



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF INSTRUCTIONAL
LEADERSHIP IN PRIVATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF BURAYU
CITY ADMINISTRATION, OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

BY: TEKALIGN TAREKEGN MEGERSA

AUGUST, 2021
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF INSTRUCTIONAL
LEADERSHIP IN PRIVATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF BURAYU
CITY ADMINISTRATION, OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

**BY
TEKALIGN TAREKEGN MEGERSA**

ADVISOR: HAILESELASSIE W/GERIMA (ASS.PROF)

**A Thesis Submitted to the College of Education and Behavioural Studies,
Department of Educational Planning and Management in partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Art in
Educational Leadership and Management**

AUGUST, 2021

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

DECLARATION

I hereby my signature below declare that the thesis entitled “**Practices and Challenges of Instructional Leadership in Private Primary Schools of Burayu City Administration, Oromia Regional State**”, is my original work and it has not been presented for the award of any degree, diploma, and other similar titles of any other university or institution and that all sources of materials used for this thesis have been dully acknowledged.

Name: Tekalign Tarekegn

Signature: _____

Date of Submission: _____

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Tekalign Tarekegn, entitled: “**The Practices and Challenges of Instructional Leadership in Private Primary Schools of Burayu City Administration, Oromia Regional State**”, and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Art in Educational leadership and Management that meets the accepted standards concerning originality and quality.

Approved by Board of Examiners:

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank almighty God for helping me throughout my carrier and successful accomplishment of my study. Next, I would like to thank my advisor Ato Haileselassie Woldegerima (Ass. professor), for his strong, critical evaluation and constructive comment in improving the quality of the study, starting from the beginning to its accomplishment. His assistance support and inspiration on this study were highly valuable. This study wouldn't be realized without his strong contribution and commitment.

Next, would like to express my greatest love and respect to my wife, Getenash Abebe for her constant encouragement and supported me throughout my MA study. My acknowledgment also to my friend Shimelis Hayilu, Hayilu Nigussie and Aman Dedefo for their moral support and significance suggestion in the process of my study.

Lastly, am very grateful for those schools, principals, department heads and teachers who played greater role in the study by filling the questionnaires and responding Interviews.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BEO: Burayu Education Office

BTA: Burayu Town Administration

CPD: Continuous Professional Development

EMIS: Education Management Information System

ESDP: Education Sector Development Program

FGD: Focus Group Discussion

GEQIP: General Education Quality Improvement Program

MOE: Ministry of Education

PSTA: Parents, Students and Teachers Association

SIP: School Improvement Program

SPSS: Statistical Packages of Social Science

TDP: Teachers Development Program

TABLE OF CONTENT

Contents	Pages
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	4
1.3. Objectives of the study	6
1.3.1. General objectives of the study.....	6
1.3.2. Specific objectives of the study	6
1.4. Significance of the Study	7
1.5. Delimitation of the Study	7
1.6. Limitation of the Study.....	7
1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms	8
1.8. Organization of the study	9
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	10
2.1. The Concept of Leadership	10
2.2. Instructional Leadership and Strategies	12
2.2.1. Instructional Leadership	12
2.2.2. Strategies of instructional leadership.....	16
2.3. Dimension of Instructional Leadership	19
2.4. Standards for Ethiopian school principals.....	23
2.5. Challenges in practicing instructional leadership.....	24
2.6. Overview of Instructional leadership in the Ethiopian context.....	25
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS	28
3.1. Research Design	28
3.2. Sources of data	28
3.3. Population of the study.....	29

3.4. Samples and Sampling Techniques	29
3.5. Data collection instruments	30
3.5.1. Questionnaire	30
3.5.2. Interview	31
3.5.3. Focus Group Discussions	31
3.6. Data Quality Control (Pilot test).....	31
3.7. Procedure of Data Collection	32
3.8. Methods of Data Analysis	33
3.9. Ethical considerations.....	33
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	35
4.1. Response Rate of Respondents.....	35
4.2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	36
4.3. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data.....	38
4.3.1. Instructional leadership practices.....	38
4.3.2. Challenges to Instructional Leadership Effectiveness	56
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	62
5.1. Summary.....	62
5.2. Conclusions	65
5.3. Recommendations	66
Reference.....	68
Appendix A	72
Appendix B	78
Appendix C	79

LIST OF TABLES

	Pages
Table 1: Weber’s (1996) Instructional Leadership Framework.....	15
Table 2: Sample Size of teachers	30
Table 3: Reliability test results with Cronbach’s alpha	32
Table 4: Response rate of respondents.....	35
Table 5: Summary of Characteristics of Respondents	36
Table 6: Teachers’ Responses on assignment of individuals to instructional leadership	39
Table 7: Teachers’ Responses on organized and managed of instructional leaders	42
Table 8: Teachers’ Responses on Lead and Facilitate vision of learning.....	44
Table 9: Teachers’ Responses on Develop and manage school community relations.....	45
Table 10: Teachers’ Responses on lead and manage learning and teaching	47
Table 11: Teachers’ Responses on lead and develop individuals and team	49
Table 12: Teachers’ Responses on lead and manage school operations and resources	51
Table 13: Teachers’ Responses on Teachers’ view on instructional leadership.....	53
Table 14: Teachers’ Responses on Lack of Skills and Training.....	56
Table 15: Teachers’ Responses on Lack of Resource Availability and Allocation.....	58
Table 16: Teachers’ Responses on Lack of Leadership behavior.....	60

ABSTRACT

The Purpose of the study was to examine instructional leadership practices and challenges in private primary schools of Burayu city Administration. The study employed mixed research design consisting quantitative and qualitative approaches to collect and analyze data. The primary sources of data were principals, department heads, teachers and secondary source of data were books, journals and organization reports. From 32 primary private school 10 of them were selected using simple random sampling technique mainly lottery method. Participants in the study were 109 teachers who were selected by simple random sampling method, and 10 primary school principals, 10 department heads and 8 teachers who were selected by purposive sampling. The primary data collection instruments were questionnaire, FGD and interview. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage and mean using SPSS version 24.0. Qualitative data were analyzed by using narration method. finding from the data analysis revealed that in private schools the assignment of instructional leadership has a gap. Instructional leaders assigned informally by the school owners or appointed by individuals' interest of investor. Instructional leader was made not on the basis of their qualification and competence. instructional leader was accountable for school manager; their performance was not evaluated by district education. practices of instructional leadership aligned with the standard of MoE in the areas like developing and managing school community relation, leading and managing learning and teaching, and leading and managing school operations and resources. but, the practices which is leading and facilitating vision of learning and leading and developing individuals and team was not aligned with the standard of MoE. Teachers have almost positive perception on instructional leadership. in relation to the result of the study there are different factors which hinder instructional leadership such as lack of qualified instructional leader, lack of training on instructional leadership, lack in-service training, lack of courage to take risks for the improvement of instruction and lack of organizing the school community for leadership work are the factor that hampered of instructional leadership in the private schools. It is, therefore concluded that there are gaps in the instructional leadership practice of the private primary schools. Finally, based on the findings and conclusions, it was recommended, to equip instructional leaders with necessary knowledge, attitude and skills, the private school owners and city education office may arrange seminars, short and long term training in collaboration with different body to improve the capacity of instructional leaders. Moreover, recommendations were also provided school owners to solve selection of instructional leaders, city education office and CRC supervisors should give consistent support, guidance and follow how private school implement government policy and curriculum according to the standard.

KEY WORDS: SCHOOL, INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP, PRIVATE,

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses several important issues relevant to the problem's context. It offers an overview of school instructional leadership practices and challenges. It also highlights the problem statement, the study's intent and goals, research concerns, and the study's significance. Finally, it provides operational definitions of key terms as used in the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Instructional leadership as a concept emerged and developed in the United States within the “effective school’s movement” of the 1980s. This was in response to the “Coleman Report” of 1966 titled "Equality of Educational Opportunity" (Marshall, 2015). The “Coleman report”, commissioned by the US government indicated that student background and socioeconomic status are more important than the school or its environment in determining educational outcomes of a student. Other educational researchers believed, on the contrary, that schools indeed make a significant difference on student achievement. This led to the formation of the Effective Schools Movement” which endeavored to substantiate that: "All children can learn, and that the school controls the factors necessary to ensure student mastery of the core curriculum". (Marshall,2015).

As Miller (cited in Dereje Demissie,2019) For the past three decades, instructional leadership has been prominent in educational leadership literature. During this era, various structures were created by authors and researchers in the area at different times to direct the role of educational leaders as instructional leadership. Researchers (Wallace Foundation, 2013, Blasé and Blasé, 2000) created an instructional leadership structure that consists of identifying and setting the vision and mission of the school, managing and overseeing the instructional programs and developing a positive school environment for teaching and learning. In order to make their schools more successful, instructional leaders should also frame school goals, collaborate, supervise and organize the curriculum, track progress and provide support for the teaching and learning community.

As Glatthom, Horing, Darling-Hammond, Stronge and Lashway (cited in Dereje Demissie,2019) conceptualized instructional leadership activities as inspiring workers to function and improve, fostering high standards, identifying and communicating a specific

mission, aim an goals, developing and changing curricula, evaluating school curricula data on teaching and learners, making formative observation on teaching and providing teachers with direct and immediate input to enhance the teaching leaning process and ensure quality of education.

The practices of instructional leadership in Africa were in various forms. In Nigeria, Principals, as described by Arikewuyo (2001:70); Nigerian principals are not only instructional leaders, but both managerial and instructional roles are performed. The following roles are specifically connected to the core activities of instructional leadership:

Providing leadership for the creation of curricula; providing leadership for instructional enhancement; creating an atmosphere conducive to the realization of human potential affecting the actions of staff and learners; supervising school teaching activities; directing the introduction and adjustment of curricula, creating a professional; ethos within the school by involving staff members in decision making (Arikewuyo, 2001:70).

Ethiopia has made a very significant effort to integrate and encourage quality education in Africa. Thus, numerous educational reforms have been made by the Ethiopian government. In 2007, the country introduced the General Quality Improvement Program for Education (GEQIP). One of its components is the School Improvement Program (SIP), which focuses on four school domains, namely: improving teacher learning, creating a conducive learning environment, improving community engagement in school affairs and improving school leadership. This is because the overall performance of the school is consistent with the dimensions of instructional leadership, as stated by MoE (2007).

In improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools, instructional leadership by head teachers is considered a priority. As set out in ESDP V, school principals and cluster supervisors lead the decision-making and management processes at school level in consultation with the Parent, Student and Teacher Association (PSTA) of a school. Same material also pointed out what was specified by a survey of teachers, the standard of school administration and human resource management is a critical factor for successful teaching. Leaders are supposed to give what it takes from them for ensuring quality education. Bekuresion (2014) shows that the degree of obligation that principals are required to assume is further exacerbated by the amount of strain imposed by the demands of the current improved standard of education. ESDP V (2016:60) emphasizes that as immediate

supervisors, the principal and lead teachers are often available in schools with a supervisory position to enable teachers to mitigate educational issues and achieve pre-determined objectives (Babson, 2005).

Instructional leaders are crucially responsible for delivering the school curriculum and teaching properly. The teaching staff's talents and energies are required to be mobilized by school administrators to provide a successful educational program. Instructional leaders should devote significant time to planning and overseeing preparation for this purpose. However, striving for educational improvement, instructional leaders meet enormous challenges. One of the challenges facing schools is the demand for the provision of quality education. Educational reformers are challenging schools to implement teaching and learning strategies that will demonstrate the quality of education. Taddese Atnafu (2014) argues that over the years, the quality problem has created a lot of debate among Ethiopians on media outlets including parents, religious bodies and NGOs

The instructional leader's emphasis was more on administrative management duties than on the core instructional phase (Addisu Chonde, 2014). The technical competence of teaching leaders was no better than that of the teachers. In his report, Geremew Terfa (2018) indicates that it was not possible to accept the selection of school leaders in the field of specialization; qualification and work experience of public second cycle primary schools.

It is an over stressed fact that the effective and efficient production of the enormous contribution of the instructional leader to the advancement of quality education. Instructional leadership and parents have the greatest responsibility for the best practice of teaching leadership in schools that improve the success of both teachers and students.

Therefore, this study investigated the instructional leadership practices and challenges in selected private primary schools of Burayu city administration by analyzing variable sampled data of principals, teachers and department heads.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The main aim of every instructional leadership operation is to increase the efficacy of the teaching and learning program by establishing a comfortable learning atmosphere. In order to build productive schools, effective instructional leadership is mandatory, which differentiates both teachers and students through their abilities as instructional leaders (Dimmock, 1993).

As scholars (like Bush, 2009 and Davis et al, 2005) suggested, in the 21st century school leaders should lead their educational institutions with enthusiasm, be skillful, knowledgeable dedicated and enthusiastic about their work and design different strategies to make their institutions/schools successful. Effective instructional leader, (Wallace Foundation ,2013), carries out tasks such as shaping a vision of academic success for students, creating a climate hospitable to education, cultivating leadership in others, improving data teaching and managing individuals and processes to promote school improvement. Instructional leaders need to understand school contexts, and how the contexts influence the ongoing learning of the students. In light of this, school principals are expected to perform well with instructional leadership activities (MoE, 1994).

However, school principals can face many challenges in implementing instructional leadership to make improvements in the school as successful as possible; the divergent challenges and needs that emerged from discontinuous environmental changes, including globalization, introduce new educational trends in schools. This, in turn, will create a daunting burden for school leaders, teachers, and students to be successful. McEwan (2003) also listed five issues concerning the efficacy of leadership in education. These are: lack of expertise and preparation for principals, lack of communication between teachers, lack of time to carry out instructional activities, lack of superintendent support, and lack of vision, ability or bravery for instructional activities by principals.

As Ethiopia Education development road map research MoE, (2017), indicate that, Poor capacities in strategic planning and management, policy making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation hamper the education system. The leadership ability is generally low, restricted managerial capacities of educational authorities at the school levels. Through any competitive procedure, leaders and managers of educational institutions are nominated or

selected. Lack of objective standards, lack of selection accountability and competitive and merit-based promotions erode professionalism and democratization.

A number of recent studies have shown that school leaders have an impact on student learning (Robinson, 2011, Leithwood and, Seashore-Louis, 2011). For example, through creativity, information sharing, and the recognition and replication of best practices, ESDP V has also established the quality of school management as a contributing factor that can largely affect students' learning efficiency. The success of leaders could be reflected in the overall learning outcomes of their students. However, many students quit the system early, which is expressed in the completion rate of grade 8 just 62.1 %, according to EMIS, (2018/19). Moreover, student results decreased for consecutive two years from 2018 to 2019 in Burayu city grade 8 exams. As the city's annual examination feedback survey, students who get higher than or equal to 50 average were 76.4 % in 2018 and 65.7 % in 2019. This data indicates a drop in the proportion of greater than 50 average student outcomes.

Related fields of educational leadership have been examined in various regions and zones of Ethiopia. In his study "Practice of Instructional Leadership in Government Primary School of Yeka Sub City," Medhanie Gebeyehu (2019) indicated that lack of leadership skills, teacher technical incompetence and inadequacy of instructional resources are major challenges of instructional leadership. In his study of "Instructional Leadership Practice in the Sheka Zone Secondary School," Aklilu (2011) found that instructional leaders do not have the requisite expertise and skills to help them lead the school group as they are all subject specialists. In his analysis of "practice and challenges of instructional leadership in selected preparatory schools in the Hadiya area," Addisu Chonde (2014) indicated that the lack of adequate skills, training and knowledge, vision, willingness and courage and availability of resources are the key obstacles to the failure to introduce instructional leadership in the schools. However, the above three studies did not cover the practice and challenges of primary private-level instructional leadership. Therefore, this study is response to the uncovered area gaps. This study is different from other studies, totally it focuses on the private schools contrary to them.

According to reviews of documents (BEO, TDP Annual Reports 2019), regarding the practice in the primary school of Burayu City, indicate that instructional support from principals and teacher heads has been so minimal to encourage intensified CPD and foster student 1 to 5

instructional grouping with a bid to boost student results. However, there are not enough studies that can illustrate the status of instructional leadership to the best of my knowledge, and no studies have been established that show the degree of problems and challenges in the field.

Due to this reason the study was attempt to investigate the practical trends and major challenges of instructional leadership in private Primary school of Burayu city administration, Oromia regional state.

Therefore, this study expected to answer the following basic questions.

1. How are individuals assigned to instructional leadership in the private primary school of Burayu city administration?
2. How is instructional leadership organized and managed?
3. How does the instructional leadership align with standard of MoE?
4. How do teachers view instructional leadership in schools?
5. What are the major challenges in practicing instructional leadership in the school?

1.3. Objectives of the study

1.3.1. General objectives of the study

The main objective of this study was to investigate the current practices and challenges of instructional leadership and its implementation in some private primary schools of Burayu city administration.

1.3.2. Specific objectives of the study

- To identify how individual is assigned be instructional leadership in Burayu administration city private primary schools.
- To analyze how instructional leadership organized and managed in the schools.
- To examine how the instructional leadership, align with standard of MoE in private school.
- Evaluating how teachers view instructional leadership in schools.
- To assess the challenges that hinders the effectiveness of instructional leadership in private primary schools of Burayu city administration.

1.4. Significance of the Study

To achieve the expected goal, managing the practices and challenges of instructional leadership is a very important issue for any organization. This study is believed to provide suggestion for the problems of practices and challenges of instructional leadership of the organization and it can give direction to the benefit of instructional leadership practices.

Therefore, the study is expected to have the following significances;

1. May give awareness among the education officials, school owners and employees in the administration city on practices and challenges of instructional leaders in private primary schools.
2. It may serve as a stepping stone and reference for interested individuals to conduct further research in the area.
3. It may help for the assemblage of information on the status and degree of problem in private primary education.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

To make the study more manageable time, cost effectiveness and feasible, the researcher geographically delimited to the Oromia region, the city administration of Burayu. In Burayu city administration, there were thirty-two (32) private primary schools and it was difficult to cover all these schools in the study, because it needs large amount of human, materials, financial and time resources. Due to these reasons, the researcher delimited the study to cover only 10(31.3%) private primary schools. Even though, there are many stakeholders for teaching learning process, for this thesis work, the participants are delimited to teachers, department heads and principals.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

The study enclosed only to assess practice and challenges of instructional leadership in private primary school of Burayu city. In this study, the researcher faced many challenges during data collection in the unwillingness of principals and department heads in collecting qualitative data because of busy to their official works to be interviewed and negligence of the participants to participate in the FGD. In addition to this, some of the informants like teachers; directors were not being cooperative to provide the necessary information to obtain the

required data for the study. As a result, shortage of time, delay and frequent journey to the sampled schools were faced during the study. Furthermore, ignorance to the request of the researcher and returning incomplete questionnaires were also another. However, the researcher mitigated to persuade through discussion to solve the described limitation with the concerned body and friendly approach with all the informants of some voluntary teachers, principals and department heads. COVID-19 pandemic and there is no appropriate research work in private schools were also another cases.

1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms

Private schools: Private schools are those which are not managed by or within the Government sector but are financed by governing authorities or personal owners (MoE, 1994).

Primary school: Schools found in the city whose grade ranging from grade 1 to 8 (MoE: 2002).

Principals: people who are responsible for leading school through, directing, organizing, evaluating and etc. (MoE: 2002).

Instructional Leadership: is delegated group of people in the school, principals, vice-principals, unit leaders, department heads, teachers and PTSA leadership that are directly related to the teaching process. In this study, I will use instructional leadership to mean the act of principals influencing the culture of teaching and learning through their practices and interactions with teachers and learners in efforts towards achieving effective curriculum delivery and coverage.

Instructional leaders: in this context, are defined as school personnel who are responsible for the conduct of instructional leadership support with a view of improving the teaching and learning performance within the school.

School Managers: in this context, are defined as school personnel or group who are responsible for the process of planning, organizing, directing and controlling functions performed to determine an accomplish the objectives of education by the use of people and resources.

1.8. Organization of the study

This research dissertation is organized into five parts. The first chapter is the introductory section that includes the context of the analysis, the problem statement, objectives of the study, operational definition of key terms, the restriction, and the terms' operational meanings. The analysis of literature applicable to the study was included in the second chapter. Study methodology was discussed in the third chapter and chapter four deals with data analysis and interpretation. The final chapter five provides the study's overview, findings and recommendations. The sections of this paper are also sources and appendices.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The aim of this chapter is to critically analyze the views of different researchers on instructional leadership practice. In this chapter, the researcher emphasized the concept of leadership, instructional leadership and strategies, the dimension of instructional leadership, Standard of Minister of Education, the key issues affecting instructional leadership practices and the overview of instructional leadership in the context of Ethiopia.

2.1. The Concept of Leadership

There are numerous ideas that researchers have been formulating regarding leadership. Leadership is about someone who has things done for other people. The following components can be distinguished as key leadership points, according to (Northouse, 2004, p.3): leadership is a process, leadership includes influences, leadership takes place within a group context and leadership includes target accomplishments. Leadership is conceived on the basis of these components (Northouse20, p.3) as “a mechanism by which a person controls a group of people to achieve a common objective.” Leadership is an effect partnership between leaders and followers who seek to make improvements that reflect their shared purposes in support of the above idea (Kort, 2008, p.409-411). It also requires the opportunity to guide leaders to inspire followers to be obedient, polite, loyal and cooperative.

Leadership is the capacity and potential to impact the achievement of the objectives defined by any community or entity (Department of Education 2004:11). The leadership process is the use of non-coercive power to direct and coordinate the actions of the members of an organized community in order to achieve the goals common to the group. Leadership is the ability to unite people around such particular objectives, according to (Niyazi, 2009:436), by inspiring them through teamwork to achieve these goals. Leaders need attributes such as vision, trust and firmness to do this. Supovitz, Sirinides and May (2009:36) argue that leadership is not strictly linked to a role, but rather is focused on the act of influencing others; it includes a process through which one individual consciously exercises control over other individuals to direct, coordinate and promote group or organizational activities and relationships.

Daresh (2001:105) sees leadership as an interaction between individuals in which one expresses knowledge of a kind and in such a way that the other becomes persuaded that if he or she acts in the recommended manner, his or her results will be enhanced. This description implies that an interpersonal relationship where one person influences, directs or regulates another's actions is the predominant feature of leadership. The Department of Education (2008:18) notes that leadership is the capacity to influence people towards the achievement of goals; it is conceptualized as a mechanism of influence that depends on the actions of an individual being accepted and at least tacitly understood by others who thus cast themselves into the role of followers, thus agreeing to be led. Leadership, from this viewpoint, is the process of being viewed as a leader by one's followers through the social creation of the sense of leadership.

School development is the purpose of school leadership. School leadership has a very significant effect on the efficiency of the organization of schools and on the performance of students. It's all about organizing the school organization to accomplish a common purpose (Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris and Hopkins, 2006, p.11). According to Leithwood, (2006, p.33), the leader needs to communicate and engage with school stakeholders in order to maximize the performance of the school and students. Hallinger and Heck (2010) note that a large number of researchers have researched the impact of school leadership over a period of time on student learning in support of the above definition. In addition, several of these scientists have "framed leadership in relation to school effectiveness and school improvement as an independent variable or driver for change."

Leadership is a mechanism by which a person controls others to achieve a purpose and guides the organization in a manner that makes it more cohesive and coherent. Another famous concept of leadership is a process in which a person influences a group of people to accomplish a shared objective (Northouse, 2007). Therefore, leadership is the capacity to take the initiative and act decisively. It includes the degree of control in the decision-making of colleagues, the degree to which a leader behaves in terms of goals and opportunities, and the degree to which others depend on other educators' experience, point of view, judgment and will.

There is a recurrence of the word influence in the meanings of idea leadership above. The word influence means the power to alter the behavior, character or beliefs of an individual. Leading by power is persuasion. In order to accomplish these objectives, the leader stimulates, schedules and guides group interactions and activities in a given situation. As an instructional chief, the principal should be able to give the educators specific instructions on the job they are expected to do. In addition, the above definitions emphasize the significance of relationships, particularly the relationship between leadership and supporters. The importance of a vision with which to inspire followers is another element of leadership that has been identified.

2.2. Instructional Leadership and Strategies

Different scholars define instructional leadership in different manner and Strategies of instructional leadership which is to implement instructional leadership activities were provides in the following section.

2.2.1. Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership applies to all roles that relate to enhancing teaching and learning for students, such as administration, professional development, data-driven decision-making and transparency (Murphy, 2007). Van Deventer and Kruger (2003) conclude that instructional leadership consists of five key components: identifying the school mission, managing the curriculum and teaching, coordinating teaching, tracking the success of learners and supporting the educational environment. In order to enhance the academic performance of the school, (Okumbe, 1987) postulates that instructional leadership includes helping teachers create syllabi, curriculum guides, purposeful units of instruction and lesson plans.

Instructional leadership is a leadership model that focuses on learning and accomplishment by developing others and also invests in capacity building by developing student social and academic capital and teacher intellectual and professional capital (Harris et al, 2005; Leithood et al, in Dimmock, 1993). It is also a leadership that is directly linked to the teaching process in which teachers, students, and the curriculum (Acheson & Smith in McEwan, 2003). In McEwan (2003), Sister Catherine Wingert also saw to reinforce this concept as: "Instructional

leadership is the development of an environment where the principal, teachers, students, parents, and school board will work together to accomplish the educational mission.”

Hallinger (2003) defines instructional leadership as defining and promoting the school’s mission, establishing parameters and goals for the school’s instructional program. In his study, identifies several indicators that can be used to identify instructional leaders with in 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.

Brewer (2001) summarized the emphasis of instructional leadership as focusing on teaching; developing a learner community; sharing decision-making; upholding the fundamentals, maximizing time; encouraging continuing professional development for all employees; redirecting resources to support a multi-faceted school strategy and fostering an environment of integrity, inquiry, and quality improvement. The historical position of instructional leadership has developed from an individual duty to a school-based duty. However, as the facilitator of instructional leadership in the school, which is linked to the purpose of instructional leadership, the principal's leadership is the central aspect.

Weber’s Model (1996) Weber addressed the need for instructional leadership, regardless of the school’s organizational structure. Weber concludes, the research suggests that even if an instructional leader of principal were not packaged as a principal, it would still be necessary to designate such a leader. The leaderless-team approach to a school’s instructional program has a powerful appeal, but a large group of professionals still needs a single point of contact and an active advocate for teaching and learning” (1996, p.254). Weber’s point is especially poignant in today’s educational arena of shared leadership and site-based management. Attention to instructional leadership will need to continue regardless of the hierarchical nature of a school organization. Weber (1996) identified five essential domains of instructional leadership: defining the school’s mission, managing curriculum and instruction, promoting a positive learning climate, observing and improving instruction, and assessing the instructional program.

Weber described defining the school’s mission as a dynamic process of cooperation and reflective thinking to create a mission that is clear and honest. The mission of the school

should bind the staff, student and parents with a common vision. The instructional leader of principal offers the stakeholders the opportunity to discuss values and expectations for the school. Together they work to create a shared mission for the school.

Managing curriculum and instruction must be consistent with the mission of the school (Weber, 1996). The instructional leader's repertoire of instructional practices and classroom supervision offers teachers the needed resources to provide students with opportunities to succeed. The leader helps teachers use current research in best practices and instructional strategies to reach school goals for student performance.

Promoting a positive learning climate comprises the expectations and attitudes of the whole school community. "Indeed, of all the important factors that appear to affect students' learning, perhaps having the greatest influence is the set of beliefs, values, and attitudes that administration, teachers, and students hold about learning" (Weber, 1996, p.263). Leaders promote a positive learning climate by communicating instructional goals, establishing high expectations for performance, establishing an orderly learning environment with clear discipline expectations, and working to increase teacher commitment to the school (Weber, 1996).

Observing and improving instruction starts with the principal establishing trusting and respectful relationships with the school staff. Weber (1996) proposed that observations are opportunities for professional interactions. These interactions provide professional development opportunities for both the observer and one being observed. In other words, a reciprocal relationship develops where both people involved gain valuable information for professional growth. Principals enhance the experience by emphasizing research as the foundation for initiating teaching strategies, remediation, and differentiation of the lessons.

Weber's last domain of instructional leadership, assessing the instructional program, is essential

for improvement of the instructional program (Weber, 1996). The instructional leader of principal initiates and contributes to the planning, designing, administering, and analysis of assessments that evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum. This continuous scrutiny of the instructional program enables teachers to effectively meet students' needs through constant revision and refinement.

Weber’s model (1996) of instructional leadership incorporates research about shared leadership and empowerment of informal leaders to create a school that underscores the emphasis of academics and student achievement for all students. However, this model, like Murphy’s (1990) model, has not been empirically tested. It is not clear that if a principal demonstrates behaviors from Weber’s model, high levels of student achievement will result. Weber’s model is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Weber’s (1996) Instructional Leadership Framework

Defining the School’s Mission	Managing Curriculum and Instruction	Promoting a Positive Learning Climate	Observing and Improving Instruction	Assessing the Instructional Program
The instructional Leader of principal collaboratively develops a common vision and goals for the school with stakeholders.	The instructional leader of principal monitors, classroom Practice alignment with the school’s mission, provides resources and support in the use of instructional best practices, and models and provides support in the use of data to drive instruction.	The instructional leader of principal promotes a positive learning climate by communicating goals, establishing expectations, and establishing an orderly learning environment.	The instructional leader of principal observes and improves instruction through the use of classroom observation and professional development opportunities.	The instructional leader of principal contributes to the planning, designing, administering, and analysis of assessments that evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum

Further, the responsibility of the instructional leader to align the five domains in a synergistic manner so that they become part of the instructional leader’s daily actions. Importantly, the domains, or behaviors, should not operate independently of each other. Instructional leaders actively participate in the school's instructional program; for instance, they constantly evaluate the program and work with teachers so as to get the best results with students. Instructional leaders improve the quality of instruction by furthering professional growth for all teachers; in-servicing contributes toward accomplishing this end. Instructional leaders

should be flexible enough to deal with any situation and should maintain a good relationship with their staff. For example, they should consider teacher input; help teachers to do their job; listen to and empathize with teachers concerning their problems; facilitate communications; and alleviate anxiety.

2.2.2. Strategies of instructional leadership

As cited in Bekuretsion Hailesilassie (2014) by Blasé and Blasé (2010:65), principals use the leadership strategies to improve the instructional practices of students such as Communicating goals, supervising instruction, promoting professional development, providing resources and Providing incentives

Communicating goals: Principals articulate school objectives in several different ways. Via faculty meetings and departmental chair meetings, they also do it. They engage with them through individual sessions, such as follow-up conferences about observations in the classroom. Teachers consider their principals to be good teaching leaders while communicating school priorities through them (Poston, 2009:140): Engaging with them about their success in the classroom, be available for the discussion of instructional subjects, Encouraging teachers to try new teaching methods by letting them know that taking risks is okay, and Explicitly expressing a school vision.

It was found that communicating school priorities had a beneficial impact on the form of instruction teachers provided. The principal's communication of school objectives was found to have a strong correlation with the creative teacher classroom. Innovation in the classroom is brought on by the ability of the teacher to pursue new and different approaches to teaching. Communicating school expectations allows teachers to use more reflection, which may lead teachers to change their teaching methods to meet students' diverse learning needs.

Promoting professional development: Promoting professional growth is the most common responsibility of leadership to have a positive influence on teacher teaching in the classroom (Ryes and Ford, 2002:77). A secret to improving teacher preparation is believed to be professional growth. District and school-level administrators are responsible for ensuring quality professional development for teachers. Principals encourage professional development through educating teachers on teaching techniques through the use of supervisors and colleagues, allowing teachers time for academic research, and by using external department

interventions such as college classes, district level seminars, and consultants that are professionals in a specific field. Promoting professional development by principal increases the use of higher-order teaching techniques by teachers as they gain professional development on a specific technique.

Higher-order teaching methods include teaching in non-traditional ways and have been shown to improve students' learning abilities. Teachers viewed the principals as being instrumental in providing staff growth in teaching the writing process. An important link was discovered between principals encouraging professional growth and the ability of teachers to pursue new and innovative educational concepts in the classroom.

The only area that was not the most significant factor in encouraging professional development was teacher creativity at high school level. This raises a concern about the impact that high school principals have on teacher preparation in the classroom. It could be that high school principals are not the ones who encourage professional development; other outlets, such as managers in central offices, could influence teachers instead. Promoting professional development by principals increases the use of creative thinking by teachers, including imaginative thinking and taking educational risks.

Blase and Blase (2010:153) presented a list of techniques for encouraging professional learning that facilitate the use of reflectively informed behaviors by teachers: Focusing teaching and learning studies, promoting cooperation between educators, establishing relationships between educators in coaching, and Adapting adult learning concepts to the growth of workers.

Principals that facilitate and encourage engagement in programs of professional development influence teachers to change their strategies in the classroom to meet the needs of gifted students. Such professional development programs include a private organization's training on how to change the program to meet the needs of gifted students. Teacher participation in these professional development programs was strongly supported by the Principals and this encouragement encouraged teachers to continue to participate. The presence of the principals in curriculum work with teachers was also found to be a key to these teachers' application of higher-order thought skills.

Providing resources and changes: Principals influence classroom instruction by supplying teachers with the necessary resources. Providing resources include more than just monetary resources and materials. According to Signe (2006:45), resource provision involves: Planning, Designing the calendar of colleges, Hiring the teachers and appropriately positioning them, introducing textbooks and adopting textbooks and Purchasing the materials needed to facilitate instruction.

Principals affect student success by helping teachers access the tools required for their teaching. The shortage of funding can be an obstacle to teachers' use of certain instructional strategies. Some schools did not have the resources to support those teaching methods and activities that were required. There was no mention of the principal; only the teachers were there. As the reason for the lack of science tools, the researchers cited the school and school system. It places blame for not having sufficient services at the central office for principals and administrators. Teachers interpret the provision of resources as productive leadership on the part of principals. McGhee and Lew (2007:75) found that favorable ratings were given to the majority of strong instructional leaders as resource providers for: Encouraging teacher learning programs for staff, getting knowledge of teaching materials, Mobilization of capital and district support to accomplish academic objectives and The school's most significant instructional resource.

The most effective tactics were viewed by teachers as the dedication of principals as resource providers; encouraging professional development and offering instructional support to teachers.

Providing incentives and changes: Providing rewards for teachers is a philosophy that can be used to encourage teachers to improve their teaching practices. By offering formal awards and using public or individual recognition for teachers, principals have rewards. Organizations use incentives to attract workers, such as praise, fair working conditions, material benefits, pride in the job performed and emotional commitment to the company, and positive working relationships with colleagues (Fullan, 2006:67).

It can be productive to compliment teachers in front of their colleagues because it promotes progress by all teachers. For what they do in the classroom, most teachers do not earn adequate monetary compensation. Recognizing teachers for their success in the classroom

creates an opportunity for change and continued development. Teachers are motivated by principals to try teaching strategies through rewards such as praise and material rewards. Communicating objectives, overseeing training, promoting professional development, and providing incentives enhance the use of reflectively informed behaviors by teachers. The communication of objectives and the promotion of professional development enhance the use of innovative educational practices by teachers.

2.3. Dimension of Instructional Leadership

Leadership practice is at the core and, depending on the different situations, the roles of leaders and followers can be shifted. In general, schools with effective and effective leadership are characterized by the way they set vision and define the school mission, manage curriculum and teaching, supervise and evaluate teaching, develop professional skills, and create a conducive and healthy school environment (Murphy,1990).

Setting School Vision and Defining School Mission: Instructional leadership has a passion for great teaching and a vision for what schools should be doing for children. In this regard, Holmes (1993), has attempted to relate school success to vision by stating that all successful are built around a clear sense of vision and purpose and relate that vision to the regular tasks and challenges of school leadership. According to Alberta Education (2010), vision describes a possible and desired future state for the organization, grounded in reality, which inspires and guides decisions and actions.

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

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

The mission is a brief summary of the overall purpose and function of an organization. It offers guidance for the programs and services offered to its students by the authority (Borba, 2002). The task of instructional leadership is one that promotes the priorities and goals of a given school in order to enhance student achievement. Defining the concerns of the Schools Task, the role of the principal in deciding the school's core purposes. The position of the principal in working with employees to ensure that the school has consistent, measurable, time-based expectations focusing on student academic success.

The school mission, according to (Weber, 1996), is a dynamic process that informs the purpose or reason for the existence of the school. The school mission serves as a basis for evaluating the performance of organizations, setting the organization's priorities, strategies, and plans to bind staff, students, and parents to a common vision. In collaboration with the school community, it is the task of instructional leaders to develop the mission statement describing who, what and where of the school community (Murphy, 1990).

The first role of superintendents and principals is to explicitly frame school system and school goals, purposes, vision and mission. A school district or school that has not fully considered how it will go about the process of education has no criteria for judging whether it is successfully engaging in that process. People who are skilled in this area often discuss purpose and mission with staff, students, and the community. They take advantage of opportunities to stress and communicate goals. Furthermore, they try to make themselves visible in their environment and they communicate excitement about education to staff and students.

Managing Curriculum and Instruction: The coordination and control of instruction and curriculum is the focus of the management of the instructional program. In coordinating curriculum shifts in schools, educational leaders play a major role. At the implementation stage, communication between administrators, supervisors, teachers and instructional leaders is critical. Techniques such as pre-service meetings, workshops and newsletters help facilitate communication processes (Hallinger, 2005). Instructional leaders should have open lines of communication with all school staff members; should promote a strong staff development program to allow teachers the opportunity to participate successfully in the curriculum change process; Interest and enthusiasm about the new curriculum must also be aroused by

encouraging and helping faculty members on a daily basis; they are responsible for the success of any process of school implementation.

Curriculum management is primarily concerned with promoting quality classroom learning and teaching. It also acknowledges that the classroom experiences of learners and educators are affected by what happens in the entire school. Managing the teaching program includes working directly with teachers in the field of curriculum and teaching (Hollinger and Murphy 1985). Therefore, by conducting teaching conferences and assessing, visiting classrooms, providing specific suggestions and feedback on the teaching-learning process, and determining teacher assignments in the best interests of student learning, educational leaders promote quality instruction.

Murphy, Elliot, Goldring, and Porter (2006) note that "school leaders in effective schools are knowledgeable about the curricular program of the school and deeply involved in it." The teaching and learning program is managed and supported by principals; they apply the highest standards of teaching and learning; they solve the problems that emerge (Chapman and Mongon, 2008). Curriculum coordination relates to main events that include opportunities for employee cooperation on curriculum alignment with expectations and achievement assessments. The instructional management function of student progress monitoring refers to the principal's use of test results to set targets, evaluate the curriculum, evaluate instruction, and measure progress towards school goals (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985).

Supervising and Evaluating Instruction: Supervising instruction in the classroom requires the principal evaluating an instructor and examining his practice in the classroom and the method of teaching and learning. This is a scenario where the teacher interacts directly with the students and the principal is present to systematically track classroom activities as a witness. Instruction supervision and assessment are characterized as activities involving interaction between the principal and teachers in classroom practices (Hallinger, 1983). It is a job function that most frequently refers to the position of the principal as the leader of instruction. The main school periodically visits the classrooms of the active school (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987). Instructional supervision focuses on enhancing learners' learning, but it is in reality that they vary. Eye and Netzer (1985:23) notes that supervision as a stage in school administration focuses primarily on the provision of classroom instruction to formally set

educational standards. This involves integrating teacher training and management in the classroom, curriculum development, and team development and action research, all to enhance learning outcomes (Olive and Paulos, 1997:11, Sergiovanni, 2001:254).

Monitoring Instructional Program: The principal's active participation in stimulating, supervising, guiding, and monitoring teaching and learning in the school is required to manage the instructional program. Good teaching leaders should be aware of the variety of ways in which the progress of students can and should be evaluated. Effective teaching leaders are heavily involved in curricular and educational problems that directly affect student performance (Cotton, 2003).

To improve the instructional program, it is essential to evaluate the instructional program (Weber, 1996). The function of monitoring student progress in instructional management refers to the main use of test results to set goals, evaluate the curriculum, evaluate instruction, and measure progress towards school goals (Hollinger and Murphy, 1985)

Promoting Positive Learning Climate: Promoting a positive climate for school learning involves creating an environment that supports the engagement of teachers and students. This includes promoting professional development, providing teacher incentives, maintaining high visibility, protecting time for instruction, and providing learning incentives.

According to Weber (1996), a healthy teaching and learning school environment reflects trust, trust and mutual respect for cooperation between employees, students, governments, parents and the wider community for purposeful effort and achievement. Best school leaders foster good working relationships and overcome the worst impacts by contrasting with positive environment development, high performance and progress (Murphy,1990).

Promoting professional development is the creation of priorities and expectations; strategic resourcing; teaching and curriculum preparation, coordination and evaluation; and maintaining an atmosphere that is orderly and supportive. In comparison to (Philip Hallinger, 2005), who found a small but significant impact of principals on student outcomes, it is also important to highlight that (Robinson et al. 2008) found a significant contribution of instructional leadership on student outcomes. Behaviors that are compatible with life-long learning are enclosed in this dimension.

By holding teacher conferences and reviews, visiting classrooms, providing detailed suggestions and input on the teaching and learning process, and assessing teacher assignments in the best interest of student learning, the instructional leader facilitates quality instruction (Murphy, 1990; Teddlie and Stringfield, 1985). The efforts to maintain high visibility include being visible around the school, talking to students and staff, giving teachers, students, and community praise and input on academic results, and ensuring that the school's educational time is not disrupted.

2.4. Standards for Ethiopian school principals

According to MoE (2013), the ministry of education identifies five standards which should serve as a basis in preparation and certification of principals like: Lead and facilitate vision of learning, Develop and manage school community relations, Lead and manage learning and teaching, Lead and develop individuals and team, and Lead and manage school operations and resource

The standards are organized under three domains such as; School Vision and Community Leadership, Instructional Leadership and Administrative Leadership (MoE,2013)

The first domain two competencies are lead and facilitate vision of learning, and develop and manage school community relations. In the second domain, there are another two competencies like lead and manage learning and teaching, and lead and develop individual and team. The third domain addresses the competence to lead and manage school operation and resources.

School Vision and Community Leadership: Principals lead the development of the vision of the school. Principals understand, mediate and serve the best interests of the community. This resonates through the strategic vision, cultural values, traditions and positive ethos they seek to promote across the school.

Principals ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders who represent diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources that improve teaching and learning. They are able to build trust across the school community and to create a positive learning atmosphere for students and staff and within the community in which they work.

Instructional Leadership: Principals share and distribute responsibilities to provide quality, effectiveness, and coherence across all components of the instructional system (such as curriculum, instructional materials, pedagogy, and student assessment). Principals engage in continuous inquiry about effectiveness of curricular and instructional practices and work collaboratively to make appropriate changes that improve results. Principals have a current knowledge and understanding of research into teaching, learning and child development and how to apply such research to the needs of the students in the school. Principals apply knowledge and understanding of current developments in education policy, schooling and social and environmental trends and developments to improve educational opportunities in the school. Principals provide opportunities for all members of the school community to build their capacity and participate in important school decisions.

Administrative Leadership: Principals manage daily operations and environments through efficiently and effectively aligning resources with vision and goals. Valuable resources include financial, human, time, materials, technology, physical plant, and other system components. Principals identify and allocate resources equitably to address the unique academic, physical, and mental health needs of all students. They manage themselves well and use ethical practices and social skills to deal with conflict effectively. They understand the implications of child safety, health and wellbeing, human resource development. Principals are able to define challenges clearly and seek positive solutions, often in collaboration with others. They know when decisions are required and are able to use the available evidence and information to support, inform and communicate their decisions.

2.5. Challenges in practicing instructional leadership

Incompetence in educational leadership, lack of incentives for teachers, issues related to teacher advancement, lack of administrative skills and engagement of those appointed as school leaders, lack of educational materials, or funding are some of the problems sometimes cited as factors that impede the successful performance of teachers (MoE,2004).Furthermore, disconnected departmental subcultures; opposition to school-wide initiatives, teacher autonomy and teacher tracking standards; and lack of preparation and resources for the participation of disconnected teenagers with severe learning gaps (McLaughlin and Talbert ,2007).While the economic, political, social or technical variations, the problems that occur in

most schools are the need to be able to draw on a body of professional knowledge, lack of time, lack of training, lack of sufficient resources and leadership personal characteristics.

Lack of professional knowledge and training: As Sergiovanni (2001) pointed out, the basic characteristics that educational leaders have to possess are technological, human and educational abilities, skills and awareness. For the advancement of learning, educational leaders without appropriate skills and training in educational leadership and teacher professional development may do little or no (West-Burnham, 1998). In order to carry out their responsibility effectively, instructional leaders need continuous and adequate preparation. Successful schools need quality support personnel, skilled and qualified academic staff, effective and competent instructional leaders to provide formal education. The secret to the entire educational process is training effective instructional leaders. The efficient development of teaching and learning tasks, thorough coverage of the syllabus in time, and a keen system of supervision are included in instructional leadership.

Lack of Adequate Resources: Instructional leaders are frustrated by a shortage of sufficient services of all types and encouragement from central offices. The progress of schools and the growth of teachers can be limited by bureaucratic management that hampers the timely allocation of human, financial and material resources needed (Dimmock, 2000).

Lack of Leadership behavior: experience, awareness, personal features, and characteristics of values and beliefs have been believed to have a substantial effect on the achievement of students as well as the success of schools (Murphy et al., 2007). Personality-wise, if a principal has strong will power, persuasive capacity, gentle personality and a controlling figure, this will most certainly suggest that a competent principal will turn a failed organization into a good institution. Personal quality is required for a person to be an effective instructional leader. This includes trust, perseverance, strong versatility in communication, ability to listen, open-mindedness, imagination, skill in problem solving, and ability to imagine.

2.6. Overview of Instructional leadership in the Ethiopian context

Ethiopia has clearly outlined its objectives, policies and investment goals within the context of the 1994 Education and Training Program, putting education at the top of the agenda, with a strong conviction that long-term, sustainable development is focused on the expansion and

provision of quality education to all people. ESDP is an intervention program for the accomplishment of the priorities of the Education and Training Strategy. The first five-year Education Sector Development Program (ESDP I) was initiated by the government of Ethiopia in 1997/98, followed by ESDP II in 2002/03, ESDP III in 2005/06, ESDP IV in 2011 and ESDP V in 2019/2020. The Ministry of Education (MOE) has established a General Education Quality Improvement Package within the context of the ESDP (GEQIP). To introduce GEQIP, MOE and Development Partners are working together. The proposed program would help the introduction of the first four of the six GEQIP elements, namely the Teacher Development Program, which includes the Quality Improvement Program for the English Language, the Program for Management and Administration and the School Improvement Program.

The School Improvement Program (SIP) is a national program initiated by the MOE in 1999 to enhance primary and secondary school results for students. With the implementation of the SIP, all schools have developed and adopted strategic plans for three years to increase student outcomes. The SIP was introduced by using SIP materials from the school improvement system, the implementation manual for the school improvement program and the school enhancement guideline. Under ESDP IV, further efforts will be made by the government to leverage resources and establish the requisite partnerships for a sustained adult literacy campaign. In order to ensure the active involvement of the newly literate population in social and economic growth, the emphasis will turn towards functional adult literacy (FAL) within an overall framework aimed at promoting adult education with a particular focus on women.

Additional, improved regulatory structures and administrative processes will be designed; roles will be sharply delineated at various levels of government; decentralization will not contribute to an inequitable distribution of resources; rather, it will allow more effective use of existing human and financial resources. Capacities will be strengthened to manage diversity, inequality and transition, and to incorporate initiatives within education and other sectors. Training for school leaders and other education staff will be given.

Responsibilities are assigned to the district for operational planning, budget distribution and budget management. The District Board of Education and Training has defined and assumed overall responsibility for the district's management of primary and secondary education. The district is responsible for empowering the community; creating a plan for mobilizing

community resources and using them to increase access and quality of education; ensuring equity; hiring teachers and non-teaching personnel; and enforcing disciplinary action on teaching and administrative staff.

Similarly, district education and training boards were formed in rural areas, and school-level parent teacher associations were created to improve community-school partnerships, build the best learning atmosphere, and minimize dropout rates. In terms of supplies, labor and funding, the Parent Teacher Associations would increase community support for schools. The acquisition of management skills will certainly require all these (personnel administration, evaluation, monitoring, planning, budgeting, accounting, etc.).

However, in their day-to-day management duties, Ethiopian school principals face two major challenges, namely (1) proper handling of the teaching learning process to ensure consistency and (2) establishing a sound teaching and learning community in which effective education can take place. In the process of creating a sound learning and teaching community, the central role played by a principal in all a school's programs and the effect he or she has on the tone and ethos that are conducive to teaching and learning is essential. Principals are inclined to undertake less administrative tasks; in the sense of being specialists in teaching and learning, they are more geared towards being educational leaders and building an atmosphere that promotes this.

Summary on Review of Related Literature

The chapter addressed the concept of leadership, instructional leadership and strategies dimension of Instructional Leadership, standard of school principal and challenges to instructional leadership.

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

Concerning to major problems that affected leadership effectiveness, Lack of professional knowledge and training, Lack of Adequate Resources and Lack of Leadership behavior were consulted. Thus, the reviewed literature helped the researcher to get the insight about the issues in detail.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This chapter deals with research methodology. It is subdivided into research design, source of data, population, samples and sampling Techniques, data collection instruments, pilot test, data collection procedures, method of data analysis and ethical considerations were treated in detail.

3.1. Research Design

Research approach is a plan and the procedures for research that covers the steps from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection, analysis, and interpretation. A mixed method research approach was employed in this study to assess the major practices and challenges impeding the school's current practices of instructional leadership. In a mixed research approach, data could be gathered, analyzed and presented in the combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods in any stages in the process of research study. According to Creswell (2012) the use of mixed methods involves the combination of both forms of data that provides a better understanding of a research problem than either quantitative or qualitative data alone. Quantitative research approach can help the researcher to generate statistics or figures that focuses on the extensive information. Qualitative research techniques helped the researcher analyze population perceptions, behavior, interactions, and so on through interviews, focus group conversations. The aim of qualitative research approach is to generate complete and in-depth information for the researcher.

For this study, the researcher selected a concurrent mixed research design; both qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed simultaneously. The researcher collected three data gathering tools (questionnaire, group discussion and interview) at the same time during the study, and then integrated these data into the interpretation of the overall results.

3.2. Sources of data

Data were obtained from primary and secondary sources. principals, department heads and teachers of private primary schools were used as the primary sources of data. The secondary data sources were obtained from books, journals and organizational reports. However, it used mostly for the purposes of reviewing literatures.

3.3. Population of the study

The overall population of this sample consisted of 32 private primary schools (1-8). According to Burayu Town education office (2019/2020) report, all have more than five years of experience. The study did not consider all private primary schools as the target for data collection because of financial and time constraints. Thus, according to Kerlinger (2003), at least 30 percent of the target population should be reflected by a sample in a survey. This is known to be simple in terms of time and money to deal with and is also sufficiently reflective of the entire population. Therefore, 10 (31.3 %) representative private primary schools were randomly selected by lottery method at the first level out of a total of 32 private primary schools. Principals, department heads and teachers currently employed in private primary schools of the Burayu city Administration were the target population for the study. Currently, there are about 161 teachers, 10 principals and 30 department heads employed in 10 separate private primary schools, according to the Burayu city Education Office (2019/2020) survey. So, a total population was 201.

3.4. Samples and Sampling Techniques

Probability and non-probability sampling methods were used in this study. According to Burayu city education office (2019/2020) report, Specifically, there were a total of 32 private primaries (1-8) schools in the town. all the schools we're having more than five years of experiences. Out of 32 private primaries (1-8) schools, the researcher selected 10 (31.3%) schools using simple random sampling technique mainly lottery method. In these 10 primary schools, there were 161 teachers, 10 principals and 30 department heads. all principals are included in the study using availability sampling. Moreover, 10 department heads were used for interviews purposes and 8 selected teachers who have more experience, responsibility and awareness about their respective school were selected purposively in order to involve in FGD.

In general, 161 teachers, 30 department heads and 10 principals were identified as a population of the study with a total population of 201. To get sample size from the population of teachers, (Yamani T. ,1967) formula was taken into consideration with confidence level of 95% and 5% sampling error was considered and to get the sample sizes from the different schools, the researcher used (C. R. Kothari ,2004) proportionate formula was taken.

Table 2: Sample Size of teachers

No	Name of the schools	population	Sample size	%
1.	Hill-Tops primary school	21	15	71.4%
2.	Oshini primary school	16	11	68.8%
3.	Paradayiz hils.no1 primary school	12	9	75%
4.	Multa Hayu primary school	20	14	70%
5.	Tsirha Tsiyon primary school	12	9	75%
6.	Pyramid primary school	12	9	75%
7.	Mnan primary school	12	9	75%
8.	unity primary school	25	17	68.0%
9.	Keta progress primary school	12	9	75%
10.	Alfiya primary school	19	13	68.4%
	Total	161	115	71.4%

So, in this study about **115** teachers were intended to be respondents of the quantitative data collecting tool which are selected simple random sampling technique mainly lottery method. However, 109 participants (94.8%) returned the questionnaire. 6 subjects (5.2%) did not return the questionnaires. In addition to 109 teachers, **10** primary School principals, **10** department heads and **8** selected teachers were directly selected purposive sampling from ten private primary schools of the city. Therefore, **137** participants were involved in this study.

3.5. Data collection instruments

Gathering necessary data for this study was done by using questionnaire, interview and Focus group discussion.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

In this study, the questionnaire was the key method used to collect data because of its ability to collect sufficient data from a large number of respondents in a short period of time. It was used in the private primary schools of Burayu city administration to obtain the required information on instructional leadership practice and challenges. Self-developed questionnaire that contain both close and open ended questions have been prepared which was related to the basic question of the study. Close ended questions were used for their easiness in tabulation,

objectivity and suitability to keep respondents on the subjects of discussion. Open ended questions are included because it gives respondents a freedom to give their extended views on the issue. Responses from participants were taken using Likert Scale method of rating and the respondents are expected to express their degree of agreement on five-point scale that is relevant to the issues. The questionnaires will be completed by respondents by asking respondents to assess practices of instructional leadership and their challenges.

3.5.2. Interview

The second significant data collection method in this study was the interview. This approach is very useful for obtaining rich, appropriate and accurate information from well informed bodies which have expertise on the issues under review.

A semi-structure interview with 10 principals and 10 department heads was conducted to obtain deep information related to the practices and challenges of instructional leadership in the study area to represent questions related to the practices and challenges of the implementation of instructional leadership in the study area. The information gathered help the researcher to enrich and triangulate the data gathered through questionnaires.

3.5.3. Focus Group Discussions

In addition, one focus group discussion during the study period was conducted with 8 selected teachers. FGD to take the advantage of collecting variety of shared understanding from those interacting individuals. The discussion took place in face - to - face conversation and was carried out at the city level in the school by the local language (i.e. Afan Oromo and Amharic) and facilitated by the researcher himself.

3.6. Data Quality Control (Pilot test)

To ensure validity a pilot study was carried out to pre-test the instrument. Thus, the researcher pre-tested the questionnaire at smart youth primary private school. To this end, the researcher distributed twenty draft questionnaires with twenty teachers through randomly selected. The draft version of the questionnaire was modified to ensure that the instrument was identifying what it set out to identify. Any irrelevant or ambiguous statements and questions were edited and eliminated and necessary modification or replacements of unclear questions were made. Additionally, the reliability of the instrument was measured by using Cronbach's alpha

method in the help of SPSS version 24.0. Cronbach's alpha is one of the alternative measures of reliability; it measures the internal consistency of the items in a scale (Louis, Lawrence & Keith, 2007:506). The results indicated that the reliability of the instruments were high since the results of 0.65 and above are reliable for attitude, opinion, and perception question items (Yalew,2011). As presented in the table 3 below, all variables it ranges from 0.725 to 0.876 with Cronbach's Alpha for total variables of an average of 0.778. Thus, reliability of the questionnaires confirmed and accepted.

Table 3: Reliability test results with Cronbach's alpha

No	Variables	Cronbach's Alpha		Number of item	
		As item	As dim.	As item	As dim.
1	Assignment of individuals instructional leadership	0.729	0.729	5	5
2	Organized and managed of instructional leadership	0.756	0.756	7	7
3	Lead and facilitate vision of learning	0.780	0.794	3	19
	Develop and manage school community relations	0.876		3	
	Lead and manage learning and teaching	0.806		4	
	Lead and develop individuals and team	0.783		4	
	Lead and manage school operations and resources	0.725		5	
4	Teachers' view on instructional leadership	0.809	0.809	8	8
5	Lack of skill and Training	0.751	0.804	4	11
	Lack of resource availability and allocation	0.808		4	
	Lack of leadership behavior	0.854		3	
Cronbach's Alpha of an average			0.778		

Source: computed from own survey data, 2021

3.7. Procedure of Data Collection

The investigator went through a serious process of data collection. These help the researcher to get accurate and relevant data from the sample unit. By using questionnaires, focus group discussions and interviews, the expected relevant data was obtained. In doing so, getting a letter of permission from the University of Addis Ababa and the City Education Office of Burayu to obtain permission; the researcher went directly for consent to 10 sample private

schools and directors of the respective schools. After making agreement with the concerned participants; the researcher introduced his objective and purposes. Then the questionnaires were administered to sample teachers with in selected schools. The participants allowed giving their own answers to each item independently as needed by the researcher. They were closely assisted and supervised by the researcher himself.

Finally, the questionnaires collected back at the right appointment. The focus group discussion was accomplished with the group incorporating selected teacher. The interview was conducted with principals and head department after their consent were proved to lesson communication barriers during in depth discussion.

3.8. Methods of Data Analysis

In this research, both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods were used. The data analysis was based on the responses gathered through questionnaires, interviews and discussion in the focus group. Using SPSS Version 24, quantitative data was structured and analyzed. Thus, for interpretation, descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentage and mean value were used. The data collected from teachers through closed-ended questionnaire items, particularly the background information of the respondents; their gender, age, qualification or level of education, field of specialization and total number of years of service are analyzed using frequency tables and percentages. Using various methods, the researchers analyzed the qualitative results. First, in order to help, enrich and compare quantitative data, the in-depth data collected through interviews, FGD and answers to open-ended questions were grouped and classified into categories. In this analysis, in order to compare and explain the collected data, the qualitative and quantitative data were mixed during the interpretation and discussion time.

3.9. Ethical considerations

Each participant was included in the study based on their willingness. After the purpose of the study has been clearly explained, participants were invited to participate on informed consent and freely without any deception. Individuals who were not willing to participate in the study were omitted and automatically replaced by other participants that were selected using the same sample selection procedure. In addition, during interview time after permission was

obtained from each interviewee. The surveys were coded while it distributed to the participants so that participants were not required for writing their names on the surveys and kept confidential. In addition, sample schools were presented using codes in the analysis part. Moreover, information and data obtained from the participants were used only for research purposes and not transferred to any other third party.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents the finding and discussion of the results derived from the data gathered from teachers, principals and department head of private primary schools of BTA using questionnaire, interviews and focus group discussion. This chapter contains the response rate, demographic characteristics of respondents, reliability and validity of collected data and the characteristics of study variables. The data were presented in narratives, numerical figures and table. Qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed in such a way that they supplement to each other.

4.1. Response Rate of Respondents

Table 4: Response rate of respondents

Respondents	Number of Planned Respondents	Returned		Unreturned	
		N	P	N	P
Teachers	115	109	94.8	6	5.2

Note: N (Frequency), P (Percent), Source: Own field survey data, 2021

For this study, qualitative and quantitative data was gathered from BTA private primary schools. The sample of private primary school teachers physically completed the survey. To 115 teachers, 115 questionnaires were given. Out of these, 109 (94.8 %) teachers responded successfully.

In addition to quantitative data, qualitative data were gathered through interviews and FGD in order to enrich, support, and triangulate the quantitative data. In this regard, the researcher held interviews with ten principals (male = 9, female = 1), 10 department heads (male = 6, female = 4) and FGD with 8 selected teachers (Male = 6, female =2) who have more experience, responsibility and awareness about their respective schools.

4.2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The surveys consisted of questionnaire that administered for teachers. The demographic characteristics contained five items which include their sex, age, Qualification or level of education, field of specialization and total number of service years. The summarized demographic information of the sample population for this study is presented as follows.

Table 5: Summary of Characteristics of Respondents

No	Characteristics of Respondents		Teachers		Principals		Dept. Head	
			No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex	Male	78	71.6	9	90	6	60
		Female	31	28.4	1	10	4	40
		Total	109	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0
2	Age	20-25	20	18.3				
		26-30	48	44.0	1	10	2	20
		31-35	29	26.6	6	60	4	40
		36-40	7	6.4	2	20	3	30
		41 and above	5	4.6	1	10	1	10
		Total	109	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0
3	Qualification or level of education	Diploma	21	19.3			2	20
		B.A/BED/BSc	78	71.6	6	60	8	80
		M.A/MSC	10	9.2	4	40		
		Total	109	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0
4	field of specialization	Subject specialist	98	89.9	6	60	10	100.0
		EDPM	7	6.4	4	40		
		Other/non-teaching	4	3.7				
		Total	109	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0
5	Service year	under 5	37	33.9				
		6-10	44	40.4	2	20	3	30
		11-15	14	12.8	5	50	6	60
		16-20	8	7.3	2	20	1	10
		21 years and above	6	5.5	1	10		
		Total	109	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As can be seen from table 5 above, 71.6 % of the teacher respondents were males and just 28.4 % were females out of 109 respondents from teachers. This shows that the involvement of women in teaching at primary private schools, relative to their male, was very poor. This is

not a new finding; rather, different scholars and organizations who have engaged in the country's educational affairs have confirmed it.

Regarding the age intervals of teachers' respondents, out of 109 respondents, 20(18.3%), 48(44.0%) and 29 (26.6%) were between 20 –25,26-30 and 31 -35 years of age respectively. While, 7(6.4%) were between 36-40 and only 5(4.6%) of the respondents were of 41 years and above. This indicates that majority 89(81.65%) of teacher's respondents were 26 years old and above, whereas the remaining 20 (18.3%) were under the age ranges of 25 and below years' old. Therefore, this figure indicates that the majority of the respondents are matured enough to provide reliable information with regard to the issue under study.

In relation to level of education the majority of teachers' respondents, 78(71.6%)were BA/BSC/BED degree holders,21(19.3%) of them had diploma and 10(9%) of them were M.A/MSC/MED Degree holders. This implies that private primary school of BTA does not have lack of well-educated man power. In sum, out of the total respondents (109), the majority 88 (80.7%) were BA/BSC/BED degree and M.A/MSC/MED Degree holders. This indicates that respondents had the ability to respond and present their ideas easily from their knowledge and educational background for the study.

The majority of teachers were asked to indicate their areas of specialization, as seen in the above table. Accordingly, 98(89.9%) of the teachers were graduates of the academic subject area. While the remaining 7(6.4 %) and 4(3.7 %) of them were EdPM graduates and others, respectively, such as management. This means that the majority of respondents are expected to provide reliable information with regard to the issue under study.

The data in Table 5 presented that, 37(33.9%) of teachers have been serving less than 5 years. whereas, 44(40.4%) have worked for 6 to 10 years, 14(12.8%) have worked for 11 to 15 years and 8(7.3%) served between 16 to 20 years, the rest 6(5.5%) of them have worked 21 years and above. This generally indicated that a great number of the sampled teachers' respondents 81 (74.3%) have been serving less than 10 years. The remaining 28(25.7%) teacher respondents had above 11 years of experience. This means that most teachers have less experience and need more encouragement from the leaders of the school.

School principals and Department heads were asked their background information during the interview. Details of their information's are given in table 5 above.

As show in table 5, 9 of school principals and 6 of department heads were male, this indicates that the participation of females in managerial position is not sufficient. Regarding the age of school principals and department heads, 8 and 7 of them are found between 31-40 years which indicates that the majority of the respondents are found at matured.

In relation to level of education 6(60%) and 4(40%) of school principal were degree and MA holders respectively. Whereas 8(80%) of department head were degree holders. 6(60%) of school principals and 10(100%) of department heads were graduates of the academic subject area. Majority of school leadership were specialization of subject area. The blue print of MoE has stated that the academic qualification required for the primary school principals are degree in Educational planning and Management. This might have its own negative implication on the overall success of leaders in the implementation of their respected roles.

As far as the experience is concerned, 7(70%) and 7(70%), of school principals and department heads have 11 to 20 years' experiences in schools respectively. This indicates that they have experience to provide professional assistances and manage schools.

4.3. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Under this part, the data collected through questionnaires, interview and FGD were analyzed and presented regarding the practices and challenges of instructional leadership in private primary school. Thus, they are five parts or sections which include about assignment of individuals to instructional leadership, organized and managed of instructional leadership, alignment of the instructional leadership with Standard of MoE, teachers view on the instructional leadership and as well as challenges of instructional leadership.

4.3.1. Instructional leadership practices

The analysis under this section is related to how instructional leadership practices were undertaken in the private school expressed in assignment of individuals to instructional leadership, organized and managed of instructional leadership, alignment of the instructional leadership with Standard of MoE and views of teachers on the instructional leadership. In each section there are elements that show the practices of instructional leadership and respondents were requested to express the extent to which each of the elements were practiced in the school using a five-point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) ... to strongly

agree (5). To manage the study easily the researcher grouped five rank responses of the questionnaire and labeled into three categories i.e. Agree, moderate and disagree. In categorizing the rating scales, the frequency and percentage results of Strongly Agree and Agree were combined into Agree and the results of disagree and Strongly Disagree were combined as Disagree and undecided as moderate and for the seek of analysis the calculated mean value is fixed in such interval 1.00-1.49 as strongly disagree, 1.5-2.49 as disagree, 2.5-3.49 as moderate 3.5-4.49 as agree and 4.5-5.00 as strongly agree.

Table 6: Teachers’ Responses on assignment of individuals to instructional leadership

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Your school principal is assigned by officially announced competition for vacancy	1	SD	8	7.3	109	3.11
		2	D	11	10.1		
		3	UD	60	55.0		
		4	A	21	19.3		
		5	SA	9	8.3		
			Total		109		
2	The official announcement post is based on clearly set criteria for the position	1	SD	6	5.5	109	3.29
		2	D	10	9.2		
		3	UD	56	51.4		
		4	A	20	18.3		
		5	SA	17	15.6		
			Total		109		
3	The principal is elected by staff members	1	SD	83	76.1	109	1.29
		2	D	22	20.2		
		3	UD	2	1.8		
		4	A	2	1.8		
		5	SA	0	0		
			Total		109		
4	The principal is assigned by district education office	1	SD	82	75.2	109	1.34
		2	D	21	19.3		
		3	UD	3	2.8		
		4	A	2	1.8		
		5	SA	1	.9		
			Total		109		
5	The principal is assigned by individuals’ interest.	1	SD	3	2.8	109	3.83
		2	D	2	1.8		
		3	UD	31	28.4		
		4	A	48	44.0		
		5	SA	25	22.9		
			Total		109		

SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, UD=Undecided, A=Agrees, SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As show in Table 6 above, five items were categorized under practice of assigned individuals to instructional leadership. In this regard, table 6 above illustrates that 30 (27.6%) of respondents agree that the school principal assigned by officially announced competition for vacancy. majority of the respondents 60(55.0%) said undecided, whereas 19(17.4%) of the respondents answered that disagree. This implies that the school principal is assigned by officially announced competition for vacancies in private school were to medium.

Supporting the above idea selected teachers through FGD stated that;

“To get competent individuals, competition was crucial. Accordingly, in the study area school principal were sometimes assigned by officially announced competition. But more schools assign school principals without competition. The schools assign the school principal without considering their knowledge, skill and competence”.

The data obtained through as one of the interviewee department head said;

“I do not know how the school leaders assigned and procedures he/she pass through”

The next item asked to find out whether the official announcement post is based on clearly set criteria for the position. As 16(14.7%) of respondents disagree that the official announcement post is based on clearly set criteria for the position. majority of the respondents 56(51.4%) said undecided, whereas 37(33.9%) of the respondents answered that agree. this implies that the items were to moderate. The data from through FGD also indicated that;

“There is a gap in implementing the selection criteria during selecting school principals in private school. The official post is not in all, all full the necessary criteria.”

In addition to the response obtained through questionnaire one of the interviewee department head indicated that;

“Sometimes individual assigned by officially announcement. Most of the time the criteria asked was education level and experience only. Otherwise criteria such as field of specialization, training and efficiency were not being as much considered. Procedure and criteria used to recruit participants for leadership position were not fair and transparent.”

Following was the item that poses a question whether the principal is elected by staff members. Majority of the respondents 105(96.3%) in the study area disagree as there was school principal is not elected by staff members in private school. 2(1.8%) of them did not

decided, whereas 2(1.8%) of the respondents answered that agree. This discloses the unfrequented occurrence of principal were elected by staff members in private school

As illustrated in Table 6 item 4 the extent to which principal is assigned by district education office. Accordingly, majority of the respondents 103(94.5%) in the study area disagree as there was principal is not assigned by district education office in private school. The rest 3(2.8%) of them did not decided, whereas 3(2.7%) of the respondents answered that they agree. This indicates that principals were not assigned by district education office in private school.

The Fifth item posed a question whether principal is assigned by individuals' interest.5 (4.6%) research samples replied 'disagree' to the idea that principal is assigned by individuals' interest. The reverse, the majority of respondents 73(66.9%) were responded to agree. The rest 31 (28.4%) were responded to undecided. This indicates that the greater number of respondents believed that principal in private school assigned by individuals' interest.

In strengthening this, according to the information obtained from through FGD participants and responses in open ended question indicated that:

“To ensure the quality of student learning, as well as the quality of the education system as a whole, knowledgeable and trained educational leaders are required.to get this the selection of instructional leaders must have properly implemented. However, school leaders were assigned informally by school owners in the study area”.

Generally, from the findings of the data, focus group discussion and interview made to conclude that the instructional leadership, mainly principals, in private school were assigned by individuals' interest without necessary procedure and criteria. whereas principals are assigned by officially announced competition based on clearly set criteria for the positions failed at moderate level. However, principals were elected by staff members and assigned by district education office were not present.

Table 7: Teachers' Responses on organized and managed of instructional leaders

No	Items	Responses N=109			
		Yes		No	
		N	P	N	P
1	Principals are accountable to CRC supervisors.	61	55.9%	48	44.1%
2	Principals are accountable to owners of school.	36	33.1%	73	66.9%
3	Principals are accountable to school managers.	73	66.9%	36	33.1%
4	Principals are accountable to city education office.	56	51.4%	53	48.6%
5	Principals are accountable to school manager.	81	74.3%	28	25.7%
6	The school provided training for principals.	39	35.8%	70	64.2%
7	Principals are evaluated by district education office.	41	37.6%	68	62.4%

Note: N (Frequency), P (Percent), Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As indicated in Table 7 items 1, 3, 4, and 5 above teachers were asked whether principals are accountable to CRC supervisors, accountable to school manager, accountable to city education office and principals are accountable to school manager.

Accordingly, 61(55.9%),73(66.9%),56(51.4%)and 81(74.3%) of teacher respondents were confirmed their responses 'yes,' while, 48(44.1%), 36(33.1%), 53(48.6%), and 28(25.7%) were confirmed their responses 'No' that for item 1,3,4 and 5 respectively. This shows that school principals were accountable to CRC supervisors, accountable to school managers, accountable to education office and accountable to school managers.

Regarding item 2 of the same table teacher were asked whether the Principals are accountable to owners of school or not, that, 73(66.9%) of teachers confirmed that school principals were not accountable to owner's school.

In table 7 of item 6, respondents were asked is the school provided training for principals. Accordingly, majority of respondents, 70(64.2) were responded 'no' while low number of respondents, 39(35.8%) were responded as 'yes'. This implies that the schools were not provided the training for principals in order to develop and update their skills and knowledge.

As demonstrated in the above table 7 of item 7 respondents were asked about is the Principals are evaluated by district education office. In a way that large numbers of respondents 68(62.4%) were confirmed their responses 'No', while, the low numbers of the study participants 41(37.6%) were responded 'yes'. This depicted that, private schools' principals

were not evaluated by district organization office. Based on this result one can concludes that private schools' principals were not evaluated based on performance standard of principals.

In addition to the above findings, the researcher also interviewed department heads and school principals on how instructional leadership organized and managed?

According to one of interviewed school principal said; *“in private school; instructional leadership are accountable to CRC supervisors and city education office, in case of the management of instructional leadership most private schools managed by the manager of schools”*.

To Sum up, from the findings of the data and interview instructional leadership in private school were accountable to CRC supervisors, accountable to school managers, accountable to city education office and accountable to school managers. However, school principals were not accountable to owners of school, private schools were not provided training to improve principals' skills and knowledge and the performance of instructional leadership were not evaluated by district education office.

Alignment of the instructional leadership with Standard of MoE.

According to MoE (2013), the ministry of education identifies five standards like: Lead and facilitate vision of learning, Develop and manage school community relations, Lead and manage learning and teaching, Lead and develop individuals and team, and Lead and manage school operations and resource. Therefore, to examine the practices of standard of MoE table 8-12 below of the questionnaires were posed.

Table 8: Teachers' Responses on Lead and Facilitate vision of learning

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Your principal facilitates the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school.	1	SD	31	28.4	109	2.39
		2	D	41	37.6		
		3	UD	10	9.2		
		4	A	17	15.6		
		5	SA	10	9.2		
			Total		109		
2	Your school principal lead the change process for continuous improvement	1	SD	32	29.4	109	2.22
		2	D	35	32.1		
		3	UD	31	28.4		
		4	A	8	7.3		
		5	SA	3	2.8		
			Total		109		
3	Your school principal anticipate and respond to educational developments that affect school issues.	1	SD	23	21.1	109	2.69
		2	D	19	17.4		
		3	UD	46	42.2		
		4	A	11	10.1		
		5	SA	10	9.2		
			Total		109		
Average mean							2.43

SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, UD=Undecided, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

Item 1 of Table 8, indicates principals facilitate the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school. In this regard, table 8 above illustrates that 72(66.0%) of respondents disagree that the principals facilitate the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school. 10(9.2%) of them undecided whereas 17(24.8%) of the respondents answered that they agree. This show that majority of the respondents in the study area disagreed as there were principals facilitate the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school. The mean result 2.39 discloses school principals practiced in facilitating the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school were ineffectively.

Concerning item 2, 67(61.5%) ,31(28.4%) and 11(10.1%) of respondents responded as disagree, undecided and agree respectively about the school principals lead the change process for continuous improvement. This implies majority of the respondents in the study area disagreed as there were school principals practice in leading the change process for

continuous improvement were low level. The mean score 2.22 emphasizes the infrequency of the performance.

Concerning item 3, 42(38.5%), 46(42.2%) and 21(19.3%) of respondents responded as disagree, undecided and agree respectively about the principals anticipate and respond to educational developments that affect school issues. This indicate that the majority of the respondents in the study area confirmed that school principals practice in anticipating and respond to educational developments that affect school issues were medium level. The mean score 2.69 emphasizes the performance.

To sum up, the aggregate mean for all variables 2.43. The finding made clear that the instructional leadership, mainly principals, did not properly facilitating the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school, and leading the change process for continuous improvement, whereas anticipating and responding to educational developments that affect school issues failed at moderate level. Therefore, the instructional leadership practices to leading and facilitating vision of learning did not properly implement.

Table 9: Teachers’ Responses on Develop and manage school community relations

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Your school principal connects the school with the community.	1	SD	5	4.6	109	3.84
		2	D	8	7.3		
		3	UD	21	19.3		
		4	A	40	36.7		
		5	SA	35	32.1		
			Total		109		
2	Your school principal involve parents and community members in improving student learning	1	SD	2	1.8	109	3.83
		2	D	28	25.7		
		3	UD	0	0		
		4	A	35	32.1		
		5	SA	44	40.4		
			Total		109		
3	Your school principal use community resources to improve student learning.	1	SD	2	1.8	109	3.88
		2	D	6	5.5		
		3	UD	28	25.7		
		4	A	40	36.7		
		5	SA	33	30.3		
			Total		109		
Average mean							3.85

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As show in Table 9, Item 1, school principals connect the school with the community. The majority of respondent replied 75(68.8%) agree as there was school principals connect the school with the community. The remaining 21(19.3%) and 13(11.9%) respondents replied undecided and disagree respectively. This indicates that the largest of respondents conclude that on agree as there was school principal's practice in connecting the schools with the community were effective. Besides, the mean score 3.84. It supports the frequency and percentage results.

The data obtained through interview ensure the above result: according to one of the interviewed department head said that:

“Schools set aside time for parent discussions so that school principals can inform parents about their child's strengths and weaknesses, and they can discuss and address their child's problems. Private school is more communication with parents.”

Concerning item 2, respondents were asked whether school principals involve parents and community members in improving student learning. The majority of respondent replied 79(72.5%) agree as there were school principals involve parents and community members in improving student learning. The remaining 30(27.5%) respondents replied disagree respectively.

This show that respondents conclude that school principals practice in involving parents and community members in improving student learning were effectively implemented.

In addition to the response obtained through questionnaire one of the interviewed school leaders state that:

“School principal is members of PTA and discuss with them in different times about student learning.”

Concerning item 3, respondents were asked whether school principals use community resources to improve student learning. The majority of respondent replied 73(67.0%) agree as there were school principals use community resources to improve student learning. This indicate that respondents conclude that on agree as there were school principals using community resources to improve student learning. The remaining 28(25.7%) and 8(6.3%) respondents replied undecided and disagree respectively. Besides, the mean score 3.88.it supports the frequency and percentage results.

The overall average mean for all variables 3.85. The finding data and interview clear that the instructional leadership, mainly principals, properly connecting the school with the community, involving parents and community members in improving student learning, and using community resources to improve student learning. Hence, the instructional leadership practices to developing and managing school community relations were effective.

Table 10: Teachers’ Responses on lead and manage learning and teaching

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Your school Principal understands promotes and share relevant research.	1	SD	15	13.8	109	2.39
		2	D	59	54.1		
		3	UD	19	17.4		
		4	A	9	8.3		
		5	SA	7	6.4		
		Total			109		
2	Your school principal advocate for high levels of learning for all students	1	SD	3	2.8	109	3.72
		2	D	7	6.4		
		3	UD	34	31.2		
		4	A	39	35.8		
		5	SA	26	23.9		
		Total			109		
3	Your school principal monitors and evaluates the quality of teaching and learning programs.	1	SD	0	0	109	4.06
		2	D	4	3.7		
		3	UD	26	23.9		
		4	A	39	35.8		
		5	SA	40	36.7		
		Total			109		
4	Your School Principal understands, encourage and facilitate the effective use of data by staff.	1	SD	1	.9	109	3.82
		2	D	6	5.5		
		3	UD	32	29.4		
		4	A	43	39.4		
		5	SA	27	24.8		
		Total			109		
Average mean							3.50

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree UD=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As depicted in Table 10 Item 1 above, the majority 74(67.9%) of respondents said disagree that school principals understand, promote and share relevant research. On the other hands,19(17.4%) and 16(14.7%) of respondents said undecided and agree respectively. The

mean score for this item is 2.39(disagree) which showed that school principals in understanding, promoting and sharing relevant research ineffectively practiced.

As shown in table 10 item 2 above, the majority 65(59.7%) of respondents said agree that school principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students. 34(31.2%) and 10(9.2%) of respondents said undecided and disagree respectively. The mean score for this item is 3.72(agree) which showed high achievement practice of the school principals practice in advocating for high levels of learning for all students.

Supporting the above idea, according to the information obtained from FGD participants state that: -

“School leaders were given attention for all students to improve their achievement by conducting timely evaluation, assessment, monitoring and discuss with students’ family about students’ performance”

As shown in table 10 item 3 above, the majority 79(72.5%) of respondents said agree that school principals monitor and evaluate the quality of teaching and learning programs. 26(23.9%) and 4(3.7%) of respondents said undecided and disagree respectively. The mean score for this item is 4.06(agree) which showed the school principals in monitoring and evaluating the quality of teaching and learning programs were highly practiced.

As shown in table 10 item 4 above, the majority 70(64.2%) of respondents said agree that school principals understand, encourage and facilitate the effective use of data by staff. On the other hands, 32(29.4%) and 7(6.4%) of respondents said undecided and disagree respectively. The mean score for this item is 3.82(agree) which showed high achievement practice of the school principals in understand, encourage and facilitate the effective use of data by staff.

Generally, the findings of the data and FGD clear that the instructional leadership advocating for high levels of learning for all students, monitoring and evaluating the quality of teaching and learning programs, understanding, encouraging and facilitating the effective use of data by staff. But, the instructional leadership did not properly understand, promoting and sharing relevant research. Therefore, the instructional leadership practices to leading and managing learning and teaching were effective.

Table 11: Teachers’ Responses on lead and develop individuals and team

No	Items	Scale	value	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Your school principal Identify and prioritize professional development needs	1	SD	19	17.4	109	2.31
		2	D	51	46.8		
		3	UD	21	19.3		
		4	A	11	10.1		
		5	SA	7	6.4		
		Total			109		
2	Your school principal develop individuals	1	SD	34	31.2	109	1.93
		2	D	33	30.3		
		3	UD	24	22.0		
		4	A	17	15.6		
		5	SA	1	.9		
		Total			109		
3	Your school principal monitor and evaluate workplace learning	1	SD	5	4.6	109	3.51
		2	D	13	11.9		
		3	UD	25	22.9		
		4	A	34	31.2		
		5	SA	32	29.4		
		Total			109		
4	Your school principal develop networks to support teams	1	SD	32	29.4	109	2.13
		2	D	39	35.8		
		3	UD	17	15.6		
		4	A	12	11.0		
		5	SA	9	8.3		
		Total			109		
Average mean							2.47

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree UD=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

Regarding to item 1 Table 11, about school principals Identify and prioritize professional development needs, 70(64.2%), 21(19.3%) and 18(16.5%) of samples marked for disagree, undecided and agree respectively. This show that the majority of respondents in the study area disagreed that school principals Identify and prioritize professional development needs. This indicated that school principal practiced in Identifying and prioritizing professional development needs were low.

In addition to the response obtained through questionnaire one of the interviewed school leaders said: -

“That as it is private school, teacher’s professional development need assessment was not conducted to identify the requirements for their development”

With regard to the case of school principals develop individuals as indicated on item 2 of Table 10, 67(61.5%), 24(22.0%) and 18(16.5%) of samples marked for disagree, undecided and agree respectively. This show that the majority of respondents in the study area disagreed that school principals develop individuals. This indicated that the school principals practiced in developing individuals were ineffective.

Concerning to item 3 of Table 11, 18(16.5%), 25(22.9%) and 66(60.6%) of samples marked for disagree, undecided and agree respectively. This show that the majority of respondents in the study area agreed that school principals monitor and evaluate workplace learning. This indicated that school principals highly practiced in monitoring and evaluating workplace learning.

Regarding to item 4 Table 11, about school principals develop networks to support teams, 71(65.2%), 17(15.6%) and 21(19.3%) of samples marked for disagree, undecided and agree respectively. This show that the majority of respondents in the study area disagreed that school principals develop networks to support teams. This indicated that school principals practiced in developing networks to support teams were ineffective.

In strengthening this, according to one of the interviewed school leaders state that:

“Seminars, workshops, exchange of experiences, CPD programs, the opportunity to update qualifications and obtain a professional license assist teacher in improving their skills and leading and developing individuals and teams. However, the reality in the research area's private primary schools is that school leader do not practice the activities.”

The overall average mean for all variables 2.47. from the finding data and interview the instructional leadership, mainly principals, did not properly Identifying and prioritizing professional development needs, developing individuals and developing networks to support teams. Hence, the instructional leadership practices to leading and developing individuals and team was not the desired level.

Table 12: Teachers’ Responses on lead and manage school operations and resources

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Your school principal establishes and maintains a safe school environment.	1	SD	0	0	109	3.96
		2	D	6	5.5		
		3	UD	25	22.9		
		4	A	45	41.3		
		5	SA	33	30.3		
			Total		109		
2	Your school principal mobilize and utilize resources	1	SD	2	1.8	109	3.85
		2	D	6	5.5		
		3	UD	28	25.7		
		4	A	43	39.4		
		5	SA	30	27.5		
			Total		109		
3	Your school principal Understand policies.	1	SD	2	1.8	109	3.98
		2	D	4	3.7		
		3	UD	26	23.9		
		4	A	39	35.8		
		5	SA	38	34.9		
			Total		109		
4	Your Principal institute procedures and practices to support staff and students	1	SD	4	3.7	109	3.72
		2	D	7	6.4		
		3	UD	29	26.6		
		4	A	45	41.3		
		5	SA	24	22.0		
			Total		109		
5	Your Principal report to the community on effective and efficient use of school resources.	1	SD	4	3.7	109	3.83
		2	D	7	6.4		
		3	UD	24	22.0		
		4	A	42	38.5		
		5	SA	32	29.4		
			Total		109		
Average mean							3.86

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree UD=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

In the table 12 item 1, indicate that the largest group of respondents 78(71.6) of the respondents agreed. Participants about 25(22.9%) were undecided and 6(5.5%) disagree. this implies the majority of respondents agreed that school principals establish and maintain a safe school environment. The mean for these items were 3.96 which shows, the most respondents were not complaining with school principals practiced in establishing and maintaining a safe school environment.

Concerning to item 2 of Table 12, the respondents were asked to respond the question whether school principals mobilize and utilize resources. The largest group of respondents 73(66.9) said agree. Participants about 28(25.7%) were undecided and 8(7.3%) disagree. this implies the largest of respondents agreed that school principals mobilize and utilize resources. The mean for these items were 3.85 which shows, the most respondents said that school principals in mobilizing and utilizing resources were highly practiced.

Supporting the above data, one of the interviewed school leaders state that:

“Resources are not an issue in a private school. the school leader facilitates the necessary resources which helps to teaching learning process in a good manner and good working environment.”

The questionnaire respondents were requested to evaluate whether school principals Understand policies. As presented in Table 12 item 3, the largest group of respondents 77(70.7) agree. Participants about 26(23.9%) were undecided and 6(5.5%) replied disagree. this implies the largest of respondents agreed that school principals practiced in Understanding policies were high.

Concerning to item 4 of Table 12, the respondents were asked to respond the question whether Principal institute procedures and practices to support staff and students. the largest group of respondents 69(63.3%) said agree. participants about 29(26.6%) were undecided and 11(10.1%) disagree. this implies the largest of respondents agreed that principals institute procedures and practices to support staff and students. The mean for these items were 3.72 which shows, the most respondents said that school principals in institute procedures and practices to support staff and students were highly practiced.

The questionnaire respondents were requested to evaluate whether school Principal report to the community on effective and efficient use of school resources. As presented in Table 12 item 5, the largest group of respondents 74(67.9) agree. participants about 24(22.0%) were undecided and 11(10.1%) replied disagree. this implies the largest of respondents agreed that school principals practiced in report to the community on effective and efficient use of school resources were high.

To Sum up, the aggregate mean for all variables 3.86. from the findings of the data and interview made to conclude that the instructional leadership properly establishing and maintaining a safe school environment, mobilizing and utilizing resources, understanding policies, institute procedures and practices to support staff and students, and reporting to the

community on effective and efficient use of school resources. Hence, the instructional leadership practices to leading and managing school operations and resources were effective.

Table 13: Teachers’ Responses on Teachers’ view on instructional leadership

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	The instructional leadership simplifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional role.	1	SD	33	30.3	109	2.46
		2	D	30	27.5		
		3	UD	21	19.3		
		4	A	13	11.9		
		5	SA	12	11.0		
2	The instructional leadership meets the individual professional needs	1	SD	9	8.3	109	3.05
		2	D	18	16.5		
		3	UD	58	53.2		
		4	A	7	6.4		
		5	SA	17	15.6		
3	The instructional leadership encourages teachers to observe each other’s class.	1	SD	2	1.8	109	3.96
		2	D	10	9.2		
		3	UD	18	16.5		
		4	A	37	33.9		
		5	SA	42	38.5		
4	The instructional leadership organizes teachers to work collaboratively.	1	SD	3	2.8	109	4.17
		2	D	4	3.7		
		3	UD	13	11.9		
		4	A	40	36.7		
		5	SA	49	45.0		
5	The instructional leadership provides help to teachers who want to improve their teaching	1	SD	4	3.7	109	3.86
		2	D	9	8.3		
		3	UD	22	20.2		
		4	A	37	33.9		
		5	SA	37	33.9		
6	The instructional leadership helps teachers to evaluate instructional materials	1	SD	0	0	109	4.10
		2	D	5	4.6		
		3	UD	19	17.4		
		4	A	45	41.3		
		5	SA	40	36.7		
7	The instructional leadership takes steps to improve student discipline	1	SD	10	9.2	109	3.80
		2	D	12	11.0		
		3	UD	15	13.8		
		4	A	25	22.9		
		5	SA	47	43.1		
8	The instructional leadership helps individual departments to coordinate learning.	1	SD	0	0	109	4.13
		2	D	4	3.7		
		3	UD	20	18.3		
		4	A	43	39.4		
		5	SA	42	38.5		
Average mean							3.69

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree UD=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As the table above show deals with the view of teachers on instructional leadership. thus, eight items of the questionnaire posed about teacher's view towards instructional leadership.

The first Item; -respondents were requested whether the instructional leadership simplifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional role. Consequently, the majority of respondents 63(57.8%) showed them disagree.21 (19.3%) of respondents cannot decided, whereas 25(22.9%) of respondent marked agree. This implied that the teachers confirmed that instructional leadership was not simplifying the instructional responsibilities of each professional role.

In the same Table of item 2, respondents were asked whether the instructional leadership meets the individual professional needs. Accordingly,27(24.8%), 58(53.2%) and 24(22.0%) with a mean value of 3.05 of the respondents disagree, undecided and agree respectively, with the idea that instructional leadership meets the individual professional needs. the majority of respondents demonstrate cannot decided. This implies undecided scale is below agreeing scale which implies the items were to moderate.

Regarding item 3 of the same table, illustrates that 79(72.4%) of respondents agree that instructional leadership encourages teachers to observe each other's class. 18(16.5%) of them undecided whereas 12(11.0%) of the respondents answered that they disagree. This show that majority of the respondents demonstrate their agreement (mean value is 3.96). This mean, teachers were considered the instructional leadership encouraging teachers to observe each other's class.

On the same Table item 4 shows above respondents were asked whether instructional leadership organizes teachers to work collaboratively. Here,7(6.5%) of the respondents disagreed, 13(11.9%) suggested undecided and 89(81.7%) of the respondents agreed. the majority of respondents said agree (mean value is 4.17). These results indicate that teachers confirmed that instructional leadership organizing teachers to work collaboratively.

Concerning to item 5 of Table 13, 13(12.0%), 22(20.2%) and 74(67.8%) of samples marked for disagree, undecided and agree respectively. This show that the majority of respondents demonstrate their agreement (mean value is 3.86). This implies that Teachers accept that instructional leadership providing help to teachers who want to improve their teaching.

The data in Table 13 Item 6 with regard to the instructional leadership helps teachers to evaluate instructional materials, the majority of the respondents 85(78.0%) in the study area said agree. On the other hand, 19(17.4%) of respondents said undecided. Whereas 5(4.6%) of respondents said disagree. This implies teachers were considered the instructional leadership helps teachers to evaluate instructional materials.

Concerning item 7, respondents were asked whether the instructional leadership takes steps to improve student discipline. The majority of respondent replied 72(66.0%) agree as there was instructional leadership takes steps to improve student discipline. The remaining 15(13.8%) and 22(20.2%) respondents replied undecided and disagree respectively. These results indicated that teachers confirmed that instructional leadership takes steps to improve student discipline.

In relation to the item that asked to find out the instructional leadership helps individual departments to coordinate learning. 4(3.7%) of respondents replied to disagree to the idea instructional leadership helps individual departments to coordinate learning and 20(18.3%) of the respondents replied that undecided. Contrastively, whereas 85(77.9%) of respondents replied that instructional leadership helps individual departments to coordinate learning have been agreeing. This shows that instructional leadership helps individual departments to coordinate learning.

In addition to the response obtained through questionnaire the information gathered from FGD member's reveals that;

“Teachers have positive attitude toward instructional leadership that they have the ability to improve students’ discipline, increase students’ achievement, develop teacher’s competencies and arrangement of teaching and learning.”

To sum up, the average mean for all variables 3.69. In strengthening the quantitative data in FGD almost all of participants indicated that teachers have positive attitude about instructional leadership. Therefore, this disclosed that teachers view on the instructional leadership were positive.

4.3.2. Challenges to Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

As it was described in the review of related Literature there are factors that affect the effectiveness of instructional leadership. Three groups of hindering factors were selected for the inquiry namely; lack of skills and Training, lack of resource availability and allocation, and lack of leadership behavior were selected as main factors.

Table 14: Teachers’ Responses on Lack of Skills and Training

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Lack of qualified instructional leaders in the school.	1	SD	6	5.5	109	3.54
		2	D	12	11.0		
		3	UD	18	16.5		
		4	A	63	57.8		
		5	SA	10	9.2		
			Total		109		
2	Lack of training on instructional leadership.	1	SD	3	2.8	109	3.90
		2	D	2	1.8		
		3	UD	29	26.6		
		4	A	44	40.4		
		5	SA	31	28.4		
			Total		109		
3	Lack of in-service training for school principals.	1	SD	0	0	109	3.91
		2	D	6	5.5		
		3	UD	30	27.5		
		4	A	41	37.6		
		5	SA	32	29.4		
			Total		109		
4	Lack of competent teachers in all subject areas	1	SD	14	12.8	109	3.02
		2	D	15	13.8		
		3	UD	50	45.9		
		4	A	15	13.8		
		5	SA	15	13.8		
			Total		109		
Average mean							3.59

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree UD=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As presented in the case of factors of Skills and Training the first item posed a question whether Lack of qualified instructional leaders in the school. 73(67.0%) reacted to ‘agree’.18(16.5%) said undecided whereas 18(16.5%) of respondents said disagree. This

implies that the biggest number of samples showed their agreement. The mean score rated 3.54 which is in the range of 'agree' could be interpreted as Lack of qualified instructional leaders was a challenging factor to the instructional leadership.

Regarding item 2 of the same table, illustrates that 75(68.8%) of respondents agree that Lack of training on instructional leadership. 29(26.6%) of them undecided whereas 5(4.6%) of the respondents answered that they disagree. This show that majority of the respondents demonstrate their agreement. The mean 3.90 which is in the range of 'agree' range that draws an interpretation that Lack of training on instructional leadership was a challenge to the instructional leadership.

The other item posed a question to find out if Lack of in-service training for school principals was a hindering factor to instructional leadership. While 6(5.5%) participants disagreed, 30(27.5%) of respondents were unable to give judgments. In contrast, majority of the respondents 73(67.0%) showed agreement that the leadership were challenged by Lack of in-service training. This implies that Lack of in-service training challenge to the instructional leadership.

The last item posed a question to respondents if Lack of competent teachers in all subject areas was affecting instructional leadership practices. 29(26.6%) disagreed and 50(45.9%) marked for 'undecided'. In contrast,30(27.6%) showed agreement. This indicated that rated as moderately challenged the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness.

Supporting the above idea, according to one of the interviewed department head state that;

“More teachers in private primary schools have a first degree, rather than a BED, which is more widely accepted in the education field. i.e. most of teachers applied graduate which has no training of PGDT program.”

Thus we can conclude that school leaders challenged lack of qualified teachers in the subject areas.

In addition, according to one of the interviewed school leaders said:

“The government's education offices haven't provided many training opportunities for private schools. The offices are solely concerned with government schools. Except for a few school leaders, the principals were almost all subject specialists. Additional the focus instructional leadership in skill and training supplied by school owners is so limited and turnover of leaders and teachers from year to year are another issue. Therefore, lack of Skills and Training were questioned the instructional leaders.”

The overall items in the challenges of instructional leadership in skill and training examination indicate that the items rated agree with average mean value of 3.59. In addition, the interviewees department head and school principals supporting the quantitative data. Therefore, from this we can summarize lack of skill and training was a challenge to the instructional leadership.

Table 15: Teachers’ Responses on Lack of Resource Availability and Allocation

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Lack of adequate of instructional time	1	SD	49	45.0	109	1.76
		2	D	45	41.3		
		3	UD	9	8.3		
		4	A	4	3.7		
		5	SA	2	1.8		
			Total		109		
2	Lack of student textbooks.	1	SD	49	45.0	109	1.88
		2	D	35	32.1		
		3	UD	18	16.5		
		4	A	3	2.8		
		5	SA	4	3.7		
			Total		109		
3	Lack of school furniture.	1	SD	46	42.2	109	1.83
		2	D	39	35.8		
		3	UD	20	18.3		
		4	A	4	3.7		
		5	SA	0	0		
			Total		109		
4	Lack of library for reading	1	SD	9	8.3	109	3.18
		2	D	19	17.4		
		3	UD	44	40.4		
		4	A	27	24.8		
		5	SA	10	9.2		
			Total		109		
Average mean							2.16

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree UD=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As indicated in table 15 above, teachers were asked whether Lack of adequate of instructional time. Accordingly, 94(86.3%) of respondents demonstrate disagree that Lack of adequate of instructional time. 9(8.3%) of them undecided whereas 6(5.5%) of the respondents answered that they agree. This show that the majority of teachers demonstrate that enough instructional

time and the mean 1.76 which is in 'disagree' range that emphasizes the factor had not been a challenge to leaders' action.

As regards to item 2 of Table 15, the majority 84(77.1%) of respondents replied to disagree. 18(16.5%) and 7(6.5%) respondents reacted undecided and agree respectively. From this one can easily understand that in the current situation student textbooks cannot be a challenge to instructional leadership.

As witnessed in Table 15 of item3, 85(78.0%), 20(18.3%) and 4(3.7%) reacted to disagree, undecided and agree respectively. From this the majority of the questionnaire respondents replied to disagree and the mean is 1.83 within the 'disagree' range that Lack of school furniture. This implies that school furniture had not been impacts in the practices of instructional leadership effectiveness.

The next item requested teachers were asked whether Lack of library for reading. 28 (25.7%) disagreed and 44(40.4%) marked for 'undecided'. In contrast, 37(34.0%) expressed agreement. The mean 3.18 indicated that rated as moderately challenged the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness.

Generally, as it can be seen from the table 14, the examination of an overall item in the dimension of availability of resources rated as Disagree challenges the practice of instructional leaders with average mean value of 2.16. This shows that the resource availability had not been impacts in the practices of instructional leadership effectiveness.

Table 16: Teachers’ Responses on Lack of Leadership behavior

No	Items	Scale	values	Frequency	percent	N	Mean
1	Lack of courage to take risks for the improvement of instruction	1	SD	20	18.3	109	3.67
		2	D	4	3.7		
		3	UD	9	8.3		
		4	A	35	32.1		
		5	SA	41	37.6		
			Total		109		
2	Lack of basic knowledge of instruction leadership	1	SD	6	5.5	109	3.43
		2	D	12	11.0		
		3	UD	46	42.2		
		4	A	25	22.9		
		5	SA	20	18.3		
			Total		109		
3	Lack of organizing the school community for leadership work	1	SD	4	3.7	109	3.53
		2	D	14	12.8		
		3	UD	36	33.0		
		4	A	30	27.5		
		5	SA	25	22.9		
			Total		109		
Average mean							3.54

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree UD=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

Source: Own field survey data, 2021

As indicated in table 16 items 1 above, respondents were requested whether Lack of courage to take risks for the improvement of instruction. 24 (22.0%), 9(8.3%) and 76(69.7%) reacted to disagree, undecided and agree respectively. This implies that the majority of respondents replied to agree.

Supporting the above idea one of the interviewed department head said:

“School principals spend more time on administrative tasks than on teaching and learning.”

Thus we can conclude that school leaders give attention to take risks for the improvement of instruction was very weak.

As regards to item 2 of Table 16, requested teachers were asked whether Lack of basic knowledge of instruction leadership. 18(16.5%) disagreed and 46(42.2%) marked for ‘undecided’. In contrast, 45(41.3%) expressed agreement. The mean 3.43 indicated that it was moderate factor that challenge to instructional leadership.

The third item of Table 16, depicted that teachers were asked whether Lack of organizing the school community for leadership work. In line to this, 18(16.5%) of respondents replied to disagree and 36(33.0%) of the respondents replied that undecided. Contrastively, whereas 55(50.4%) of respondents replied to agreeing. This show that majority of the respondents showed their agreement in that the Lack of organizing the school community for leadership work.

In addition, according to one of the interviewed school leaders said:

“Lack of leadership behavior is one of the factor of effectiveness of instructional leaders in private schools. Supporting and guiding by CRC supervisors and city education office are very important to improve Lack of leadership behavior. But supporting and guiding CRC supervisors and city education are very weak. most of the times CRC supervisors come to school to gather information, problems and collecting different data mostly for reporting purposes.”

The overall items in the dimension had agree challenged the instructional leadership effectiveness with the average mean values of 3.53. then, from the finding data and interview we can summarize that Lack of Leadership behavior was a challenge to the instructional leadership.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents summary of major findings, conclusions drawn from the findings and recommendations that the researcher suggested to help concerned bodies. Based on the data analyzed in the chapter four of the major findings were summarized in response to the research objectives.

5.1. Summary

The goal of this study was to investigate the degree to which instructional leadership is implemented and to identify the major challenges of instructional leadership practice in the private primary schools of Burayu City Administration, Oromia National Regional State. In order to meet this objective, the study raised the following basic questions. With this consideration an effort has been made to answer the following basic questions.

1. How are individuals assigned to instructional leadership in the private primary school of Burayu city administration?
2. How is instructional leadership organized and managed?
3. How does the instructional leadership align with standard of MoE?
4. How do teachers view instructional leadership in schools?
5. What are the major challenges in practicing instructional leadership in the school?

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were employed to answer these fundamental study questions. In order to gather primary data from the respondents, the researchers used questionnaires, interviews and FGD. The data was prepared in line with the basic question and gathered from a total of 109 teachers, 10 primary school principals, 10 department heads and 8 Selected teachers.

Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentages, frequency and mean counts. In order to make the results of the study more accurate, the qualitative data obtained through interviews and FGD was interpreted in a narrative way and incorporated into the quantitative data.

Therefore, the major findings of the analyzed in line with the basic questions were described as follows.

- As indicated in the findings of the study, instructional leaders in private school were assigned by individuals' interest or assigned informally by the school owners. moreover, the finding of the study indicated that assigning instructional leaders by posting officially announced vacancy for competition based on clearly set criteria fail under the moderate level of agreement. In contrast, principal was elected by staff members and assigned by district education office were not present.
- The finding of the study indicated that in private schools, the majority of respondents were responded that, instructional leaders accountable to CRC supervisors, accountable to school manager, accountable to city education office and accountable to school manager. private schools were not provided training to improve principals' skills and knowledge and the performance of principals were not evaluated by district education office.
- Most of teacher respondents indicated that the overall judgment of the practice of Leading and Facilitating vision of learning with in facilitating the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school and leading the change process for continuous improvement and anticipating were ineffective. Whereas responding to educational developments that affect school issues are categorized under medium level of agreement. This is described that instructional leadership which is practiced in private primary schools of Burayu city administration were not aligned with leading and facilitating the vision of learning which is the standard of MoE.
- Majority of the respondents believed that regarding to the overall judgment of the practice of instructional leadership in Developing and managing school community relations to be highly successful in connecting the school with the community, involving parents and community members in improving student learning and using community resources to improve student learning. Then, the respondents have perceived that their practice to the Develop and manage school community relations had successfully been practiced in the sampled schools with average mean value of 3.85. This show that instructional leadership practices was aligned with Develop and manage school community relations in the sampled schools.
- The obtained data showed that concerning the overall judgment on the practices of instructional leadership to Lead and manage learning and teaching is found to be effectively implemented with average mean values of 3.50.

- Concerning the overall judgment on the practices of instructional leadership in Leading and developing individuals and team is found to be low. This implies that instructional leadership which is practiced in private primary schools of Burayu city administration were not aligned with Leading and developing individuals and team which is the standard of MoE.
- Most of teacher respondents indicated that the overall judgment of the practice of leading and managing school operations and resources to establish and maintain a safe school environment, mobilize and utilize resources, understand policies, institute procedures and practices to support staff and students and report to the community on effective and efficient use of school resources is found to be effectively implemented with average mean value of 3.86. This described that instructional leaders practice are high to lead and manage school operations and resources. This is confirmed that instructional leadership practiced in private primary schools of Burayu city administration was aligned with leading and managing school operations and resources which is the standard of MoE.
- The findings showed that the views of teachers on the instructional leadership in encouraging teachers to observe each other's class, organizing teachers to work collaboratively, providing help to teachers who want to improve their teaching, helps teachers to evaluate instructional materials, takes steps to improve student discipline and helps individual departments to coordinate learning is found to be positive. In contrast, the view of teachers on simplifying the instructional responsibilities of each professional role and meeting the individual professional needs are found to be negative and medium respectively. This means that of teacher's view on instructional leadership is which indicate optimistic perception.
- As indicated in the findings of the study, overall assessment of items revealed that the challenges of instructional leadership were lack of qualified instructional leaders, lack of training on instructional leadership and in service training, lack of courage to takes risks for the improvement of instruction and lack of organizing the school community for leadership work of instructional leadership were rated as highly challenged. Lack of competent teachers in all subject areas, lack of library for reading and lack of basic knowledge of instructional leadership were rated as medium challenged. In other way the finding indicated that lack of resource availability and allocation which rated the 2.16 was not a challenged of instructional leadership.

5.2. Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn on the basis of the main findings of the study.

1. In private primary schools the assignment of instructional leadership has a gap. Instructional leaders were assigned informally by the school owners or appointed by individual interest of investor. Instructional leader was made not on the basis of their qualification and competence.
2. To provide the quality of education and to improve student's performance, instructional leadership should be managed and organized properly. From the findings of the study it is concluded that instructional leadership in private schools were organized and managed under school manger, private schools were not provided training to improve principals' skills and knowledge and the performance of principals were not evaluated by district education office.
3. Concerning the instructional leadership alignment of MoE, it is concluded the practices of instructional leadership in private primary schools is aligned with the standard of MoE in the areas like developing and managing school community relations, leading and managing learning and teaching, and leading and managing school operations and resources. But the part of standard which is leading and facilitating vision of learning and leading and developing individuals and team was not aligned with standard of MoE.
4. Regarding the teachers view on instructional leadership teachers have positive perception on encourages teachers to observe each other's class, organizes teachers to work collaboratively, provides help to teachers who want to improve their teaching, helps teachers to evaluate instructional materials, takes steps to improve student discipline and helps individual departments to coordinate learning.
5. In general, the practice of instructional leadership effectiveness was challenged by lack of qualified instructional leaders, lack of training on instructional leadership, lack in service training, lack of courage to takes risks for the improvement of instruction and lack of organizing the school community for leadership work.

5.3. Recommendations

The results of this study make it possible to make certain recommendations for strengthening instructional leadership practices. These suggestions will be used by the owner or school administrators to initiate actions that will improve the tradition of instructional leadership in private primary schools in the Burayu city administration. The recommendations below are focused on the findings of this report.

1. To improve the quality of education and enhance student's achievement the schools must be lead by knowledgeable, skilled, and experienced leaders in both private and governmental schools. Therefore, private primary schools are recommended to assign instructional leaders depending their capacity, education qualification, work experience and by posting clear announcement with standard which was prepared by MoE.
2. Expanding private school is the strategy of our government to expand and improve the quality of education. The private school instructional leadership like any other governmental school's instructional leadership must be organized by official organization such as CRC, Woreda education office and bureaus. But, Burayu private primary school's instructional leadership organized by the school manager may not have a knowledge and skill on school management and education policy. Therefore, Burayu education office should be given more attention toward the organization of private primary school's instructional leadership with governmental primary schools similarly. The city education office should have to give equal attention to private school as governmental primary schools, by enforcing private schools to provide training and development program for principals, and setting performance standards for principals and making evaluation by city education office.
3. The practice of instructional leadership align with standard of MoE has positive indication in develop and manage school community relations, lead and manage learning and teaching, and lead and manage school operations and resources. But their practice on lead and facilitate vision of learning and on lead and develop individuals and team was not aligned with standard of MoE. Therefore, city education office and CRC supervisors should support and guide the school leaders to

improve them self-according to the standard MoE. Moreover, the school owners and town education offices need to facilitate conditions in which individuals get trained.

4. The perception of teachers on instructional leader is negative on their simplifying the instructional responsibilities of each professional role and meeting the individual professional needs. Therefore, in collaboration with school owners and city education office to provide adequate training to improve the capacity, skill and attitude of teachers and leaders.
5. Regarding to challenges that impede effectiveness of instructional leadership in this study, the findings witness that hinder the effectiveness of instructional leader were the lack of qualified instructional leadership, lack of training on instructional leadership, lack of in service training, lack of courage to take risk for the improvement of instruction, lack of basic knowledge of instructional leadership and lack of organizing the school community for leadership work were to listed. In order to mitigate such problems, in collaboration with the Oromia region education bureau, city education office and school owners should provide pre service and in service training for private primary leaders to solve the problem of capacity of instructional leadership. Moreover, school owners should reconsider the instructional leadership selection, promotion, and appointment process and consider the quality of their school leadership.
6. The city education office and CRC supervisors should observe how private school leaders adhere to the standard when implementing government policy and curriculum.

Reference

- Addisu Chonde (2014) Practice and challenges of instructional leadership in selected preparatory schools of Hadiya zone.
- Aklilu Alemu 2011. An Assessment of instructional leadership practice in the secondary Schools of Sheka Zone. MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University.
- Alberta Education. (2010). Policy and Requirements for School Board Planning and Results Reporting.
- Arikewuya, B. 2001. The National Professional Qualification for Leadership: The key to Effective school leadership: *School Leadership and Management* 18 (3), 21-3133.
- Babson, N.O. (2005). Education and Resources Requirement. Nigeria., Port Harcourt: Akpan Printing Press Limited.
- Bekuretsion Hailesilassie (2014). The Principal's Instructional Role; A case of four secondary schools in southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Region, Ethiopia.
- Blasé, J.; & Blasé, J. (2000). Effective Instructional Leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), p 130-141.
- Borba, A.L. (2002). Instructional leadership practices and beliefs of superintendents of high performing, high-poverty school districts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 2002).
- Bush, T. (2009). Leadership development and school improvement. *Contemporary issues in leadership development. Educational Review*, Vol.61, No.4. PP. 375-389.
- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting and evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative research*. (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Daresh, J.C. 2001. *Supervision as proactive leadership*. Chicago: Waveland Press.
- Davis. S. Darling – Hammond, I. Meyerson. D, & Lapointe, M. (2005). *Review of research. School leadership study: Developing successful principals*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership institute.

- Dereje Demissie (2019) instructional leadership practice and challenges of school principals in governmental secondary schools of sidama zone.
- Department of Education. 2004b. Women in management and leadership positions. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Education Sector Development Program V (ESDP V) 2015/16-2019/2020: Program Action Plan. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Dimmock, Clive. (2000). Designing the Learning Centered Schools. London: Falmer Press
- Geremew Terfa (2018). Principals Instructional Leadership Effectiveness and Influencing Factors in Government Second Cycle Primary Schools of Adami Tulu Jido Kombolcha Woreda. MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University (Unpublished).
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985a). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–248.
- Hallinger, P. (2003a). School leadership development: Global challenges and opportunities. In P., Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective*.
- Hallinger. (2005). *Instructional Leadership and the School Principal: A Passing Fancy that Refusesto Fade Away Instructional Leadership*. Bangkok, Thailand: College of Management, Mahidol University.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck R. (2010b). Leadership for learning. Does collaborative Leadership make a difference in school improvement? *Educational management administration and leadership in school improvement* no. 6 654-678
- Harris, A. (2003). *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. New York: Rutledge Flamer
- Kerlinger, F. N (2003) *Foundations of Behavioral Research* New Delhi: Surjet Publications
- Kotahri, C. (2004). *Research Mthodology: Method and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: New Age international Ltd.
- Leithwood, K, Day, C. Sammons, P., Harris, A. & Hopkins (2006). *Successful School Leadership what it is and how it influences Pupil Learning*. NCSL

- Marshall, G. (2015). "Coleman Report". A Dictionary of Sociology. Retrieved from: Encyclopedia.Com. <[Http://Www.encyclopedia.Com](http://www.encyclopedia.com)>.
- McEwen, E.K. (2003). Seven steps to instructional leadership. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press
- McGhee, M. A., and Lew, C. 2007. Leadership and Writing. How principals' knowledge, beliefs, and interventions affect instruction. Educational Administration quarterly, 43(3), 358-380.
- McLaughlin M. W. & Talbert J. E. (2007). Building Professional Learning Communities in High Schools: Challenges and Promising Practices in Professional Learning Communities: Divergence, Depth and Dilemmas. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Medhanie Gebeyehu (2019). Practice of Instructional leadership in Government Primary Schools of Yeka Sub city. MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University (Unpublished).
- MoE (1994). Educational and Training policy. Addis Ababa EMPDA.
- MoE. (2002). Education Sector Development Program II. Program action plan. Addis Ababa.
- MoE (2007). Review of Ethiopian education and Training policy and Its Implementation.
- MoE (2008). General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP). Addis Ababa: Ethiopia.
- MoE (2013). National professional Standard for School Principals. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ministry of Education
- MoE (2017). Ethiopian Education Development Roadmap. Addis Ababa.
- MoE (2019) Education Statistics Annual Abstract 2011 E.C. (2018/19 G.C) Addis Ababa EMIS, Planning and Resource Mobilization Management Process.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal Instructional Leadership. Advances in Educational Administration, ICB: Changing Perspectives on the School), 163-200. AA: USAID. Pamela
- Murphy, J. and A. Porter, 2007. Leadership for learning: a research based model and Taxonomy of behaviors. Journal of school leadership and management 27(2) 179-201

- Niyazi, C. 2009. The leadership behaviors of educators in primary schools in Turkey. Turkey: Erciyes University.
- Northouse, P.G. (2004). Leadership Theory and Practice. California: Sage Publications, INC;
- OECD (2008). Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and Practice.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). Leadership theory and practice (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peter, S. M. (1990). The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations. Sloan Management Review.
- Okumbe, A. J. 1987. Effectiveness of Supervision and Inspection in Selected Secondary Schools in Kiambu District, Central Province, Kenya. Unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, Kenyatta University.
- Sergiovanni, T.T. (2001). The principal ship: A Reflective practice perspective (4th ed). London: Allyn and Bacon
- Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P. & May, H. 2009. How the principal and peers influence teaching and learning. Educational Administration Quarterly, 46(1):31-56.
- Tadesse Atnafu (2014) Instructional Leadership practices and challenges in government primary schools of woreda five in Arada sub city.
- Van Deventer, I and Kruger, G. A.2003. an Educator's Guide to School Management Skills. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Wallace Foundation (2013). The school principal as a leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning. Retrieved Oct6,2013 from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership-documents>.
- Weber, J. (1996). Leading the instructional program: School leadership. Cleaning house of Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon
- Yamane.T(1967). Statistic an introductory analysis: In G. D.Israel ,Determining Sample

Appendix A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE FILLED BY TEACHERS

Dear Respondent: I am MA student of Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. I am carrying out a study on the topic: **Practices and challenges of instructional leadership in private primary school of Burayu Town Administration, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia.** Thus, the main purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant information to compliment this research work. I request for your co-operation by helping to answer the questionnaire as per the instructions at the beginning of each section. The success of this study directly depends upon your honest and genuine response to each question. You are requested to be as frank as possible when answering this questionnaire. Your responses will be highly respected and accorded the highest confidentiality.

Thank you very much in advance for your taking time to fill out this questionnaire!

Show your agreement to fill the questionnaire by answering the following question.

Would you fill this questionnaire voluntarily?

Yes

No

Note: -

- *You do not have to write your name.*
- *Your answer should represent your thinking or opinion.*
- *Feel free while filling out the questionnaire and reflect your views without any restrain*
- *Try to properly understand the statements before giving responses.*
- *Remember to go through all **pages** of this questionnaire.*
- *Give response by putting (√) in the appropriate box against each closed ended items and by giving brief descriptions of your opinion for open ended questions.*
- *Every response has to be based on your school context.*

PART I. Questions Related to Personal Information

1. Your Town Administration _____
2. Name of your school _____
3. Age: 20-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41 and above
4. Your academic status: Diploma B. A/BED/BSc M. A/MSc
5. Your field of specialization: Teaching EDPM Other (specify) _____
6. Service year Gender: A. Male B. Female
7. : under 5 years 6-10 11-15 16-20 21 years and above

Part II. Items/questions related to practices and challenges of instructional leadership in primary private schools.

1. Questions about assignment of individuals to instructional leadership.

The following table consists of questions that show **how individuals are assigned to instructional leadership in your school**. Please indicate the extent to which each statement represents your school by putting tick mark (√) in one of the boxes against each item.

Rating scales: 5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree(A), 3=Undecided(UD), 2=Disagree (DA) 1=Strongly Disagree (SD)

N o	Items	SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Your school principal is assigned by officially announced competition for vacancy.					
2	The official announcement post is based on clearly set criteria for the position.					
3	The principal is elected by staff members.					
4	The principal is assigned by district education office.					
5	The principal is assigned by individuals’ interest.					

Please list down any more methods or criterion (other than the above lists) that are practiced to assign principals to instructional leadership in your school.

2. Questions about organized and managed of instructional leadership.

Below is a table that consists of questions about organized and managed of instructional leadership of your school. Indicate your response by putting this mark (√) in one of the boxes against each item.

No	Items	Yes	No
1	Principals are accountable to CRC supervisors.		
2	Principals are accountable to owners school.		
3	Principals are accountable to school managers.		
4	Principals are accountable to city education office.		
5	Principals are accountable to school managers.		
6	The school provided training for principals.		
7	Principals are evaluated by district education office.		

3. Questions about alignment of the instructional leadership with standard of MoE

The following table that consists of questions that show the standard of MoE of principals practices. Please indicate the extent to which each statement represents your school by putting tick mark (√) in one of the boxes against each item.

Rating scales: 5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4= Agree(A), 3=Undecided(UD),
2=Disagree (DA) 1=Strongly Disagree (SD)

No	Items	SA	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
I	Lead and facilitate vision of learning.					
1	Your principal facilitates the articulation and realization of a shared vision of school.					
2	Your school principal lead the change process for continuous improvement.					
3	Your school principal anticipates and responds to educational developments that affect school issues.					
II	Develop and manage school community relations					
1	Your school principal connects the school with the community.					
2	Your school principal involve parents and community members in improving student learning					
3	Your school principal use community resources to improve student learning.					
III	Lead and manage learning and teaching					
1	Your school Principal understands promotes and share relevant research.					
2	Your school principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students					
3	Your school principal monitors and evaluates the quality of teaching and learning programs.					
4	Your School Principal understands, encourage and facilitate the effective use of data by staff.					
IV	Lead and develop individuals and team					
1	Your school principal Identify and prioritize professional development needs					
2	Your school principal develop individuals					
3	Your school principal monitors and evaluates workplace learning.					
4	Your school principal develops networks to support teams.					
V	Lead and manage school operations and resources					
1	Your school principal establishes and maintains a safe school environment.					
2	Your school principal mobilize and utilize resources					
3	Your school principal Understand policies.					
4	Your Principal institute procedures and practices to support staff and students					
5	Your Principal report to the community on effective and efficient use of school resources.					

4. Questions about teachers' view towards instructional leadership in your school.

The following questions or items are assumed to be related perceive of teachers about the practices of instructional leadership in school. Please indicate the extent to which each statement represents perceive of your school teacher by putting tick mark (√) in one of the boxes against each item.

Rating scales: 5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree(A), 3=Undecided(UD),
2=Disagree (DA) 1=Strongly Disagree (SD)

No	Items	S	A	UD	DA	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The instructional leadership simplifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional role.					
2	The instructional leadership meets the individual professional needs.					
3	The instructional leadership encourages teachers to observe each other's class.					
4	The instructional leadership organizes teachers to work collaboratively.					
5	The instructional leadership provides help to teachers who want to improve their teaching.					
6	The instructional leadership helps teachers to evaluate instructional materials.					
7	The instructional leadership takes steps to improve student discipline.					
8	The instructional leadership helps individual departments to coordinate learning.					

5. Questions about the major challenges in practicing instructional leadership in your school.

The following table consists of items considered as common challenges of schools that hinder the practices of instructional leadership. Please rate each item, using the (1-5) scales that best describes the degree to which the challenges are availability in your school.

Rating scales: 5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree(A), 3=Undecided(UD), 2=Disagree (DA) 1=Strongly Disagree (SD)

No	How do you rate the following challenges of instructional leadership in your school?	S	A	UD	DA	SA
		5	4	3	2	1
I	Lack of Skills and Training					
1	Lack of qualified instructional leaders in the school.					
2	Lack of training on instructional leadership.					
3	Lack of in-service training for school principals.					
4	Lack of competent teachers in all subject areas.					
II	Lack of Resource Availability and Allocation					
1	Lack of adequate of instructional time.					
2	Lack of student textbooks.					
3	Lack of school furniture.					
4	Lack of library for reading.					
III	Lack of Leadership behavior					
1	Lack of courage to take risks for the improvement of instruction					
2	Lack of basic knowledge of instruction leadership					
3	Lack of organizing the school community for leadership work					

Please list down if you have any more challenges to instructional leadership at your school.

Thank you for scarification of your precious time!

Appendix B

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS

PART I. Questions Related to Personal Information

1. Your Town Administration _____
2. Name of your school _____
3. Gender: A. Male B. Female
4. Age: 20-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41 and above
5. Your academic status: Diploma B.A/BED/BSc M.A/MSc
6. Your field of specialization: Teaching EDPM/ Leadership Other
(specify) _____
7. Service year: under 5 years 6-10 11-15 16-20 21 years and above

PART II: Interview Guide Questions.

1. What are the criteria used in your school to assign/elect school leaders? How do you evaluate the effectiveness of the criteria? Who set and practice those criteria?

2. Do you think that your principal is effective in instructional leadership practice? If you say “yes” How? If you said “no” Why?

3. How instructional leadership organized and managed?

4. Do you think that you are effective in your instructional leadership practice? If you say “yes” How? If you said “no” Why?

5. How do teachers perceive instructional leadership?

6. What are the challenges you faced in practicing instructional leadership in your school?

Appendix C

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PRINCIPALS

PART I. Questions Related to Personal Information

1. Your Town Administration _____
2. Name of your school _____
3. Gender: A. Male B. Female
4. Age: 20-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41 and above
5. Your academic status: Diploma B.A/BED/BSc M.A/MSc
6. Your field of specialization: Teaching EDPM/ Leadership Other (specify) _____
7. Service year: under 5 years 6-10 11-15 16-20 21 years and above

PART II: Interview Guide Questions.

1. How are individuals assigned to instructional leadership? What are the criteria? How do you evaluate the effectiveness of criteria? Who set and practice those criteria?

2. Do you; think that, you are effective in your instructional leadership practice? If you say yes, how? If you said no, why?

3. How instructional leadership organized and managed?

4. How do you evaluate the community relations with schools?

5. How do you practice professional development needs in you school?

6. How do teachers perceive instructional leadership?

7. What are the challenges you faced in practicing instructional leadership in your school?
