves. This finding parallel with the statement by Armstrong and Barm (1998) that information is usually fed back to the employees in form of ratings against various performance dimensions. As regards the advantages of feedback, Armstrong (2003), further points out that feedback helps individuals get a broad perspective of how they are perceived by others than previously possible, increase awareness of and relevance of competencies, encourage more feedback, re-enforce desired competencies, give people a more rounded view of performance and finally, it clarifies to employees 'critical performance aspects or areas that need improvement.

Providing regular feedback to employees, contends Hunsaker (2009), will improve their performance. Most importantly, Nampa's study helps to understand the value of the concept of feedback provision as one of the dominant characteristics of performance management (p.50). In addition, it is worthy of noting that feedback on supervised teacher's performance takes place in the last phase of supervision, which is post-conference phase (Okumbe, 2007). Post-conference phase is crucial and allows both supervisor and teacher interact as the supervisor provides feedback regarding he/her observation during supervision and entertains teacher's reaction to given feedback.

As an instructional source, supervisors provide, not only a diagnosis of teaching, but also feedback that enables teacher's professional growth and development. Above all, this phase has a significant bearing on the success of supervision and requires qualities like intimacy, honesty, tactfulness, considerateness alongside mutual understanding from both parties. Regarding significance of feedback, Hunsanker and Hunsaker (2009), asserts that providing structured feedback through formal performance appraisal process can increase productivity and morale

and decrease absenteeism and staff turnover in organization (p.50). Feedback is also regarded as a performance motivator as it involves provision of information on progress toward accomplishing a goal, or data indicating where a shortfall occurs (Newstrom&Bittel, 2002).

Research by Montgomery (1999) has also publicized that most teachers lack grounding in relevant teaching theory and become susceptible to fashions and fads in teaching. Therefore, many teachers are unable to develop an effective system for teaching. Effective leadership by the instructional leader, however, provides a platform for improving the teaching process. Teacher's attitude toward supervision is also of great concern. Kramer and others (2005) found through findings that there is a significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in low performance schools and the teachers in high performance schools. Teachers in high performance schools on the average had more positive attitudes toward supervision of instruction than teachers in low performance schools. This, in effect, implies that some teachers favor instructional supervision while others do not like at all. According to Kramer and his colleagues (2005), teachers in high performance schools view supervision of instruction in a more positive light than those in low performance schools. In analyzing individual items from the questionnaire there are several areas where teachers in low performance schools feel supervision is lacking. They went further reporting from their research study findings that responding teachers in low performance schools do not feel they are motivated or encouraged during the observation or supervision process. Overall, they do not receive frequent *feedback* regarding their teaching performance. Their supervisors fail to help them understand new instructional strategies and standards or identify resources for use in the classroom. This is in contrast to the attitudes of the responding teachers in high performance schools (Kramer and others. 2005).

From Kramer and others (2005) study findings, it can be surmised that supervision of instruction can have either negative or positive effect on the teacher depending on how the head teacher carries it out. This is another factor to consider, in fact. Supervision can encourage or discourage vis-à-vis teacher's attitude. Bias/prejudice is the may result in to negative attitude. Consequently, one of the keys to effective supervision is keep teachers abreast of supervision benefits through effective communication between the supervisor and the supervisee (Zepeda (2003). Still, more on teachers perspectives of supervision will be looked at for constancy in the study to be yet carried out.

Based on the above findings, it is partially revealed that general and instructional supervision has a significant correlation with teacher's work performance in schools. This is the very reason why the researcher of this study believes that the conspicuous decline of supervision of instruction

poses a threat on teacher's performance. This, of course, becomes a challenge among others for a country to meet its educational goals and objectives that are considered as the compass of education system of any country (Petty, 2004). Thus, the researcher intends to investigate further the problem on ground.

In a related development, Habimana (2008), study findings indicate that head teachers and deputy head teachers deemed supervisory practices extremely indispensable in schools. Besides, results indicated that the way head teachers and teachers stimulate students affects student's academic performance, and also from student's responses, the way head teachers delegate their supervisory duties affects the student's academic performance. Whereas, according to teacher's responses the way supervision is carried out does not affect student's academic (Habimana, 2008). Teachers and students reported that the time spent by head teachers on supervision of instruction does not affect the academic performance of students whereas head teachers reported the opposite.

While correlating supervision with quality teaching, Nambassa (2003), study findings indicate that lack of supervisors and inadequate inspection brings about poor quality teaching and learning in primary schools. However, Glickman (1990) contends that supervision is —a glue of successful school. The study revealed that a number of primary school teachers are not supervised at all. Sadly, it was revealed that supervisors/head teachers do not possess prerequisite supervisory techniques and skills and are inadequately facilitated to do their supervisory duties. Even teachers who reported to have been at least supervised, post-conference between supervisor and supervisee, which formally takes place right after supervision, was a rare thing to hear about, and yet this phase is crucial in supervision.

What does school leadership (supervision) to promote learning and support teachers? Over 25 years of research on effective schools has underscored the central role that school leadership play in creating the conditions and norms necessary to create such schools (e.g., Purkey & Smith, 1983). Leadership must build collaborative structures and cultures of trust. They need to provide support for educator learning and establish structures and deploy resources in support of student learning. Back and forth between different schools, classrooms, and institutional level of administration and policy, and therefore, he or she has a better sense of the whole school than individual teacher. Thus, head teachers entrusted with direct supervisory responsibilities are expected to have larger view of supervision than newly deployed teachers do. Simply put, a supervisor, in case of head teachers, must be an experienced, professional teacher (Okumbe, 2007). To emphasize the point, Newstrom and Bittel (2002), further assert that supervisors need

to engage in personal time management, solve problems, provide training to employees, and handle a wide range of communication.

Still Nampa's study reveals that effective supervisors expect nothing less than high productivity and good performance from teachers. It was also revealed that supervisors act as problem solvers and decision makers as they find out why something is going wrong and then decide what to do about it. In line with this finding, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993), mentioned in previously, assert that supervisor's view is larger than individual teacher's view as regard the improvement of school and classroom instruction.

2.7. Challenges of School Leadership

Leadership must build collaborative structures and cultures of trust. They need to provide support for educator learning and establish structures and deploy resources in support of student learning. It will be seen that an instructional leadership requires a substantive knowledge base that is grounded in the educational sciences if he/she is to be the resource envisaged by the role. Nolan and Frances (1992) argued that supervision needed to become a group process of interdependent cooperation rather than the one-on-one clinical method, and they noted: Given the research on cooperative learning and teacher collegiality, we hypothesize that if supervision were carried out as a group process in which the supervisors and teachers were interdependent in achieving group and individual goals, the process of supervision would become more effective in helping teachers learn about and improve their teaching. One of the challenges in the schools instructional leadership supervisory practices commonly observed in that school teachers were dissatisfied about the way in which teacher's observation and evaluation is taking place. The reason for that is expected to be because the action taken by principals of the schools alone.

As a parallel to the notion that the shift from a traditional, teacher-centered base of learning to a more collaborative foundational learning concept, scholars pointed to the need for self-supervision through reflection and the creation of knowledge. Grauwe (2007), contends that an increasing number of countries have, from the early 1990s onwards, attempted to reform supervision, not as the result of a radical political change, but because of recognition of its ineffectiveness. These reforms are inspired by the conviction that an effective supervision is a key tool to monitor and improve education quality, (Nambassa, 2003).

The instructional leadership knowledge and desire in supervision to work with teachers, in encouraging teachers to observe each other's classes and to promote teacher's professional

growth are activities expected to be challenges at the school level. School leadership need to understand the practice and theory of contemporary leadership and management and apply that knowledge in school improvement. They should be well competent in the latest research and development in pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment and reporting. They must have relevant knowledge of national development policies and strategies, practices and initiatives as well as relevant federal and regional state legislation and agreements.

The challenge that appears in most of the schools supervisors is the need to be able to draw on a body of professional knowledge and research to respond to the needs of school community within the educational contexts. They must understand school contexts, and how the contexts affect the students' continuous learning. They should be able to demonstrate their knowledge and skill on how to structure the supports to meet the physical, social and intellectual development and characteristics of the students at schools. In support of this fact, cluster based staff development program, supervisory support and guideline in instructional leadership is the most effective means of in service teachers' professional development. As UNICEF (2004) reported, school clustering approach takes place in developing capacity of schools and teachers at cluster level, and the main futures of the strategies are also indicates that the clustered schools importantly are expected to facilitate and provide promotion of experience sharing and effective monitoring and provision of supportive supervision at all level.

School supervisors should be able to promote, support and create conducive environment for effective learning and teaching activities at schools. They are also expected to be able to create and maintain safe, inclusive and challenging learning environments and promote fair and equitable behavior management system. They need to use simple and appropriate communication techniques; to have a repertoire of effective supervisory work strategies and use them to implement well-designed support, control and evaluation programs.

2.8. Summary of Instructional Leadership Supervisory options

The supervisory practice in instructional leadership are very much available to provide quality of learning in a better way and minimize challenges appeared to be difficulties for the achievement of students learning. Supervision is one of the functions of education that offers opportunities for schools to improve teaching and learning and the professional development of teachers (Kutsyuruba, 2003; Arong & Ogbadu, 2010). Improving supervision of instruction in school is of great concern to educational authorities worldwide.

The above supervisory models are indispensable in the education system to schools instructional leadership to work with teachers cognitive and skill development. The supervisory models discussed above are summarized and placed into three developmental levels (structured, moderately structured, and relatively unstructured) for the instructional leader to use when deciding which approach would be appropriate for a particular teaching situation. These developmental levels were determined by utilizing the theoretical frameworks of situational leadership (Hersey and others. 2001) and the developmental research of Piaget (Wlodkowski, 1985). The Situational Leadership Model by Hersey and others (2001) suggests different leadership approaches to employ based on the follower's readiness level and a particular situation. Along a similar vein, the supervisory option for instructional leadership encourages the instructional leader to utilize a variety of supervisory models by an instructional leader with particular teaching situations and teacher readiness levels.

Additionally, the instructional leadership must evaluate his/her/ own readiness level and the challenges to accommodate particular situations. It is the instructional leader's duty to understand and be able to implement the supervisory models within the supervisory option for instructional leadership. Furthermore, the essence of the supervisory option for instructional leadership is to accommodate the teacher; therefore instructional leadership should have a variety approaches to select from. Utilizing the previous example, if an instructional leader utilized a more structured model of supervision with this particular teacher this may hinder the teacher's future growth in the classroom.

Besides, some teachers obviously have a clear understanding of student's learning but only lack classroom experience. An instructional leadership of the school must be able to recognize the teacher's level of development and adjust the supervisory approach accordingly. Finally, an instructional leadership must be willing to take additional risks in the supervisory process with the understanding that rewards may be gained because of the risks taken. Maintaining structure may be more accommodating for the instructional leader but will not work for every teacher; therefore, allowing teachers to be involved in the supervisory process is essential for teacher growth.

3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Design and methodology of the study is described in this chapter. The research design, source of data, population, sampling, data collection instruments and the data analysis methods are discussed here under.

3.2. Research design

Research design is the overall plan for collecting data in order to answer the research question and also the specific data analysis techniques or methods that the researcher intends to use. The design employed for this study is predominantly descriptive survey research; since it attempts to secure information as currently exists. The purpose of descriptive surveys, according to Ezeani (1998), is to collect detailed and factual information that describes an existing phenomenon. This research intends to apply both quantitative and qualitative (mixed) approaches to identify an accurate description of the major practices and problems encountered on the schools current practices of instructional leadership with in the role of supervision.

The selection of the design was based on the insight of the problem and the nature of the data expected to be collected. Quantitative data gathering techniques have been used to condense data in order to see the bigger picture. Qualitative data-gathering technique by contrast is also used for identification of challenges in the leadership, as data enhancer, and the researcher made the data in use to triangulate from both approaches.

3.3. Population

Since the study intends to identify the instructional leadership supervisory practices and challenges in “woreda Five” government cluster schools, teachers and school leaders of these schools are selected to be target groups of the study. These were supervisors and supervisees in the cluster. According to the Regional draft guideline, there is only 1 assigned supervisor in a cluster. In Woreda Five, totally 52 personnel’s were taken as the total population of the instructional leaders group of the schools (10 school principals, 1 cluster supervisor, and 41 department heads/senior teachers/), proper teachers of government primary schools 84, beginner teachers 44, totally 180 were the population for the study from which the samples were drawn. According to the thesis operational definition, supervisors are school personnel’s, senior teachers and the cluster supervisor. In these schools those who are expected to involve in conducting

instructional leadership are the 10 principals, 42 department heads and senior teachers, Including one appointed supervisors.

3.3.1. Sample size

The sample for the study was drawn from Addis Ababa City Administration of Arada Sub City “woreda Five” government primary schools. There are five government primary schools in “woreda Five” and all were included in the study.

The schools were namely 1) Bethlehem Primary School, 2) New Era Primary School, 3) Alem Berihan Primary School, 4) Ras Abebe Primary School and 5) Timihirit Bilicheta Primary School. The Woreda is selected because of the availability of adequate number of government schools in one cluster to come up with some kinds of analysis.

Based on Cliff (1970), the smaller the population, the larger the sampling ratio that is required for a high degree of accuracy and for a population smaller than a thousand, a sampling ratio of 30% is needed. The respondents of the questionnaires are the teaching staff (supervisees) and the internal supervisors. From all the five schools 180 total population of the study, above 50% of the total population of each school were included in the sample and has been responded for the study. By considering their work title sample taken was 22 from beginner teachers, 42 from proper teachers and 26 lead teachers including principals and cluster supervisor. Number of sampled respondents for the questionnaire was 90.

As indicated, number of respondents from all 5 (five) schools in the Woreda were 90 teachers’ (supervisees) and lead teachers (supervisors), and in addition, using non probability purposive sampling, 31- interview respondents were involved. Therefore, the total number of respondents included in the study was 121.

3.3.2. Sampling Technique

The research focused on the identification of the practice and challenges of supervision in instructional leadership. Stratified random sampling technique was applied to include the beginner teachers, proper teachers and the lead teachers (the instructional leadership group). As indicated above, total number of sampled respondents was 90 out of 180 target groups. The stratified random sampling was to consider an equal chance of being selected for every member of the population, and more importantly. to be used for the analysis of one of the basic question on identification of the instructional leadership support for teachers at different level.

The sample was taken from all government primary schools in the Woreda by considering the homogeneity of the work title (rank) of teachers. Respondents were grouped in to three categories, namely beginner teachers, proper teachers, and the third strata were the instructional leaders or the supervisors (The cluster supervisor, principals, and senior teachers).

To sum up, both probability and non-probability sampling techniques were employed. In case of the non-probability sampling, purposive sampling was used to involve Principals, assistant principals, and the cluster supervisor.

Table 1: Distribution of Sample Respondents in Primary Schools

	Population	Sample	% of sample population
Beginner teachers	44	22	50%
Proper teachers	84	42	50%
Lead teachers, Principals & Cluster supervisor	52	26	50%
Total	180	90	50%

3.4. Sources of Data

The research employed both primary and secondary data sources.

3.4.1. Primary Data Source

Since this research focused mainly on the supervisory role of instructional leadership, the teachers, principals and the cluster supervisor have direct involvement and are responsible for the supervisory activities for what is happening in the schools. The major data source was obtained directly from these primary sources through questionnaire and an interview to identify and insight the role of supervision in instructional leadership in the schools.

3.4.2. Secondary Data Source

In addition to primary sources, secondary data were used to substantiate the primary data sources. The researcher made a general overview of the past three years grade 8 final exam result of students, relevant literatures, the City Administration supervisory draft guidelines and procedures that have been used in the indicated academic years, instructional performance reports on improved and failures of service provision of the supervisors (Instructional leaders), action research delivered in the schools and past supervisors' reports and descriptions were used as secondary data enhancer of the research.

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

Questionnaires, interview and some relevant student's exam results have been used to collect data.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed after an intensive review of literature and it constitutes both closed and open ended questions. The closed ended questionnaire designed for supervisors and supervisee members, was partially adopted and contextualized from the already existing source: by Edmonds (1979), questionnaire on Instructional leadership role and responsibilities. The standard questionnaires were selected to identify supervisory approaches needed to be used by the instructional leadership of the schools, since they were originally produced as the basis for creating supervisory options in the teaching and learning process accordingly.

In the standard questionnaire, Items that were not directly related to any of the factors in this research were identified and changed, and questions added to the precision of the instrument by assessing other instructional leadership contributions for primary school instructions. Questionnaire was developed and selected because of two major reasons: firstly it makes respondents free and helps to catch respondents viewpoints regarding the issue examined. Secondly it is helpful to collect a good deal of data from a large number of the schools within a short period of time.

A set of questionnaire with 5-point Likert Scale survey was employed to identify the practice and challenges of supervision for instructional leadership in the Woreda. The items in the questionnaire were open and closed ended. The categories for the Likert Scale were 5 point for "we do this task all the time", which was represented by "Always"; 4 was for the response in which the school perform the task commonly or "Usually"; 3 for the school perform the task occasionally or "Sometimes"; 2 was for the school perform the task infrequently or "Rarely", and one is "Never".

In this study, the researcher developed 7 personal information questions in part 1, and in part 2, questionnaires with closed type that deals on supervisory observation and evaluations, allocation of instructional resources, development of academic climate, encourage concerns and coordination of instructional programs. Numbers of closed question are 35 and open ended types of questions were three.

The questionnaire was designed to all the respondents and distributed to Beginner teachers, Teachers (proper teachers), Lead teachers and Supervisors (Instructional Leaders) to collect information and facts of the respondents. These were taken as basic sources in identification of supervisory practices employed, challenges and actions in instructional leadership of the schools.

The standard questionnaires at first were 28 and piloted in the neighboring Sub City Yeka, Kifle Ketema in “Hibret Ferye” primary school and the data collecting instrument has been modified in accordance with relevant inputs obtained from 10 respondents (cluster supervisor, principal and selected teachers). The pilot result was analyzed and finally corrections made and additional data collecting instruments (7 questions) were added with the assistance of thesis advisor. Some items were reconstructed newly and others were modified before the beginning of field operation. Relevant improvements were made to overcome ambiguities that may pose problems in attempting answers to the items. Clarifications on how respondents able to provide responses from alternatives were added in order to avoid confusions.

Table 2: Respondents in number and percent (%)

	Name of the schools	No_ of respondents	Percent (%)
1	New Era	25	27.7
2	Alem Birihan	20	22.2
3	Timihirt Bilichita	15	16.7
4	Betelihem	15	16.7
5	Ras Abebe	15	16.7
	Total	90	100.0

3.5.2. Interview

Semi- structured interviews were conducted with 11 supervisors (including lead teachers and principals) and 20 supervisees (teachers) of all the schools. The semi-structured interview respondents were selected by purposive sampling method from those who were not participated in responding the questionnaire.

From each of the school participants were 6 and totally 31 supervisees and supervisors were involved in the interview at different time and place including the cluster supervisor. 6 interview questions for supervisors and 7 questions for supervisees, which were organized differently but

with similar contextual meaning. Interviews were employed to gather data on challenges of the instructional leadership and for triangulating the information obtained through questionnaires.

3.5.3. Document Analysis

General overview of the past three academic years grade 8 students regional exam result, relevant literatures, teacher's perception reports on improvement and failures of service provision of the supervisors (Instructional leaders), and past supervisors' reports and descriptions has been analyzed as data enhancer.

3.6. Method of Data Analysis

Questionnaires were distributed for 90 respondents (Beginners, teachers and to the lead teaching staff) and 31 teachers and supervisors interviewed. The collected data from the respondents was recorded, coded and processed. Analysis made based on the information and empirical evidences collected through questionnaire, interview and reports of student exam result.

The response obtained from the questionnaire items was tabulated, interpreted and analyzed. The analysis made by Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, more commonly known as SPSS, which is a computer program that can be used to calculate many of the descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean) obtained from the questionnaire respondents. Once all surveys were completed and data entered into the computer, and data analysis conducted based on the following steps.

1. Use of Tables to report the number of the sample who did and did not respond to the survey.
2. Descriptive analysis of the data was made. The researcher discussed the frequencies and percentages of respondents for each item that were presented to gather the data needed. By including a frequency Table, display the number and percent of people belonging in one category.
3. Determine reliability. The researcher calculated the response rate by using this calculation: $(\text{number of surveys received} / \text{total number of surveys}) \times 100$.

Thematic analysis was employed as needed in the discussions accordingly on the information obtain from open ended questions, semi-structured interviews and reviewed documents. Based on the data analysis, interpretations were made to come up with certain finding, finally conclusion with some possible recommendations.

Table 2: Likert Scale, Coding, & Interpretation Scale

Coding, & Interpretation Scale	Coding	Mean	Interpretation
Never	1	1.00-1.49	Totally not performed (never)
Rarely	2	1.50-2.49	Perform this task infrequently (rarely)
Sometimes	3	2.50-3.49	Perform this task occasionally (sometimes)
Usually	4	3.50-4.49	Perform this task commonly (usually)
Always	5	4.50-5.00	Perform this task all the time (always)

CHAPTER IV

4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The data obtained from both closed and open ended questionnaire sought the opinions of teachers and head teachers (supervisors) on how they experienced instructional leadership in their schools and how they thought supervision of instructional leadership needed to be practiced. The information in the first part sought were the sex, age group, work title, qualifications, and additional responsibilities of respondents. This section asked respondents about their position (teacher or head teacher) and service years as teacher or head teacher.

The questionnaire included 35 Likert scale items, open ended questions and interviews to sort out the extent in which the instructional leadership involved in its role of supervision, to identify relevant support provided for teachers at different experience level and the challenges of the instructional leadership in improving instructions.

The final part of the chapter presents a summary of findings from the interview schedule from the open-ended items, and comments from respondents is presented to manipulate the support and practice of supervisory instructional leadership in upgrade students learning.

4.1. Characteristics of Respondents

Table 4: Characteristics of respondents

No	Description		Frequency	Percentage
1	Sex	Male	58	64.4
		Female	32	35.6
2	Age	Below 25	26	28.9
		26-30	24	26.7
		31-35	9	10.0
		36-40	8	8.9
		Above 40	23	25.6
3	Qualifications	TTI	4	4.4
		Diploma	53	58.9
		Degree	30	33.3
		MA//MSC	3	3.3
4	Work Title/Job/ Classification	Beginner	22	24.4
		Proper	42	46.7
		Lead teacher	15	16.7
		Principal	9	10.0
		cluster Supervisor	1	1.1
		Unidentified Rank	1	1.1
5	Total Years of Service	1-5years	30	33.3
		6-10years	25	27.8
		11 and above	35	38.9
6	Additional responsibility in support of student learning	Homeroom teacher	43	47.8
		Unit leader	1	1.1
		Department head	17	18.9
		No additional	23	25.6
		Others	6	6.7
7	Staff involved in supervisory role	Principals	29	32.2
		Department heads	23	25.6
		Homeroom teachers	10	11.1
		Proper teacher and above	16	17.8
		all are involved	12	13.3

The age of the respondent in item number two shows, 26 (28.9%) were below the age of 25 while 24 (26.7%) were between the ages of 26-30, 9 (10.0%) were from 31-35, from 36-40 were 8 (8.9%), the rest were above 40 and which is 23 (25.6%). Totally below the age of 25, 26-30 and above 40 has got the dominant age group respectively.

The principals, supervisor and teachers were asked about the highest degree (certification from respective institutions)) they owned or earned. Principals in the five primary schools held at least a university first degree academic level. The rest of all respondents are observed with the certification provided by institutions and teachers college. Majority teachers have got college

diploma (teachers Diploma, were 53 (58%), Degree holders were 30 (33.3%), 4 (4.4%) were from TTI (Teachers Training Institutes), college diploma and 3 (3.3%) are MA/MSc/.

Regarding the Profile of the respondent, work title/ job classification includes 42 (46.7%) were proper teachers; 22 (24.4%) were beginners, and Lead teachers were 15 (16.7%). Others are principals and the supervisor.

As to the sampled respondents about the total years of services in the schools was shown, 35 (38, 9%) were above 11 years of services, 30 (33.3%) were between 1-5 years of service, 25 (27.8%) were from 6-10 years of services in the schools.

Teachers are commonly expected to involve with some additional responsibilities in relation to the instructional leadership activities such as, Homeroom teacher, Dept. Head and the likes. As it has observed from the Table, majority of the respondents were assigned as a home room teacher (classroom representatives). On the other hand considerable number of teachers did not involve to any of the activities except their responsibilities of being subject instructor.

As it is shown on item 7, supervision of teachers were performed dominantly by the school principals alone. The supervisory practices in which 29 (32.2%) was carried out by the school principals, with the involvement of department heads 23 (25.6%), and respondents those who verify the involvement of all concerned expertise in supervising instructions were only 12 (13.3%).

School based supervision that attempt at bringing improvement in the quality of instruction has to involve staffs as essential part of the process. This type of school-based (in-school) supervision has to be done by the school personnel's (school principals, department heads and senior teachers including the cluster supervisor), aimed at providing guidance, support, and continuous assessment to teachers for their professional development and improvement in the teaching-learning process.

4.2. Data Presentation and Interpretation

The first Table of the research question presented to the respondents were items related for identification of the practice of supervision in instructional leadership specifically those are interrelated in support of classroom instructions through observation and evaluation. The responses of respondents are demonstrated on Table 5.

Table 5: The extent of teacher's observation and evaluation

No	Statements		N	R	S	U	A	Mean
1	Supervision of teachers is done to communicate the instructional goals of the school.	Frequency	7	19	21	24	19	3.30
		Percent	7.8	21.1	23.3	26.7	21.1	
2	Supervision of teachers simplified instructional responsibilities of each professional role.	Frequency	5	15	27	23	20	2.43
		Percent	5.6	16.7	30.0	25.6	22.2	
3	Supervision of teachers meets the individual professional needs	Frequency	4	19	38	20	9	2.41
		Percent	4.4	21.1	42.2	22.2	10.0	
4	Supervision of the school evaluates teachers.	Frequency	5	23	29	23	10	2.48
		Percent	5.6	25.6	32.2	25.6	11.1	
5	Supervision of teachers is done to observe teachers in their classrooms.	Frequency	7	18	29	27	9	2.56
		Percent	7.8	20.0	32.2	30.0	10.0	
6	Supervisors spend one full class period time when conducting instructional supervision observation	Frequency	9	21	27	21	12	2.09
		Percent	10.0	23.3	30.0	23.3	13.3	

N=Never (1), R=Rarely (2), S=Sometimes (3), U=Usually (4), A=Always (5)

Participants were asked to indicate how often they articulated or communicated the instructional goals of the school. Data presented in Table 5 demonstrate that the largest group of respondents 24 (26.7%) usually, in which the school perform this task commonly or articulated the instructional goals of the school. The next largest group was 21 (23.3%) those who are sometimes articulated the instructional goals of the schools. Two groups were equally 19 (21.1%), did the same task always and other groups are used to communicate to the instructional goals of the schools rarely. There were seven (7.8%) that reported the school never doing this task. Almost 71.1% of the respondents indicated they performed this task at least sometimes in the academic year. Others perform this task nearly half (47.8%) indicated usually and always in a regular manner. The mean for this item was 3.30; this shows the instructional leadership articulated the instructional goals of the school and performs the task some time.

The second item in the extent of teacher's observation and evaluation, examined how school supervision in instructional leadership simplified the instructional responsibilities of each professional role. The largest group of 27 (30.0%) said instructional leadership simplify the instructional responsibilities of each professional commonly. as indicated in Table 5. The next largest group of 23 respondents (25.6%) said they performed this task usually or commonly. The middle group 20 (22.2%) indicated the instructional leadership performs this task all the time (always). 15 (16.7%) are suggested rarely and 5 (5.6%) they never did this task. The mean for this item was 2.43 that show the school instructional leadership performed the task infrequently.

Respondents were asked on how supervision of teachers meets the individual professional needs. The data located in Table 5 shows 38 (42.2%) of the respondents the task was performed sometime. (22.2%) stated the schools perform this task commonly within the academic year, 19

respondents (21.1%) responded the school perform this task infrequently or “Rarely”, and (4.4%) the task was not known or “Never” performed. The mean for these items is 2.41, which shows that the task was performed rarely.

As to the majority of open ended question respondents about the availability of differentiated supervision; the instructional leadership in the schools didn’t satisfactorily practicing differentiated supervision. Rarely there were types of support delivered distinct to beginner teachers but not in a regular manner. As to the respondents, the reason why this was not practiced as required was because of the absence of awareness of the objectives of differentiated supervision on the side of the instructional leadership as well as teachers

Majority semi structured interview respondents noted on the type of supervision provided were all the same to the school teachers, and they couldn’t recognize the time where developmental supervision has been employed in their schools in the past six months. The communication with supervisees before, during, and after the visit were not followed the procedures as it has been indicated for clinical supervision.

The participants were asked to indicate how often the school instructional leadership evaluated teachers. Instructional leadership of the schools evaluates teachers 29 (32.2%) responded sometimes, and respondents which were 23 (25.6%) equally approved it was a practice carried out by the school supervision usually and rarely. The mean for this task is 2.48. This indicates the instructional leadership was performed task in the schools rarely or infrequently, even below the average.

Another question presented was to identify the way and how the instructional leadership in their supervision role has observed teachers in their classrooms. In this regard, as it is demonstrated on Table 5, the largest group of respondents 29 (32.2 %) indicated that the school performed this task occasionally, or “Sometimes”. 27 (30%) of the participants indicated the school performed these tasks at least sometimes in the academic year. There were 20.0% and 7.8% indicated the school performed the task infrequently (rarely) or never performed respectively. Which indicated this task was an averagely important job for the supervisory roles of the school instructional leadership. The mean for the task is 2.56, which denotes that the instructional leadership was performed the task in schools normally sometimes.

Respondents of the open ended question revealed that usually schools are not accustomed in providing specified support for instructional gaps of individual teachers. There were also a big gap on the sides of supervisors to provide feedback or sometime the feedback provided were not

directly related with what was observed in the classroom and supervisors were incapable to give evidence base feedback. Some respondents didn't observe such a practice in their schools in the past six months, some are facing a problem even to identify the value of supervision in support of their instructional performance specifically in the classroom teaching learning process.

Participants were also asked to indicate whether supervisors spend one full class period time or not when conducting instructional supervision observation. The largest group of respondents (27, 30%) indicated that the school performed this task occasionally, or "Sometimes". There were seven (23.3%) and (10.0%) of the respondents articulated in that the supervisors spend one full class period time infrequently or totally they didn't or never doing this task respectively. The mean for the task was 2.09, which show the task has been performed rarely.

One of the open ended questions was also about the supervision provided in each of the schools and how they perceive the supervision rendered by the instructional leadership in improving the performance of teaching and learning process. Respondents were asked to give a "yes" or "no" answer in the first place, and secondly to provide the reason why they say "yes" or "No", most likely, they were asked to state how their performance was improved or not.

As mentioned, respondents describe their insights of the importance of supervision, using "Yes" or "No" optional responses, so that respondents as it has been indicated on the Table (see Annex VII), the result shows that majority (77.8%) responded the support rendered by supervision has helped in improving their performance as a teacher and 22.2% of respondents revealed the supervision support in the school where they are teaching had no value in improving teachers performance.

Majority of semi structured interviewed teacher respondents noted that the instructional leadership in guiding and supporting the work in classroom were limited, rather they were more effective in administrative works or it can be said on managerial duties. Majority of supervisees (teachers) respondents agreed on how the instructional leadership can be supportive to their instructional effectiveness. However, some of the respondents were not pleased with the quality of support provided and are inconvenient to accept feedbacks of the instructional leadership supervision. They doubt with their supervisory skills and methodological approaches specially to carry out classroom observation. They noted that the leadership had employed classroom observation infrequently in the academic year.

The practice of supervision by the instructional leadership in encouraging concern for achievement, focused on the extent to which the supervision by the instructional leadership encouraged the achievement of students is presented on Table 6 with six identified items.

Table 6: Instructional leadership in encouraging concern for achievement:

No	Statement		N	R	S	U	A	Mean
1	The Instructional leaders organize staff development programs	Frequency	21	34	25	8	2	2.31
		Percent	23.3	37.8	27.8	8.9	2.2	
2	The Instructional leaders encourage teachers to observe each other's class	Frequency	9	10	25	27	19	3.46
		Percent	10.0	11.1	27.8	30.0	21.1	
3	The Instructional leaders communicate to all students for achievement	Frequency	4	11	28	31	16	3.54
		Percent	4.4	12.2	31.1	34.4	17.8	
4	The Instructional leaders work with teachers to improve the instructional program for the school	Frequency	6	15	28	24	17	3.34
		Percent	6.7	16.7	31.1	26.7	18.9	
5	The Instructional leaders assign teachers to specific classes or sections	Frequency	10	17	19	18	26	3.32
		Percent	11.1	18.9	21.1	20.0	28.9	
6	The Instructional leaders compile reproductions testimonials, and student work that represent the teacher's professional growth	Frequency	5	17	26	28	14	3.31
		Percent	5.6	18.9	28.9	31.1	15.6	

N=Never (1), R=Rarely (2), S=Sometimes (3), U=Usually (4), A=Always (5)

The first item focused on the amount of time spent in organizing staff development programs by the instructional leadership in its role of supervision. Table 6 shows the greatest number of respondents 34 (37.8%); the school rarely or infrequently organized instructional staff development. The next largest group 25 (27.8%), noted the school did this task sometimes or occasionally. There were 21 respondents (23.3%) that indicated the schools never organize instructional professional development. Eight (8.9%) indicated the school supervision (instructional leadership) did this task usually or commonly, and (2.2%) said the school organize professional development all the time. The mean for this item was 2.31, which shows the instructional leadership perform this task infrequently.

The second item in encouraging concern for achievement examined how often supervision of the school leadership encouraged teachers to observe each other's classrooms. The largest group 27 (30.0%) noted that they encouraged teachers to observe other teachers' classrooms commonly. as indicated in Table 6. The next largest group of 25 respondents (27.8%) noted that they performed this task occasionally or sometimes. The middle group 19 (21.1%) indicated the instructional leadership performs this task all the time (always). Almost as many (11.1%) encouraged mutual observation rarely and 9 (10.0%), they never did this task. The mean for this item was 3.46, which were performed sometimes.

Open ended questions were also presented about the challenges observed in the supervisory role of instructional leadership. Majority of lead teacher and principal respondent on this issue noted about the problem that exists on teacher's side, awareness to accept supervision as helping and supportive provision for instructional procedures and absence of interest to be observed (supervised) by their colleagues (suggested loss of self-confidence) or teachers resistance to view supervisors as helpful (hesitant to welcomed supervisors).

The third item was on how the supervision in instructional leadership communicates to all the students to create general concern for achievement. Respondents 31 (34.4%) felt this was something that they performed commonly or usually. Occasional (sometimes) communication was reported by 28 (31.1%) of the respondent. Sixteen or (17.8%) of the respondents approved the school supervision communicate to all students all the time to create general concern for achievement. However, (12.2%) depicted the school perform this task occasionally and 4.4% concluded the school never perform this task. The mean for this item was 3.54; the instructional leadership performed this task commonly.

Respondents were asked how often the school instructional leadership supervision has worked with teachers to improve the instructional program for the schools. The data located in Table 6 shows 28 (31.1%) of the respondents stated at least the schools perform this task occasionally or "Sometimes" within the academic year, 24 (26.7%) responded the school supervision perform this task commonly (usually), there were 17 (18.9 %) who responded the supervision of the school did this task all the time (always). 16.7% and (6.7%) responded the school performs this task Rarely, and the task was not known "Never" performed consecutively. The mean for the task was 3.34, which indicates the instructional leadership has worked with teachers to improve the instructional program sometimes.

One of the item requested was how often the leadership assigned teachers to specific classes or sections to support classroom instructions. From the total participant around seventy percent of the respondents depicted that the school perform the task at least occasionally "sometimes" to all the time" usually". Others which are 17 (18.9%) approved they perform the task rarely and the rest respondents 10 (11.1%) never practiced this task in their schools. The mean for this item is 3.32, which shows that the task was performed sometime.

The school supervision compile reproductions, testimonials of teachers and student work that represent the teacher's professional growth was reported consecutively 15.6%, 31.1%, and 26 (28.9%) of the participants said the school supervision compile the work that represent teachers

professional growth all the time, commonly and occasionally. Respondent on the other hand depicted 17 (18.9%) occasionally and 5 (5.6%) infrequently and totally not performed. The mean for this item was 3.31 (the school leadership) perform this task sometimes or occasionally).

On the other hand, majority of open ended respondents approved the support rendered by the instructional leadership was useful to improve their performance, the supervision delivered by the instructional leadership has helped them in providing training, in identifying the weakness and the strength they have, and to discuss and resolve personal problems of teachers that had appeared in the school teaching learning process.

Table 7: Extent of allocation of instructional resource

The third factor on the research questions in instructional leadership supervisory role was the allocation of instructional resources for the instructional purpose. Allocation of instructional resources gives an indication of how the school based supervisors frequently evaluate and realize the appropriateness of instructional materials. The factor also refers on how often the school leadership was certain to allocate personnel and physical resources in support of learning in the classroom. This factor contains five items and is presented on Table 7.

	Statement		N	R	S	U	A	Mean
1	The instructional leaders helped teachers to relate the school's instructional goals to their curriculum units	Frequency	6	16	35	17	16	3.23
		Percent	6.7	17.8	38.9	18.9	17.8	
2	The instructional leaders analyze students test scores to identify general instructional strengths and weaknesses	Frequency	10	16	13	30	21	3.40
		Percent	11.1	17.8	14.4	33.3	23.3	
3	The instructional leaders allocate materials needed to accomplish instructional goals	Frequency	6	23	19	25	17	3.16
		Percent	6.7	25.6	21.1	27.8	18.9	
4	The instructional leaders help teachers to evaluate instructional materials	Frequency	9	13	36	19	13	3.13
		Percent	10.0	14.4	40.0	21.1	14.4	
5	The instructional leaders help teachers to develop appropriate instructional materials that are not commercially available	Frequency	5	23	27	23	12	3.16
		Percent	5.6	25.6	30.0	25.6	13.3	

N=Never (1), R=Rarely (2), S=Sometimes (3), U=Usually (4), A=Always (5)

Respondents were asked how often the school instructional leadership has help teachers to relate the school's instructional goals to their curriculum units. The data located in Table 7 shows more than half of the respondents (63.4%) stated the schools perform this task occasionally or "Sometimes" within the academic year, of the 63.4%, there were 17.8% and 6.7% responded the school perform this task infrequently or "Rarely", and the task was not known "Never"

performed consecutively. There were 17 (18.9%) participants that the school perform this task commonly or “Usually”; and 16 (17.8%) responded that the schools do this task all the time, “Always”.to relate school’s instructional goals to their curriculum units.. The mean for this item was 3.23, this depicts that the schools were performed this task occasionally or sometimes.

To identify the general strengths and weaknesses of the learning process, the instructional leadership is expected to analyze students test results and thereby they are also expected to allocate instructional resources. The next item in this factor was analysis of students test scores to identify general instructional strengths and weakness of students by the school leaders. It was indicated the largest group 30 (33.3%), and the second group was 21 (23.3%). The mean of respondents for this item was 3.40, in which the task has been performed occasionally in the schools.

The third item was about the allocation of materials needed to accomplish instructional goals. The largest group as stated by the participants, schools allocated materials needed to accomplish instructional goals usually or commonly which were 25 (27.8 %). The mean of respondents for this item was 3.24. As it is depicted in Table 7 on item 4, the question were to identify the help made for teachers to evaluate instructional materials. Thirty six (40%) responded dominantly, in which the task accomplished in the schools occasionally. The mean of respondents for this item was 3.13. Respondents for the last item in this Table provided somehow as similar as the above participants responded. However, the mean about the help provided for teachers to develop appropriate instructional materials that are not commercially available was also 3.16, that shows the task performed sometimes by the instructional leadership.

Semi structured interview questions were presented to verify the roles of instructional leadership in support of classroom instructions on varied supervisory activities, such as in allocation of instructional resources and in helping teachers to develop appropriate instructional materials. Majority of respondents noted that the school leadership was commonly providing instructional materials that are appropriate for the teaching and learning process.

The fourth factor is presented to identify the extent in which the instructional leadership was focused on the development of academic climate for the instructional purpose. The data is presented on Table 8, comprising 6 items.

Table 8: Extent of instructional leadership in the development of academic climate

No	Statements		N	R	S	U	A	Mean
1	The school Coordinate necessary personnel support to accomplish instructional goals	Frequency	7	13	33	26	11	3.23
		Percent	7.8	14.4	36.7	28.9	12.2	
2	The instructional leaders organize teachers to work collaboratively in pairs and small teams to observe each other's' teaching and to improve instruction.	Frequency	9	13	24	27	17	3.33
		Percent	10.0	14.4	26.7	30.0	18.9	
3	The instructional leaders take steps to improve student discipline.	Frequency	4	15	18	25	28	3.63
		Percent	4.4	16.7	20.0	27.8	31.1	
4	The instructional leaders take steps to develop a school climate conducive to learning	Frequency	4	13	27	18	28	3.59
		Percent	4.4	14.4	30.0	20.0	31.1	
5	The instructional leaders coordinate experienced educators (mentor) to works with a novice	Frequency	6	16	26	23	19	3.37
		Percent	6.7	17.8	28.9	25.6	21.1	
6	The instructional leaders provide help to teachers	Frequency	6	12	32	22	18	3.38
		Percent	6.7	13.3	35.6	24.4	20.0	

N=Never (1), R=Rarely (2), S=Sometimes (3), U=Usually (4), A=Always (5)

The first item was presented for respondents to determine how often the schools were ready in assigning support personnel to assist teachers with accomplishing instructional goals. Table 8 demonstrates that 33 (36.7%) instructional leaders performed this task occasionally (sometimes). 26 (28.9%) the school perform the task commonly and 11 (12.2%) it was performed in the school all the time. The mean response for this item was 3.23 and which was performed sometimes.

The second item was about how often the school organized the teaching staff to work collaboratively in pairs and small teams to observe each other's' teaching and to improve instruction. The largest group of respondents 27 (30.0%) stated they usually organized teachers for instructional purpose. The next largest group 24 (26.7%) stated they did this occasionally. Seventeen (18.9%) were depicted the school perform the task all the time. On the other hand 13 (14.4%) in this study the leadership organized teachers for instructional leadership rarely or occasionally, 9 (10.0%) of the respondents did not observe this task in their school or totally the leadership never did this part. The mean response for this item was 3.33. This indicates that the task was performed in the schools occasionally.

The other item examined how often assistant principals took steps to improve student discipline. Data located in Table 8 show the largest group of respondents were 28 (31.1%), in which the school leadership doing the task all the time. 25 (27.4%) of respondents are also approved the school leadership had worked commonly (usually) toward improving student discipline.

Respondents are also 15 (16.7%) articulated the practice was infrequent or rarely happened and 4 (4.4%) of the respondents response was it was not practiced or never has happened in their schools. The mean for this item was 3.63. The school leadership performed this task in a better way which can be said commonly.

The next item on Table 8 checked how frequently the instructional leadership took steps to develop a school climate that was conducive to learning. The majority 28 (31.1%) of respondents noted the leadership took steps to develop a climate conducive to learning all the time. There were 13 (14.4%) respondents that said the school performed this task infrequently, and 4 (4.4%) said the leadership never performed this task. The mean response for this task is 3.59; .that shows the school leadership performed the task commonly.

The item about the development of academic climate was asked to all the participants, about how the instructional leaders coordinate experienced educator (mentor) to works with novice. Data Table 8 demonstrates 28.9% of the respondents revealed that the leadership coordinated occasionally. The second group (25.6%) of this item respondents said the school leadership did the coordination occasionally. 21.1 % responded the school performs the task all the time. The next smallest groups 17.8% and 6.7% were responded the leadership perform the task infrequently and it was not practiced (never) in the school. The mean for this item was 3.37, which was performed averagely sometimes.

The last item of Table 8 was about how often the leadership able to help teachers in improving their teaching. Thirty two (35.6%) indicated the school supervision help teachers occasionally (sometimes), 22 (24.4%) and 18 (20.0%) responded the in school supervision provided help to teachers usually (commonly) and all the time consecutively. Among the respondents 12 (13.3%) indicated the supervision by the instructional leadership helped teachers rarely and 6 (6.7%) respondents did not sow the help for teachers from the instructional leadership, so that they responded they never perform the task. The mean for this task is 3.38, which was performed sometimes.

Majority of semi structured interview respondent's, the teachers and supervisors noted that school leadership was taking more time in striving to the development of academic climate, in taking steps to improve student discipline, and steps like developing a school climate to make conducive to learning.

Below is also to explore the extent in which the instructional leadership supervision was effective in improving instructions in coordinating the instructional program. The data is presented in Table 9 with 7 items.

Table 9: Extent of instructional leadership on Coordination of Instructional Programs

No	Statements		N	R	S	U	A	Mean
1	Instructional leadership initiates new programs that have an instructional emphasis.	Frequency	5	10	34	23	18	3.43
		Percent	5.6	11.1	37.8	25.6	20.0	
2	The instructional leadership established a school policy on student performance	Frequency	8	17	13	40	12	3.34
		Percent	8.9	18.9	14.4	44.4	13.3	
3	The instructional leadership help individual departments	Frequency	5	10	26	33	16	3.50
		Percent	5.6	11.1	2.9	36.7	17.8	
4	Instructional leadership select instructional personnel fairly	Frequency	8	17	20	31	14	2.71
		Percent	8.9	18.9	22.2	34.4	15.6	
5	Instructional leadership develop the school's annual instructional programs	Frequency	6	16	19	18	31	3.29
		Percent	6.7	17.8	21.1	20.0	34.4	
6	Instructional leadership communicate to parents of basic skills instruction in the schools	Frequency	6	9	27	26	22	3.54
		Percent	6.7	10.0	30.0	28.9	24.4	
7	Secure additional funds for instructional purpose	Frequency	10	18	31	22	9	3.00
		Percent	11.1	20.0	34.4	24.4	10.0	

N=Never (1), R=Rarely (2), S=Sometimes (3), U=Usually (4), A=Always (5)

The first item was presented to identify the instructional leadership supervisory involvement in initiating new programs that have an instructional emphasis. Most of the respondents (37.8%) indicated that they initiated programs or perform this task occasionally. 23 (25.6%) respondents noted that it was practiced usually, and 18 (20.0), were indicated the school perform the task all the time (always). Almost 15% of participants indicated they infrequently (10%) or totally never (5%) did this task as indicated in Table 9. The mean for this item was 3.43, which shows that the task was performed sometimes.

The second item was presented to evaluate the instructional leadership role in establishing a school policy on student performance. Majority (44.4%) indicated that they usually or commonly established a school policy on student performance as depicted in Table 9. About 17 (18.9) indicated the leadership performed this task rarely or occasionally. Others 13 (14.4%) respond the schools perform this task all the time. The remaining group 8 (8.9) said the school leadership never established school policies on student performance. The mean for this item was 3.34; as to the mean weight of this item, it can be said that the school leadership performed the task occasionally.

The third item was on how often the leadership supervision helped departments in coordination of instructional programs and to coordinate their curricula. The largest group of respondents indicated they usually (commonly) obtained help with this task. There were 23.8% that indicated

the instructional leadership supervision helped individual departments to coordinate curricula occasionally or sometimes. The third largest group 16 (17.8%) noted that they performed this activity always (all the time). Infrequent (Rare) help to individual departments was revealed by ten (11.1%) and 5 (5.6%) claimed that they never practiced the task. The mean for this item was 3.50. Schools perform this task usually or it was practiced commonly in the schools.

Item four examined how often the supervision in instructional leadership was involved in the selection of appropriate instructional personnel fairly. The greatest number of participants (34.4%) indicated they usually (occasionally) performed this task in the academic year, while 8 (8.9%) said they never did the task. The mean for this task is 2.71 (schools perform this task occasionally (sometimes)). Item six asked participants to indicate how often they developed the school's master schedule. Respondents reported from the school perform this task all the time, the largest group 31 (34.4) to 6 (6.7) the school never perform this task .The mean indicated that 3.29, the school sometimes or occasionally perform the task.

Teachers, principals and the supervisor were asked how often the school leaders communicated to parents on basic skills of instructions. The larger group of the respondents felt the school performed this task occasionally. Over half (28.9%) denoted that they performed this task commonly, and (24.4%) approved the schools were performing the task all the time. Two groups depicted (10.0%) infrequently and (6.7%) indicated the schools never performed this task. The mean response for this item was 3.54, which indicated the school performs this task in a better way commonly.

The last item was about how often they obtain additional funds for instructional purposes. The highest group (34.4%) reported occasionally schools were doing this task and 24.4% reported they were doing this task commonly in the academic year. Respondents indicated (11.1%) the schools totally did not perform and (20.0%) indicated this was infrequent practice. The mean response for this item was 3.00, which indicated the schools perform this task occasionally.

Majority of semi structured interview respondents of teachers and supervisors noted that school leadership was taking more time to the development student learning, in coordinating necessary personnel support to accomplish instructional goals, the leadership was doing also better in the coordination of the instructional program to develop the school's annual instructional programs and in communicating parents.

The support for teachers at different experience level is summarized in Table 10; Analyzed respondents were 22 beginners, 42 proper teacher and 24 instructional leaders group within the 90 (50%) total sampled respondents. The difference in Table 10 with the previous Tables is the analysis in Table 10 was made on the bases of respondents work title.

For this study among the 26 sampled respondents of the instructional leaders (supervisors) group (the lead teachers, cluster supervisor, and principals), as indicated in chapter three, principals and the cluster supervisor were taken directly by non-probability sampling technique. Consequently the number of principals and the cluster supervisor in the sample was 11, and of the lead teachers were 15. From all these, one of them definitely among the principals did not state his work title on the questionnaire, so that was not included in the SPSS statistics analysis of the instructional leadership category. On the other hand, the cluster supervisor was not responded for the items in Table 10. Because of these, number of principal respondents were 9, lead teacher respondents was 15 and totally 24 respondents were responded on the side of the school instructional leadership.

Table 10: Instructional leadership support at different teachers rank/level/

Statement	Work title	N	R	S	U	A	Mean
The leadership meets the individual professional needs:	Beginner	(4) 18.2%	(9) 40.9%	(7) 31.8%	(2) 9.1%		2.41
	Proper	(6) 14.3%	(13) 31%	(18) 42.9%	(5) 11.9%		2.52
	Lead Teacher	(3) 20%	(7) 46.7%	(4) 26.7%	(1) 6.7%		2.20
	Principal	(1) 11.1%	(4) 44.4%	(4)44.4%	-		
The leadership observe teachers in their classrooms	Beginner	(8) 36.4%	(4) 18.2%	(5) 22.7%	(5)22.7%		2.32
	Proper	(7) 16.7%	(18) 42.9%	(11) 26.2%	(5)11.9%	(1)	2.40
	Lead Teacher	(1)1.1%	(4) 26.7%	(4) 26.7%	(6) 40%		3.0
	Principal	(1) 1.1%	(2) 22.2%	(2) 22.2%	(4)44.4%		
Supervisors spend one full class period of his/her time when conducting instructional supervision observation	Beginner	(3)13.6%	(10) 45.5%	(9) 40.9%			2.27
	Proper	(14) 3.6%	(16) 38.1%	(9) 21.4%	(3) 7.1%		2.02
	Lead Teacher	(2) 9.1%	(9) 60%	(4) 26.7%			2.13
	Principal	(2) 9.1%	(5) 55.6%	(2) 22.2%			
The leadership schedule assemblies that have an instructional purpose	Beginner	(2) 9.1%	(13) 59.1%	(7) 31.8%			2.23
	Proper	(5)11.9%	(16) 38.1%	(18) 42.9%	(2) 4.8%	(1)	2.48
	Lead Teacher	(5)33.3%	(8) 53.3%	(2) 13.3%	-		1.80
	Principal	(2)22.2%	(5) 55.6%	(2) 22.2%	-		
The leadership employ several phases, such as conference, observation by a supervisor, and post-conference (clinical)	Beginner	(3) 13.6%	(11) 50%	(8)36.4%			2.23
	Proper	(15) 35.7%	(14) 33.3%	(12)28.6%	(1)		1.98
	Lead Teacher	(3) 20%	(4) 26.7%	(8)53.3%	-		2.33
	Principal	-	(3) 33.3%	(6)66.7%	-		
Give teachers feed back on their weekly lesson plans	Beginner	(5) 22.7%	(13) 59.1%	(4)18.2%			2.05
	Proper	(9) 21.4%	(17) 40.5%	(12)28.6%	(4) 9.5%		2.26
	Lead Teacher	(1) 6.7%	(9) 60%	(4)26.7%	(1) 6.7%		2.33
	Principal	-	(6) 66.7%	(2)22.2%	-	(1)	
The leadership suggest alternative instructional methods for children who are failing consistently	Beginner	(3) 13.6%	(10) 45.5%	(9) 40.9%			2.27
	Proper	(5) 11.9%	(20) 47.6%	(16) 38.1%	(1)		2.36
	Lead Teacher	(3) 20%	(7) 46.7	(5) 33.3%			2.27
	Principal	(1)	(2) 22.2%	(5) 55.6%	(1)		
The leadership organize staff development programs that relates instruction	Beginner	(7) 31.8%	(8) 36.4%	(3) 13.6%	(3) 13.6%	(1)	2.23
	Proper	(7) 16.7%	(17) 40.5%	(15) 35.7%	(3) 7.1%		2.38
	Lead Teacher	(5) 33.3%	(4) 26.7%	(5) 33.3%	(1)		2.13
	Principal	(2) 22.2%	(4) 44.4%	(1)	(1)	(1)	
The Leadership evaluate teachers	Beginner	(5) 22.7%	(8) 36.4%	(6) 27.3%	(3)13.6%		2.32
	Proper	(5) 11.9%	(20) 47.6%	(12) 28.6%	(3)7.1%	(2)	2.45
	Lead Teacher	(2)13.3%	(5) 33.3%	(4) 26.7%	(3) 20%	(1)	3.27
	Principal	(2)22.2%	(2)	(1)	(4)44.4%		
The leadership give teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching (Cognitive coaching)	Beginner	(4) 18.2%	(9) 40.9%	(7)31.8%	(2) 9.1%	-	2.32
	Proper	(7) 16.7%	(16) 38.1%	(15) 35.7%	(3)7.1%	(1)	2.40
	Lead Teacher	(4) 26.7%	(3) 20%	(7) 46.7%	-	(1)	2.40
	Principal	(2) 22.2%	(5) 55.6%	(1)	(1)	-	

One of the items on this Table was about how far the supervision of the school meets the individual professional needs: Among the beginner teachers (40.9%) responded it was

infrequent (rare). Others (31.8%) responded the school performs this task sometimes. Participants about (18.2%) responded the schools never perform to meet individual teachers need. Teachers with proper teacher rank were responded for similar item, as if it was happened rarely (31%) and those responded the school instructional leadership has never perform this task were (14.3%).

In general the mean for beginner respondents of this task was 2.41; for teachers were 2.52 and of the lead teachers were 2.20. This indicates, the school leadership performance to meet the beginner teachers professional needs were rare, for proper teachers it was happened sometimes and the lead teachers approved that it was a task that was performed for them rarely as that of the case for beginners.

The other item presented was how frequently the school instructional leadership supervision observed teachers in their classrooms. Beginner teachers responded the school never perform this task (36.4%), other two groups (22.7% responded equally the school perform the task usually and all the time and some (18.2%) depicted it was infrequent action in their school. Majority of proper teachers (42.9) depicted the school perform this task infrequently, some of them (26.2%) responded they did it occasionally, (16.7%) responded the school leadership never practiced supervision in their classroom for the sack of instructional observation, and those who usually had instructional supervision in the classroom while teaching were (11.9%). The third group at the lead teacher level indicated it was happen commonly (40%), some other two groups (26.7%) equally indicated it was occasional and rarely.

The mean response for this task separately is 2.32 for beginners; 2.40 is for teachers; and 3.0 is for lead teachers. This indicates, the school leadership performance in observation of beginner teachers in their classrooms was happened rarely, for proper teachers it was happened in a similar way, and to the lead teachers it was a task that was performed for them sometimes.

In relation to these, response for item which was asked about individuals participated in supervision and evaluation of teachers revealed that individuals most frequently identified as supervisor of their instruction (32.2%) were principals those who were involved in observation and evaluation of teachers. Thus, the finding clearly shows that teachers and department heads are not actively involved in the instructional leadership of their respective schools.

The other item was to identify the instructional leadership role of supervision in employing several phases to communicate with teachers, such as conference, observation, and post-

conference. Modern supervision is considered as any service for teachers that eventually results in improving instruction, learning, and the curriculum. It consists of positive, dynamic, democratic actions designed to improve instruction through the continued growth of all concerned individuals-the child, the teacher, the supervisor, the administrator and the parent and other lay person. The respondents specially the beginners for these clinical supervisory activities responded schools perform infrequently (50%), occasional (36.4%), and others (13.65) depicted the school didn't employ (never) all these several phases. Proper teachers responded for this item the school supervision never employs these all several phases (37.7%), others depicted it was infrequent (33.3%), the rest responded (28.6%) it was occasional to be carried out in their schools. Among the lead teachers (53.3%) indicated the school performed the task occasional, other group recognized the task was infrequent (26.7%), there are also some who identified the task never (20%) had been carried out in their school. Principals responded also they have been practicing these all phases in their supervision sometimes (66.7%), and infrequently (33.3%).

Accordingly, in computing the mean weight for each group it depicts that 2.23 for beginners, 1.98 for teachers, 2.33 for lead teachers. This indicates, the school leadership rarely performed to employ several phases of clinical supervision for all the teachers at different level invariably.

The most notable difference between the clinical model and other more traditional models of teacher supervision is that the supervisor and the teacher discuss and agree upon the focus for the observation, i.e. the area of concentration on the observation. For example, if the focus of the observation is to be teacher-student interaction and the supervisor notes that the problem is that of classroom management, then the reference point has to be localized. That would mean that the supervisor and teacher have got specific and mutually desired data to discuss.

Respondents about instructional leadership support in alternative instructional methods for children who are failing consistently, responded by beginners (45%) were infrequently, sometimes (40.9%), no suggestion at all (13.6) were responded. Majority of teachers for this item indicated in which that has happened infrequently (47.6%), sometime (38.1%), and never was (11.9%). Whereas the lead teachers on this item responded it had happened rarely (46.7%), others depicted sometimes (33.3%), and never practiced (20%).Principal respondent on this issue indicated it has happened sometimes (55.6%), and rarely (22.2%).

With this regard, the mean weight for beginners is 2.27; proper teachers 2.36; lead teachers 2.27. This indicates the school leadership in its instructional leadership support on how alternative instructional methods can be used for children who failed consistently, provided suggestions for teachers of at all level of experience infrequently.

The instructional leadership in its role of supervision is highly expected to implement teacher's development program entirely on the bases of individual teachers need. In the schools beginner teachers approved (36.4%) in that supervision of the leadership were practicing the teachers development program task infrequently and (31.8%) depicted the schools never practiced the development program for teachers .The remaining respondents indicated (13.6%), in their schools this has been practices sometime, usually and always for each equally. While looking for proper teacher's respondents, majority of them (40.5%) responded it was rare, (35.7%) responded occasionally, whereas (16.7%) indicated totally it was not practiced. Majority of the lead teachers responded it was never practiced and equal number of respondents approved that the schools performed this task sometimes. (33.3%). whereas (44.4%) approved that they know the school was practicing this task rarely. The response coming from principals also was not that much different, in which (44.4%) depicted they are practicing this task infrequently.

To sum up, the mean for beginner respondent of this task is 2.23, for teacher level respondents 2.38, lead teachers 2.13. This indicates, the school leadership performance in teacher's development program on the bases of individual teachers need was invariable. It can be stated that was rarely practiced for all the teachers at different experience level.

One of the items was about the process of observation and evaluation of teachers to identify how the responsible individuals concomitantly taking the action. The respondents summary report for teacher supervision and evaluation shows that at the beginner teachers side 8 (36.4%), were not totally observed in their classroom, and evaluated rarely (infrequently) in the academic year. Proper teachers 18 (42.87%) were observed and 20 (47.6%) were evaluated by the school responsible individuals in their classrooms infrequently (rarely). The mean in case of evaluation of teachers by the school instructional leadership were again 2.32 for beginners, 2.45 for teachers and 3.27 for lead teachers. The practice of class observation and evaluation for beginners and teachers were performed infrequently.

The last item in this factor was the item that examined the provision of non-evaluative feedback (cognitive coaching) about their teaching. The item presented was to respond on how frequently they practiced non-evaluative feedback in their school to provide cognitive coaching. On the side of beginner 9 (40.9%) teachers responded the feedback was given rarely (infrequently), those who responded the non-evaluative feedback has been provided sometime were 7 (31.8%), and others responded "never" were 18.2%. No one beginner teacher responded this activity by their supervisors has happened all the time (always). Even on the side of proper teachers and lead teachers the response was almost similar. Proper teachers 16 (38.1%) were responded "Rarely",

“Sometimes” 15 (35.7%), and “Never” 7 (16.7%). The lead teachers responded (46.7%) “sometimes”, “never” (26.7%) and those who responded “Rarely” were 20% of the respondents. The majority were responded about the non-evaluative supervision that has been provided by the school instructional leadership as if it was practiced rarely or the school performed this task infrequently. The data in Table 10, illustrate that the largest group of respondents 33 (36.7%) indicated they have been provided non-evaluative feedback infrequently.

The mean for beginner respondent of this task is 2.32, teacher level 2.40, lead teachers 2.40 indifferently. This indicates, the school leadership performed non-evaluative feedback for teachers about their teaching were practiced rarely for all the teachers with different experience level.

Beginner teachers, proper teachers and some of the lead teachers respondents suggested about the infrequency of the instructional leadership (supervision), provided in the schools because of some other external workloads, time constraints; and if it happened, the instructional leadership supervision prevailed were not organized under the lead of the principals and the time provided for classroom observation were insufficient.

Principal’s intention towards instructional leadership observed by the majority of respondents was less as compared to their administrative role they used to perform. On the other hand some lead teachers respondents indicated the size of satellite (nearby) schools in a cluster and material (Budget) constraints as a bottleneck factor for not performing instructional leadership as needed. Some respondents were not comfortable with the appropriateness of the types of feedback provided by supervisors to resolve identified problems.

Supervision provides an opportunity to promote teacher efficiency, abstract thought, and a reflection on the teacher’s own instructional methods (Glickman and others., 1995). If the instructional leadership lacks adequate knowledge of supervision and does not know how to meet the needs of the teacher, then an unproductive working relationship may be established (Acheson & Gall, 1980). The teacher could spend time being upset with the instructional leader and might not devote sufficient effort toward teaching students, more importantly, students’ desire, ability, and levels of learning may be affected (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). When the instructional leader cannot meet the teacher’s needs, the entire teaching experience may not be as effective as it could have been (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988). Therefore as suggested, to provide

differentiated supervision for the development of novice teachers and even all others, the instructional leadership supervision did not employ the steps for conferencing with supervisees.

As it has been indicated in the literature review of this thesis, one of the significant merits of differentiated supervision is that it reduces much of the anxiety usually associated with classroom observation or inspections by the supervisor. If the objectives are clearly stated before the observation and the method of data collection is discussed in a full participatory manner of all key actors during the pre-observation period, there would be no secrets about what the supervisor is doing which can put the teacher off ease, and thereby counterproductive in its desired effect. Everything works better in a climate and environment devoid of tension and mutual suspicion.

The semi structured interview questions were also presented to verify the relevance of the instructional support at different levels (ranks). The in school supervision personnel's were questioned on permissiveness of the school policy to choose types of supervision in accordance with the needs of the supervisees and the communication they had with the teacher before, during, and after the visit. The supervisees were also interviewed; on how does the instructional leadership perform satisfactorily to improve the quality learning and why, and time spent for instructional supervision, inputs for instructions, process of class observation and feedback. Respondents noted that the school policy undoubtedly permits to choose types of supervision in accordance with the needs of the supervisees and to be used subsequently, and the instructional leadership in its role of supervision was not taking sufficient time for classroom observation and in providing collegial feedback for teachers at different experience level.

CHAPTER V

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMENDATIONS

Chapter five provides an overview of this study and includes a brief introduction, a review of the research principal purpose, a review of the research methodology and a summary of the findings and conclusions. Following the summary of findings, this chapter offers conclusions and recommendations.

The principal purpose of this study was to identify instructional leadership practices and challenges in government “woreda Five” primary schools. The data collected were used to answer the following three research questions:

- To what extent do the instructional leadership involve in its role of supervision?
- To what extent does the instructional leadership provide relevant support for teachers at different level?
- What are the challenges of the instructional leadership in improving instructions?

As explained in chapter-3, this study descriptive research design to answer the three research questions. The data were received from the primary school teachers, cluster supervisor and principals across Addis Ababa City Administration of Arada Sub City “woreda Five” governmental primary schools.

After the establishment of complete agreement to work with the school society and brief understanding about the purposes of the data collection in the schools, a total of 90 respondents were selected and all of them presented their response. Respondents for the interview were 31 and totally 121 from 180 total numbers of staffs, school teachers and personals have been participated.

Sample selection was stratified on the bases of the teachers work title (rank) that includes the beginner, proper and lead teachers. Collected data were examined to determine insight into the percentage of practices and mean in primary schools supervisory activity in their instructional leadership tasks and the summary is presented on Annex V. Analysis of the study is presented in Tables and indicates the respondent’s frequencies of each factor. Particular attention was paid to the six factors of the adapted supervisory roles of instructional leadership activities.

Whether the tasks performed most frequently or not, the instructional leadership involvement in its role of supervision in the five primary schools of “Woreda Five” are indicated in Tables and noticed with a mean weight response score of 1.0 -5.0 (the school “Never” perform to “Always” perform the given task) are listed in Tables. Tasks that have been performed all the time or always shown with a mean response score of 4.50-5.0. Tasks considered secondary (with less attention) had a mean response score of 1.0-2.49 (the school perform this task rarely or never perform) are listed in Tables.

5.1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The study has manipulated the instructional leadership practices and challenges in their roles of supervision including encouraging concern of achievements, allocation of instructional resources, supervisory observation and evaluations, development of academic climate and coordination of instructional programs. In addition to these, the study employed open ended questions, semi structured interviews, and the past consecutive 3 years grade 8 exam results (since it is a way to substantiate the success or faller of schools in support of the instructional leadership). Grounded on the data obtained through all these instruments the following are presented in the summary of the research finding.

- Among the staff of these primary schools those who have been involved in the school supervision for instructional purpose were denoted by (32.2%) of the respondents it was the school principal’s duty alone. Mostly principals were performing the supervision task in the schools without the involvement of other senior teachers.
- Teacher’s supervision in communicating the instructional goals of the school as noted by the majority (24%) among respondents was usually performed by the instructional leadership of the schools. Simplifying the instructional responsibilities of each professional role, the supervisory support to meet the individual professional needs, teacher’s evaluation, and observation in their classrooms has been performed sometimes or occasionally by the school supervision.
- Majority of respondents about the desire by the instructional leadership supervision to work with teachers, in encouraging teachers to observe each other’s classes, and compiling reproductions, testimonials, and student work that represent the teacher’s professional growth were performed sometimes (occasionally) by the instructional leaders of the school.

- Organization of staff development programs related to instructions as noted by the majority of respondents, has been performed rarely (infrequently).
- The school leadership takes steps to improve student discipline and steps to develop a school climate to be conducive to learning all the time as it has been indicated in Table 8. In this regard as to the majority of the respondents revealed, it can be said that there were reasonable measures that has been taken.
- The process of organizing teachers to work collaboratively in pairs and small teams to observe each other's' teaching and to improve instruction were also performed commonly.
- In coordination of experienced educators (mentor) to works with a novice and to strengthen the instructional support for teachers the school leadership has made occasional effort, which means the school performs this task sometimes as one of the school leadership duties.
- Majority of beginner teachers (40.9%) responded about the support provided for beginner teachers was infrequent and it was a challenge for instructional leadership and proper teacher reveal the support was carried out occasionally.
- Concerning the teaching and learning classroom observation (Observation of teachers in their classrooms) performed by the instructional leadership, for lead teachers noted that it was commonly practiced, whereas for proper teachers it was infrequent and beginners revealed that the observation of beginner teachers in their classroom was never performed in the academic year.
- In order to support the teaching and learning process through classroom observation the instructional leadership supervision group has to take sufficient time to observe the overall interaction among teachers and students. Majority of Beginners and lead teachers noted that the supervisors rarely takes sufficient time, and proper teacher on their side noted the supervision by the instructional leadership has never used sufficient time for classroom observations.

- One of the items presented for each level respondent was about how frequently the supervision in instructional leadership employs assemblies with several phases such as conference, observation, and post-conference which are all the procedures to apply clinical supervision. In this regard majority of proper teachers noted that it has never been practiced in their schools, the beginners approved it was an action that was practice rarely in their schools and lead teachers responded sometimes they have been used practicing clinical supervision in their schools. So that these appears to be one of the challenge for the school leadership in their roles of improving instruction.
- For the item that request on how the supervision of the instructional leadership suggesting alternative instructional methods for children who are failing (not promoted from class to class) consistently; more than three fourth of the respondents in each of the groups approved that it was rare and not accustomed as usual practice.
- Regarding organization of staff development programs that relate to instruction was infrequent practice for beginner and proper teachers. For majority of lead teachers, it was a practice that has been carried out occasionally by the school instructional leadership.
- In case of evaluating teachers to give non-evaluative feedback about their teaching (Cognitive coaching), were infrequent practice for beginner and proper teachers and whereas lead teachers noted it was sometimes practiced by the in school supervision.
- majority (77.8%) responded the support rendered by supervision have helped in improving their performance as a teacher and 22.2% of respondents denoted the supervision support in the school where they are teaching had no value in improving teachers performance.
- For more than 75% of respondents one of the challenges indicated by the majority of the respondents was the problem that exists on teacher's side, awareness to accept supervision as helping and supportive provision for instructional procedures and absence of interest to be observed (supervised) by their colleagues.
- Respondents of the five clustered school teachers, principals and the supervisor denoted the availability of differentiated supervision accordingly with the level of their experience; however, the instructional leadership in the schools mostly didn't practice the support as needed.. Rarely there were types of support delivered distinct to beginner

teachers but not in a regular manner. The reason for this was the absence of awareness of the objectives of differentiated supervision on the side of the instructional leaders as well as teachers

- There were also a gap on the sides of supervisors including the cluster supervisor, to provide feedback or sometime the feedback provided were not directly related with what has been observed in the classroom and supervisors were incapable to give evidence base feedback. Some respondents didn't observe such a practice in their schools in the past six months; few were facing a problem even to identify the value of supervision in support of their instructional performance specifically in the classroom teaching learning process.

5.2. CONCLUSION

There are many different definitions of instructional leadership. These definitions are dependent on the source and philosophy of the researcher that is reporting the definition. Principals and teachers both play a part in forging an effective leadership relationship. One of the guiding principles of this study was principals and teachers are viable contributors to an effective instructional leadership in schools student learning.

As it has been indicated in the book of “Supervision for Today’s Schools” Fifth Edition, written by Peter F. Oliva and others, offered a comprehensive definition of supervision: Supervision is instructional leadership that relates perspectives to behavior, clarifies purposes, contributes to and support organizational actions, coordinates interacts, provides for maintenance and improvement of the instructional program, and access goal achievements. Accordingly, this research paper considered principal’s, senior teachers and the cluster supervisor together part and parcel of the school instructional leadership. The focus of the research was not to deal about the responsibility of principals by considering their leading role alone. As indicated, it was about the instructional leadership team supervision practices as a process. Therefore, the research results that are revealed in this study provide insight into the practices and challenges of instructional leadership that the school principals, lead teachers and cluster supervisor has played.

Mostly principals were performing the supervision task in the schools without the involvement of other senior teachers. However, teacher’s supervision in communicating the instructional goals of the school was commonly performed by the instructional leadership of the schools. Concerning the issues on how supervision involved in instructional leadership and encouraged achievements in the learning process; the research denoted that, the desire by the instructional leadership supervision to work with teachers, in encouraging teachers to observe each other’s classes, and compiling reproductions, testimonials, and student work that represent the teacher’s

professional growth are activities that were occasionally performed. Teacher's supervision in communicating the instructional goals of the school was usually performed by the instructional leadership of the schools. The supervision involved by the instructional leadership to work with teachers in encouraging teachers to observe each other's classes were performed averagely which was sometimes (occasionally).

The school leadership takes steps to improve student discipline and steps to develop a school climate to be conducive for learning all the time. In this regard as to the majority of the respondents revealed, it can be said that there were reasonable measures that has been taken. The process of organizing teachers to work collaboratively in pairs and small teams to observe each other's' teaching and to improve instruction were also performed commonly.

The extent of supervision involved in support of classroom instructions, differentiated support for teachers at different experience level /rank/ and challenges appeared because of insufficient support provided by the instructional leadership or may be because of the problem arise by teachers themselves have been examined using the data obtain from Arada Sub City Woreda Five governmental primary schools sampled respondents. Factors that were employed in answering basic questions are observation and evaluation, and encouraging concern for achievement, development of instructional programs, allocation of resources, and facilitating learning climate and differentiated support of teachers.

The supervisory support to meet the individual professional needs, teacher's evaluation, and observation in their classrooms has been performed sometimes or occasionally by the school supervision without considering the rank and experience of teachers. However, through computing the same data across stratified samples by considering the rank of respondents, majority of beginner teachers responded about the support provided for beginner teachers was infrequent and proper teacher reveal the support was carried out occasionally. Concerning the teaching and learning classroom observation (Observation of teachers in their classrooms) performed by the instructional leadership supervision for lead teachers denoted that it was commonly practiced, whereas for proper teachers it was infrequent and beginners revealed in that the observation of beginner teachers in their classroom were never performed in the academic year.

In order to support the teaching and learning process through classroom observation the instructional leadership supervision group has to take sufficient time to observe the overall interaction among teachers and students. Beginners and lead teachers noted that the supervisors

rarely takes sufficient time, and proper teacher on their side denoted the supervision by the instructional leadership never had used sufficient time for classroom observations.

The study revealed that the supervision practice by the instructional leadership faced with variety of challenge that had been occurred because of varied reasons. respondents in this regard, stipulated one of the challenges indicated was the problem that exists on teacher's side, awareness to accept supervision as helping and supportive provision for instructional procedures and absence of interest to be observed (supervised) by their colleagues. There were also a gap on the sides of supervisors including cluster supervisor in providing feedback that are directly related with what has been observed in the classroom and unable to give evidence base feedback. Some respondents didn't observe such a practice in their schools in the past six months; few are facing a problem even to identify the value of supervision in support of their instructional performance specifically in the classroom teaching learning process.

Respondents of the five clustered school teachers, principals and the supervisor denoted the availability of differentiated supervision; however, supervisors in the schools mostly didn't practice the support or it was rarely to happen invariably at all level (either for beginners, teachers or lead teachers) in such away and identified these were the biggest challenge of the schools. Rarely there were type of support delivered by the school instructional leadership which was distinct to beginner teachers but not in a regular manner. The reason why this was not practiced as required as noted by the majority of respondent destined it was because of the absence of awareness of the objectives of differentiated supervision on the side of the instructional leaders as well as teachers. More of that, grade 8 students exam result shows that less success of learners, that implies also the weaker sides of supervision provided by the instruction leadership in support of teachers. Supervision provides an opportunity to promote teacher efficiency, abstract thought, and a reflection on the teacher's own instructional methods (Glickman and others., 1995). If the instructions had been given with appropriate attention by the supervision of the instructional leadership for the classroom teaching learning process, unquestionably students learning will be improved thereby promotion rate of students at each grade level will be greater than ever.

5.3. RECOMMENDATION

As to the findings obtained from the questionnaire, interview, students exam result, and open ended questions, the instructional leadership supervision practice by its own has to be purposive, knowledge based and supportive. The in school supervisors should be given opportunities for

short and long term training programs on how to employ classroom observation (clinical supervision) and providing non evaluative feedback, to initiate new programs that focus on instructions, opportunities to establish school instructional policies as well as opportunities to focus on assisting individual departments and teachers at different level.

Challenges that appeared unresolved in instructional leadership supervisory practices should be given strong emphasis by concerned authorities starting from and within the school level for improving instructions and promoting quality of learning. Based on the descriptive survey data assessment and findings, some of the challenges that strictly demanding prior attention in the “woreda Five” government primary schools are identified hereunder. To cope up the challenges that have been identified in the finding the following recommendations are offered on how the extent of supervision in instructional leadership can encourage teachers as a whole and at different level and thereby to improve quality of learning. As a result of the findings previously stated:

1. Observation of teachers in their classrooms:

- **Supervisory support:** The supervisory support to meet the individual professional need, teacher’s evaluation, and observation in their classrooms as shown on the study finding has been performed rarely by the school supervision, that depicted the schools perform the task infrequently. While correlating supervision with quality teaching, Nambassa (2003), study findings indicate that lack of supervision and inadequate inspection brings about poor quality teaching and learning in primary schools. Therefore, teachers should be given supervisory support and has to be observed in their classroom while teaching by the school instructional leadership.
- **Observation of beginner teachers in their classroom.** Concerning the teaching and learning classroom observation (Observation of teachers in their classrooms) performed by the instructional leadership supervision for proper teachers was infrequent, whereas, beginners revealed in that the classroom observation for beginner teachers was never performed in the academic year. Teachers at earlier stages of development often have problems making decisions and defining problems, and they have learned few ways of responding to problems. Directive supervision places the instructional leadership as the expert in charge of writing goals for the teacher. The instructional leadership has to be active in working with the teacher. Observation of beginner teachers in their classroom should be carried

out frequently as needed to anticipate and fulfill gaps in knowledge and skills especially for novice.

2. Variety of instructional staff:

The results of this study found out there was a challenge in the participation of senior teachers in the instructional leadership of the school. The study disclosed that school teacher's observation and evaluation dominantly has been carried out by the school principals alone. Nolan and Frances (1992) argued that supervision needed to become a group process of interdependent cooperation. Teachers should have the role of observing their peers, novice and evaluating instructional duties, and should be given opportunities to work with colleagues to improve their practice. Collaborative inquiry supplants principal-centered supervisory practices (Reitzug, 1997). As teachers inquire together, they encourage each other toward answers for instructional problems. Principals should consider how to include various members of their staff to participate on the instructional leadership team of the school and provide opportunities for self-learning process.

3. Staff development operations:

- **Organize staff development programs.** Regarding organization of staff development programs related to instruction was infrequent practice for beginner and proper teachers as shown in the conclusion of the study. For majority of lead teachers, it was practiced occasionally by the school instructional leadership. Staff development can be defined as the process of providing opportunities for employees to improve their knowledge, skills, and performance in line with the goals and values of the organization and in relation to the interests and needs of the teachers. Therefore, the school leadership should have the role of organizing staff development program and the annual and the weekly plan has to comprise organizing staff development programs in the supervisory instructional leadership activities.
- **Coordination of experienced educators (mentors) to works with a novice .**In order to coordinate experienced educator (mentor) to work with a novice and to strengthen the instructional support for teachers the school leadership has made some effort but not commonly. Mentoring generally refers to the art of helping to steer a subordinate or a colleague in the same field. The school instructional leadership should have to give significant attention for the coordination of experienced educators (teachers) to work with a novice.

- **Meeting the individual professional needs:** The support provided by the supervision in instructional leadership to meet the individual professional needs of beginner teachers was infrequent and proper teacher reveal the support was carried out occasionally. Through meeting the instructional professional needs of teachers, the instructional leadership and teacher can establish goals, identify how they will be achieved, and as a team note when the achievement should be noticed. Therefore, the instructional leadership should be designed and implemented to meet individual teacher's professional needs.

4. Teachers evaluation:

- **Non-evaluative feedback:** giving non-evaluative (Cognitive coaching) feedback about their teaching, were infrequent practice for beginner and proper teachers and whereas lead teachers revealed it was sometimes practiced by the in school supervisors. Cognitive coaching also refers to “a nonjudgmental process in which supervisor (senior teacher) attempts to facilitate teacher learning through a problem solving approach by using questions to stimulate the teacher's thinking” (Costa and Garmston ,1994, p. 2). The instructional leadership should conduct walk-throughs or mini-observations regularly in order to give teachers non-evaluative feedback on implementation of their weekly lesson plans, so that create opportunities to assist teachers in improving their communication in teaching and learning.
- **Evaluative feedback:** As to the interviewed personals the feedback after the supervisory process were not given right after the evaluation. Armstrong (2003), points out that feedback helps individuals get a broad perspective of how they are perceived by others than previously possible, increase awareness and relevance of competencies, encourage more feedback, re-enforce desired competencies, give people a more rounded view of performance and finally, it clarifies to teachers critical performance aspects or areas that need improvement. The evaluation feedback for teachers should be provided, and evaluation finding feedback has to be provided timely by the instructional leadership in order to make in use for improvement of the teaching learning process.

5. Scheduling assemblies for an instructional purpose:

- **Employ several phases:** One of the items presented for each level respondent was about how frequently the supervision in instructional leadership employs several phases, such as conference, observation, and post-conference which are all the procedures to apply clinical supervision. In this regard majority of proper

teachers revealed that it had been never practiced in their schools, the beginners approved it was an action that had been practice rarely in their schools and lead teachers responded they have been used practicing clinical supervision sometimes in their schools. The instructional leadership should have to employ all the steps with supervisees, such as conference, observation, and post-conference in line with decisions made about the procedures with careful regard to teacher's developmental level and needs at the moment.

6. Suggesting alternative instructional methods:

- The suggestion expected from the supervision of instructional leadership on an alternative instructional method for children who are failing consistently; in the finding of the study, each of the respondent groups of teachers in the study approved that it was rarely to happen and not accustomed as usual supervision practice. Supervision existed for the primary purpose of improving instruction (Neagley & Evans, 1976: 104). It was also revealed that supervisors act as problem solvers and decision makers as they find out why something is going wrong and then decide what to do about it. As a result of supervisory observation and on the bases of identified gaps of the teaching learning process, the leadership should provide alternative instructional method for the improvement of student learning outcome.

7. Professional development in instructional leadership.

- Majority of the interview and open ended question respondents revealed the supervision in instructional leadership performed not satisfactorily to improve the quality of learning and some are inconvenient to accept the feedback coming on the side of instructional leadership supervision. William H. and others gave supervision broader interpretation, viewing it as a technical service requiring expertise, the goal of which is improvement in the growth and development of the learner. In strengthening the instructional leadership role of supervision and the way on how the leadership has to perform the supervision collaboratively with senior teacher, should be supported by professional development programs by higher institutions in a regular manner for specialization of the lead teachers in supervisory procedures in instructional leadership.
- In support of this fact, cluster based staff development program, supervisory support and guideline in instructional leadership are the most effective means of in service teachers' professional development. the clustered schools supervisor

importantly is expected to facilitate and promote experience sharing among schools and teachers

To find out the schools instructional leadership practices and challenges through the provision of support, teachers development, creation of learning environment, instructional program development and allocation of resource for instructional purpose has been assessed as presented. Among others, one of the instruments was, the past three years grade 8 regional examinations, which have been computed as shown in Annex III. Number of students failed to pass to the next grade level and the rate of detainees has been increased by 15% from year to year. Adepoju (1998) defines school supervision as the process of bringing about improvement in instruction by working with people who are working with pupils. It has also been described as a process of stimulating growth and a means of helping teachers to achieve excellence in teaching. Supervisory involvement of instructional leadership therefore is a vital process and combination of activities which is concerned with the quality of teaching and improvement of teaching for students learning in the school framework.

References

- Acheson, K. A. & Gall, M. D. (1980). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers*. New York: Longman.
- Adepoju T.L (1998). *Fundamental of school administration, planning and supervision in Nigeria*. Ibadana; Alafas Nigeria at Company.
- Adesina, S. (1981). *Some Aspects of School Management*. Education Industries Nigeria Limited.
- Ajayi T, andAdegbesan SO (2007). Quality assurance in the teaching profession. Paper presented at a forum on emerging issues in teaching professionalism in Nigeria (14-16 March) Akure, Ondo State.
- Allington, R.L. (2001). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based interventions*. New York, NY: Longmans.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Babson, N.O. (2005). *Education and Resources Requirement: The Case of Nigeria*. Port Harcourt: Akpan Printing Press Limited.
- Blase,J.,& Blase,J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teacher perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 349-378.
- Bartky, J.A. (1973). *Supervision as Human Relations*. Health D.C. & Co.
- Brophy, J. (1986). Teacher influences on student achievement. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1069–1077.
- Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (1989). *Supervision: Focus on instruction*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Instructional leadership*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Burton, William H., and Leo J.Brueckner. *Supervision: A social process*, 3rd ed. New york: Appleton-century –crofts, 1955.
- Calabrese, R., & Tucker- Ladd. (1991). *The principal and assistant principal*:

a mentoring relationship. NASSP Bulletin, 75, 1991.

Celikten, M. (1998). The instructional leadership tasks of high school assistant principals and factors that enhance or inhibit the enactment of these tasks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison.

Cliff, N. (1970). *The Relation Between Sample and Population Characteristics: Vectors*, Psychometrika, 35, 163-178.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cook, G. E. (1996). Using clinical supervision to promote inquiry. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17(4), 46-50.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (1994). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christophore-Gordon.

DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership*, 15, 15-20.

Donmoyer, R., & Wagstaff, J. G. (1990). Principals can be effective managers and instructional leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74(525), 20-29.

Edmeirer, H., & Nicklaus, J. (1999). The impact of peer and principal collaborative supervision on teacher's trust, commitment, desire for collaboration, and efficiency. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14(4), 351-378.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective school for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 17, 15-24.

Ezeani, S. (1998). *A Research Method: A realistic Approach*. Ebbadan Nigeria, Elohim Publishers

Fenstermacher, G., & Richardson, V. (2005). On making determinations of quality in teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 107, 186-213.

Fitzmaurice, J. (1997) M.St. Thesis, University of Dublin.

Fry, F. L., Stoner, C.R. & Hattwick, R.E. (2001): *Business, an Integrated Approach*, Irwin/McGraw-Hill, Boston.

Ginsburg, H., & Opper, S. (1979). *Piaget's theory of intellectual development* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Glatthorn, A. A. (1997). *Differentiated supervision* (2nd ed). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Glickman, C. D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glickman, C. D. (Ed.). (1992). *Supervision in transition*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (1995). *Supervision of instruction* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *SuperVision and instructional leadership* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. J. (1993). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- G. R. Terry, Principles of Management. 3rd Ed, Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin. 1960
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985a). Developing an instructional role for the assistant principal. *Education and Urban Society*, 18(1), 85-95.
- G. Yukl, Leadership in organizations, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994 Ibid.
- Haileselassie, W. (2001). Current expectations from educational supervision in the Ethiopian system. Material presented for training of trainers workshop. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ministry of Education.
- Harris, Ben M. *supervisory leadership in education*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice- Hall, 1985.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (8th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- J. R. Weber, Instructional Leadership: A Composite working Model Synthesis of the literature, ERIC Clearing house on Educational Management, University of Oregon. Ed 287211, 1987
- J. Gardner, *Leadership: An Overview*, Washington, DC: The Independent Sector, 1988
- Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). Estimating teacher impacts on student achievement: An experimental evaluation. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kirschner, P.A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R.E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based,

- experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41, 75–86.
- Kitchener, K. S., Lynch, C. L., Fischer, K. W., & Woord, P. K. (1993). Developmental range of reflection judgement: The effect of contextual support and practice on developmental stage. *Developmental Psychology*, 29 (5), 893-906.
- Kutsyuruba, B. (2003). *Instructional Supervision: Perceptions of Canadian and Ukrainian Beginning High-School Teachers* (Master's thesis). Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.
- Lezotte, L. (1991). *Correlates of Effective School* (Report). Retrieved May 6, 2008, from Effectiveschools.com Web site: <http://www.effectiveschools.com/Correlates.pdf>
- McShane, S.L. & Von Glinow, M.A. (2000): *Organizational Behavior, Emerging Realities for the Workplace Revolution*, Irwin-McGraw-Hill, Boston.
- Mish, F. C. (Ed.). (1989). *The new Merriam-Webster dictionary*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Montgomery, D. (1999). *Positive teacher appraisal through classroom observation*. London: David Fulton.
- Mondy, R.W. and Premeaux, S.R. (1993): *Management: Concepts, Practices and Skills*, 6th edition, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Pajak, E. (1989). *Identification of supervisory proficiencies project*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427- 52.
- Ralph, E. G. (1998). *Developing practitioners: A handbook of contextual supervision*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Reiman, A. J., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1998). *Mentoring and supervision for teacher development*. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Reitzug, U. C., & Cross, B. (1993, October). *Deconstructing principal instructional leadership: From "super" vision to critical collaboration*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
- Reitzug, U. C. (1997). Images of principal instructional leadership: From supervision to collaborativenquiry. *Journal of Curriculum Supervision*, 12, 356-366.
- Schön, D. A. (1988). Coaching reflective teaching. In P. P. Grimmett & G. F. Erickson (Eds.), *Reflection in teacher education* (pp. 19-30). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schonberger, R. J. and Knod Jr., E. M. (1997): *Operations Management: Customer Focused Principles*, 6th edition, Irwin-McGraw-Hill, Boston.

- S.D. Thomson, "Editorial: Effective Leadership", NASSP Newsletter, 27, 8. 1980
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1988). *Supervision: Human perspectives* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 53(2), 12-16.
- Smith, W., & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Warmbrod, J. R. (1986, March). *Priorities for continuing progress in research in agricultural education*. Paper presented at the 35th Annual Southern Region Research Conference in Agricultural Education, North Little Rock, AK.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on pupil achievement* (A working paper). Aurora, CO: Midcontinent Research for Education and Learning.
- Wiske, S. (Ed.). (1998). *Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1996). *Supervision: A guide to practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. (1985). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

Sources form Internet

1. Anonymous. Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, Issue #140, March 12, 2013. © by CJEAP and the author(s).
2. Anonymous. Rethinking Leadership: The Changing Role of Principal Supervisors www.wallacefoundation.org.
3. Anonymous. The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality www.nctq.org
4. Bizarre Rhino (2011), Leadership Behavior and Motivation. Retrieved April, 2013 from: <http://businessstudyguide.weebly.com/>.
5. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement: _Commissioned by the Wallace Foundation www.wallacefoundation.org
6. How leadership influences student learning: Kenneth Leithwood, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson and Kyla Wahlstrom
7. Karen Seashore Louis*, Beverly Dretzke and Kyla Wahlstrom: School Effectiveness and School Improvement <http://www.informaworld.com>

8. Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004, September). How leadership influences student learning. (Review of research). The Wallace Foundation, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, www.ontario.ca/eduleadership.
9. Supervisory Options for Instructional Leaders in Education: Journal of Leadership Education. cfritz@utk.edu
10. University of Saskatchewan. Retrieved on November 21, 2010, from: <http://library2.usask.ca/theses/available/etd-09052003-134303/>

Annex – I

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Educational Leadership and Management

**Questionnaire to be filled by Arada Sub City Woreda Five Governmental
Primary School Teachers, Principals and Supervisors**

The purpose of this study is to collect data on how teachers, head teachers, principals and assigned supervisor, in clustered primary schools apply and practicing supervision of instruction. Thank you for agreeing to help us by completing this survey questionnaire.

PART ONE: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Directions: Please put a tick mark (✓) inside the box or circle the number of your choice. You do not need to write names.

1. Sex: Male Female
2. Age: Under 20-25 years old 26-30 years old
31-35 ears old 36-40 years old 40 and above years old
3. Work title/ Job Classification(career aspirati) Beginner proper teacher Head Teacher
 Principal Cluster Supervisor , If any other please Specify _____
4. Academic Rank: TTI certificate , College Diploma , Degree ,MA/MSc
5. Total years of experience, 1-5 years , 6-10 , 11 and above years of experience
6. Additional responsibility Home room teacher ,Unit leader , Dept. Head , No additional responsibility If any other please -----
7. Staffs involved in supervisory role of your school for instructional leadership ,the Principal ,Dept. Heads , Homeroom Teachers , Principals &Dep. Heads , All are involved

PART TWO: BASIC DATA

The following questions are about the instructional leadership practices and challenges in your school. The items in the questionnaire are open and closed ended. Your alternate chooses in the academic year are “we do this all the time”, which is represented by “A” (5); the task performed commonly or “Usually” (U) the value is (4); 3 is for the task performed occasionally or “Sometimes”(S); 2 is for the task performed infrequently or “Rarely”, and 1 is “Never” (N). Please put a tick (√) mark inside the box that indicate your level of agreement for each of the following statements.

No.	Statements /Items/	N	R	S	U	A
1.	communicate the instructional goals of the school					
2.	The leadership simplify the instructional responsibilities of each professional role					
3.	The leadership meets the individual professional needs:					
4.	The leadership evaluate teachers					
5.	The leadership observe teachers in their classrooms					
6.	supervisors spend one full class period of his/ her/ time when conducting instructional supervision observation					
7.	The leadership Schedule assemblies that have an instructional purpose					
8.	The leadership employ several phases, such as conference, observation by a supervisor, and post-conference.					
9.	The leadership give teachers feedback on their weekly lesson plans					
10.	The leadership organize staff development programs that relate to instruction					
11.	The leadership encourage teachers to observe each other’s class					
12.	The leadership communicate to all students the school’s general concern for achievement					
13.	The leadership work with teachers to improve the instructional program for the school					
14.	The leadership assign teachers to specific classes or sections					
15.	The leadership compile reproductions, testimonials, and student work that represent the teacher’s professional growth.					
16.	necessary support personnel (aides, secretaries, etc.) are made available to assist teachers in accomplishing instructional goals					
17.	The leadership organize teachers to work collaboratively in pairs and small teams to observe each other’s’ teaching and to improve instruction					

18.	The leadership take steps to improve student discipline						
19.	The leadership take steps to develop a school climate conducive to learning						
20.	coordinate experienced educator (mentor) to works with a novice or less experienced teachers teacher collaboratively)						
21.	The leadership provide help to teachers who want to improve their teaching						
22.	The leadership help teachers to relate the school's instructional goals to their curriculum units						
23.	Analyze students test scores to identify general instructional strengths and weaknesses						
24.	The leadership allocate materials needed to accomplish instructional goals						
25.	The leadership help teachers to evaluate instructional materials						
26.	The leadership help teachers to develop appropriate instructional materials that are not commercially available						
27.	The leadership give teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching						
28.	The leadership suggest alternative instructional methods for children who are failing consistently						
29.	The leadership initiate new programs that have an instructional emphasis						
30.	The leadership establish a school policy on student performance						
31.	The leadership help individual departments to coordinate learning						
32.	The leadership select instructional personnel fairly						
33.	The leadership develop the school's annual instructional programs						
34.	The leadership communicate to parents the importance of basic skills instruction in the schools						
35.	The leadership secure additional funds for instructional purpose						

Part Three: Open ended

36. Do you think the support rendered by supervision have helped in improving the performance as a teacher? Yes , No

If yes, state how your performance is improved-----

37. What do you think about the challenges involved in the supervisory role of instructional leadership of the school? -----

38. What do you think about the supervision provided in your school on how relevant are the instructional support for teachers at different levels? -----

Annex II

Interview Questions for Instructional leadership Supervisors & Teachers

I. Interview questions for the principals, senior teachers and for cluster supervisor:

1. How often do you visit classrooms?
2. What communication did you have with the teacher before, during, and after the visit?
3. Would you please tell us about the recent supervision visit of a classroom? When and what was the purpose of the visit? Describe what you were looking for.
4. Does the school policy allow choosing types of supervision in accordance to the needs of the supervisees?
5. How do you determine the time you spend during the week or which of the following are taking more time in your instructional leadership tasks of the week? And why? Observe and Evaluate; Allocate Instructional Resources; Develop academic Climate; Encourage Concern for Achievement; Coordinate the Instructional Program
6. How do you know that changes are being made in instruction?

II. Interview questions for the teachers:

1. How often do the supervisors observe or visit your classroom?
2. What kinds of feedback or suggestions do the supervisors give to help you improve your instruction?
3. What role does your principal and other supervisors play in guiding and supporting your work in the classroom?
4. How do you recognize the importance of supervision in instructional leadership for student learning?
5. How appropriate it is the way leaders allocate instructional resource?
6. What is your observation about the coordination of instructional programs in the school?
7. Does the instructional leadership (supervision) provide in your school satisfactory to improve student learning result & the quality learning? And why?(time spent for instructional supervision, inputs for instructions, process of class observation, feedback)

Annex III

Eighth grade 3 years exam result

Schools	Sex	Academic Year									Average
		2003			2004			2005			
Alemberhan		Registered	Passed	failed	Registered	Passed	failed	Registered	Passed	failed	
	M	56	56	-	40	34	6	28	24	5	
	F	53	48	5	61	41	20	64	35	29	
	T	109	104	5	101	75	26	92	59	34	
	% failed			4.59			25.74			36.956	22.42867
Ras Abebe	M	26	24	2	26	15	11	38	29	9	
	F	40	34	6	35	22	13	54	30	24	
	T	66	58	8	61	37	24	92	59	33	
	% failed			12.12			39.34			35.87	29.11
Timihirt	M	32	30	2	22	18	4	57	34	23	
Bilichita	F	58	54	4	57	41	16	84	49	35	
	T	90	84	6	74	59	17	141	83	58	
	% failed			6.67			22.97			41.13	23.59
Beteliher	M	101	95	6	98	78	8	102	85	17	
	F	90	84	6	92	72	20	104	76	28	
	T	191	183	12	190	150	40	206	161	45	
	% failed			6.28			21.05			21.85	16.39333
New Era	M	99	95	4	103	88	15	97	80	17	
	F	102	90	12	107	83	24	108	72	36	
	T	201	185	16	210	171	39	205	152	53	
	% failed			7.96			18.57			25.85	17.46

Annex IV

Do you think the support rendered by supervision have helped you in improving your performance as a teacher?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	70	77.8	77.8
No	20	22.2	100.0
Total	90	100.0	

Annex V

Practice and challenges of in instructional leadership study frequencies and factors

	Frequency Variables	No_ of items	Grand Mean	Rank/Title Respondents	Analysis
1	Observation and evaluation	6	2.545	All	The task performed sometimes
2	Allocation of instructions	5	3.232	All	The task performed sometimes
3	Development of academic climate	6	3.42	All	The task performed sometimes
4	Encourage concern of achievement	6	3.213	All	The task performed sometimes
5	Coordination of instructional program	7	3.38	All	The task performed sometimes
6	Teachers at different level	10	2.265	Beginners	Performed Rarely
			2.325	Pro. Teachers	Performed Rarely
			2.388	Lead Teachers	Performed Rarely

Annex VI

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
simplify the instructional responsibilities of each professional role	Between Groups	.972	5	.194	.230	.949
	Within Groups	71.128	84	.847		
	Total	72.100	89			
meets the individual professional needs:	Between Groups	3.740	5	.748	.987	.431
	Within Groups	63.649	84	.758		
	Total	67.389	89			
evaluate teachers	Between Groups	4.789	5	.958	.878	.500
	Within Groups	91.666	84	1.091		
	Total	96.456	89			
observe teachers in their classrooms	Between Groups	9.330	5	1.866	1.652	.155
	Within Groups	94.892	84	1.130		
	Total	104.222	89			
supervisors spend one full class period of his/ her/ time when conducting instructional supervision observation	Between Groups	2.216	5	.443	.676	.643
	Within Groups	55.073	84	.656		
	Total	57.289	89			
Schedule assemblies that have an instructional purpose	Between Groups	5.882	5	1.176	2.028	.083
	Within Groups	48.740	84	.580		
	Total	54.622	89			
Employ several phases, such as conference, observation by a supervisor, and post-conference. (Clinical).	Between Groups	4.982	5	.996	1.604	.168
	Within Groups	52.173	84	.621		
	Total	57.156	89			
give teachers feedback on their weekly lesson plans	Between Groups	2.926	5	.585	.839	.526
	Within Groups	58.629	84	.698		
	Total	61.556	89			

Assuming the Lickert Scale is a continuous variable, there is no statistically significant difference between the three (five) groups in all cases.

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this study is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all the sources of materials used for the study have been duly acknowledged.

Declared by

Name Tadesse Atnafu

Signature _____

Date _____

Confirmed by Advisor

Name Kenenisa Babi (Ato)

Signature _____

Date _____