

*Addis Ababa
University*

(Since 1950)



**Factors Influencing Principal's Instructional Leadership
Performance in Governmental Primary Schools of Kolfe
Keranyo Sub-city, Addis Ababa**

By

Tigist Bogale

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

June 2018

Addis Ababa
University
(Since 1950)



**Factors Influencing Principal Instructional Leadership
Performances in Governmental Elementary Schools of Kolfe
Keranyo Sub-city in Addis Ababa**

By

Tigist Bogale

**A thesis submitted to the school of graduate studies of Addis Ababa
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Masters of School Leadership**

June 2018

Addis Ababa University
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

*Factors Influencing Principal Instructional Leadership Performances
in Governmental Elementary Schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city in
Addis Ababa*

By

Tigist Bogale

Approved by board of Examination

_____	_____	_____
Chairperson Head of Graduate committee	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner (Internal)	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner (External)	Signature	Date

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to give my sincere thanks and heartfelt appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Dessue Writu for his constructive advice and his willingness to always guiding me in the right direction during the whole process of the study.

I am greatly indebted to my devoted husband Ato Aniley Himero for his unlimited support and advice to do my study. And my Son Nahome Aniley they form the backbone and origin of my happiness. For their love and support without any complain or regret has enabled me to complete this MA Thesis.

Special thanks given to five schools principals, supervisors, teachers and woreda and sub-city Education Office heads where I conducted my study, for allowing me to do research at their and to given necessary data.

Finally, my deepest gratitude also goes to sub-city education office workers to Ato Nebelbal Hilu, Ato Menchile Adugna, w/ro Bertukan Mengesha and W/rt Tsegae Tegegne for their advice and supported by giving necessary data to do my study.

Contents

	page
Acknowledgements.....	iv
List of Table.....	vii
Abbreviations vs Acronyms.....	viii
<i>Abstract</i>	ix
CHAPTRE ONE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	6
1.3.1. General Objective.....	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives.....	6
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	6
1.5. Delimitations of the Study.....	7
1.6. Limitation of the Study.....	7
1.7. Definition of Conceptual VS operational terms.....	7
1.8. Organization of the Study.....	8
CHAPTER TWO.....	9
Review of Related Literature.....	9
2.1. Concept of School Leadership.....	9
2.2. Definition of Instructional Leadership.....	10
2.3. Instructional Supervision role of principals.....	11
2.4. Instructional Leadership Effectiveness.....	12
2.4.1. Instructional Leadership and Teaching and Learning.....	14
2.4.2. Role of Instructional Leadership on School Success.....	15
2.4.3. School Leadership practice in Ethiopia.....	17
2.5. Factors Affecting Instructional Leadership Performance.....	18
2.5.1. Personal Characteristics and Leadership.....	19
2.5.2. Factors of school climate.....	19
2.5.3. External Factors of Education Department.....	21

CHAPTER THREE	22
Research Design and Methodology	22
3.1. Research design and Research Method.....	22
3.2. Sample size and Sampling techniques	22
3.3. Sources of Data	23
3.4. Instruments of data collection	24
3.5. Data Collection Procedures.....	26
3.6. Method of Data Analysis	26
3.7. Ethical Consideration	27
CHAPTER FOUR.....	28
DATA PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	28
4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents’	28
4.2. Factors of School climate.....	32
4.3. Role Diversity	35
4.3. Professional Norm.....	37
4.4. Sub city /Woreda Education Office Responses	39
4.6. Communicating School Goals.....	44
4.7.Managing Curriculum and Instruction.....	46
4.8 .Monitoring students’ Progress	48
4.9 .Evaluating Teachers	50
CHAPTER FIVE	52
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	52
5.1. Summary	52
5.2.Conclusion	54
5.3.Recommendations	55
Reference	58
Appendix-A	1
Appendix-B.....	7
Appendix-c.....	8

List of Table

	Page
CHAPTER THREE.....	22
Table 1 Group of Respondents.....	22
Table 2 Sample size of Principals, Supervisors and Teacher.....	23
CHAPTER FOUR.....	28
Table 1 Respondents by sex, Age and Qualification.....	29
Table 2 Respondents by Work Experience.....	31
Table 3 Availability of Instructional Resource.....	33
Table 4 Principals' Role Diversity and Its influence an Instructional Leadership Performance.....	36
Table 5 Views on Professional Norm.....	38
Table 6 Elements constraining instructional Leadership.....	40
Table 7 views on Communicating School Goals.....	45
Table 8 Views on Managing Curriculum and Instruction.....	47
Table 9 Views on Monitoring Students' Progress.....	49
Table 10 views on Evaluating Teachers.....	50

Abbreviations vs Acronyms

FGD	Focus Group Discussion
ILP	Instructional Leadership Performance
MOE	Ministry of Education
Std	Standard Deviation
WEO	Woreda Education Office
EDPM	Educational Planning and Management

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the current status of principals' instructional leadership performances and to investigate some of the factors that influence its provision in Primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city in Addis Ababa. The study was conducted in 5 primary schools selected from among 27 schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city by using a simple random sampling technique; a total of 124 respondents, 20 school principals, 94 teachers, 5 woreda education heads, 5 supervisors were used as subjects of the study by provide necessary research data. Questionnaire, interviews, FGD and observation were the instruments used for data collection. The data gathered were interpreted and analyzed by using descriptive statistical techniques: such as frequency, percentage, mean value, standard deviation and t-value. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of principals lacked the required qualification and training in educational leadership (EDPM).As a result they were incompetent in playing their instructional leadership role effectively. On the other hand heavy work load and paper work requirements affected the quality of instructional leadership. Another problem of principals in their leadership activity was lack of instructional materials and operative funds. Furthermore, principals failed to accomplish classroom visit. They conducted classroom visit only to evaluate the semester's performance of teachers. The study indicated that principals' collaboration and openness in communicating in problem solving with teachers was not satisfactory. On the other hand there was unimportant interference of sub city and WEO in the function of principals. In line the above finding and conclusion it was recommended that Addis Ababa Education Bureau in collaboration with sub city education office should be define the instructional leadership roles of principals clearly in terms of the five dimensions, provide trainings in the area, revise and improve the selection and appointment criteria of leadership positions, reduce and improve the organizational and sub city/WEO factors debilitating instructional leadership role of principals.

CHAPTRE ONE

Introduction

This chapter deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, research design and methodology, organization of the study , definition of key terms .

1.1 Background of the Study

School systems are the bases for the production and provision of qualified human resources. They are in charge of achieving educational objectives to shape pupils in accordance with the needs and interest of beneficiaries. It is generally believed that a society's future layer depends on the success of schools in effectively carrying out their objectives.

In order to accomplish their purpose, they need to deliver learning through effective teaching and the success is determined by schools outcomes, the quality and quantity of graduates (Krug, 1992; 432). However, this cannot be attained without adequate and proper provision of school curriculum and instruction for each level and grade. The responsibility for proper and adequate provision of school curriculum and instruction rests with the school principal.

School leaders are expected to mobilize the abilities and efforts of the teaching staff to provide effective educational program. To this end, instructional leaders should devote considerable time to coordinate and manage instruction, and stay close to the instructional process (Lock heed and Verspoor, 1991:44). In light of this, Tompkins and Trum (in Bishaw, 1975:12) allocate “three-fourth” of principal's time for instructional matter.

In relation to the tasks expected from the school leaders for effective instructional leadership, different authors and researchers have developed different conceptual frameworks based on the characteristics of effective schools and effective principals. (Snyder, 1983; 32) for instance, conceptualized instructional leadership in terms of planning, staff and program development and evaluation activities using such organizational properties, however may entirely capture the normative dimension of school social organization without which the instructional leadership tasks

of leaders could not influence the quality of instruction as well as student achievement. Considering such limitation of Snyder's conceptual model, Hallinger and Murphy (1987:56) developed a three dimensional conceptual frame-work which embraces ten functional categories framing goals, communicating goals, Knowledge of curriculum and instruction, coordinating curriculum, supervising and evaluating instruction, monitoring progress, setting standards, setting expectations, protecting time and promoting improvement.

Recent authors and researchers, however, reframed the conceptual framework of instructional leadership in to five dimensions based on (Halingers and Murphy, 1987;86) functional categories and other similar studies, these dimensions that are: Defining the school mission, Managing curriculum and instruction, Supervising instruction ,Monitoring student progress and Promoting instructional climate (Krug, 1992:431).These researcher and authors believed that the five dimensional are Structurally more tenable, simpler to work with and not appreciably less precise.

According to (Daresh 2002) "effective instructional leader actively promotes more effective practice in the teaching and learning processes in his/her school. The key to instructional leadership is in the principal defining his/her role in terms of recognizing instructional priorities rather than by serving as a school manager. The well-defined instructional leader is the principal who makes instructional and learning excellence the center of his/her actions, communications, and decisions.

The effective instructional leader is involved in several facets of the school culture. This individual is involved in the coordination of staff development, receiving input from all stakeholders in planning and implementing staff development programming. The well-defined instructional leader supervises and evaluates all staff members by collaborating with them to set instructional goals and objectives and by meeting with them to check their progress. He/she facilitates instruction by supporting teachers who have innovative ideas and by making instruction a priority in terms of time. An effective instructional leader resolves student problems by assisting teachers with student discipline, enforcing attendance policies in order to increase instructional time, and by interacting with students daily.

From the above statements, we can conclude that principal is the pivotal point within the school who affects the quality of individual teacher instruction, enhanced student achievement and the

degree of efficiency of school functioning. He/she makes frequent observations of classroom instruction, provides clear communication to staff of expectations relative to the instructional program, teacher involvement in decision making regarding instructional program, active participation in planning and evaluating the instructional program, and demonstrating high expectations for the effective instructional program.

In Ethiopian context, although an attempt has been made to make the educational administration system professional, still a lot remain to be done, particularly in the area of training and professionalizing principals. Regarding the effectiveness of principal in leadership (MOE.2005:11-12) argues that principals failed to play their key roles.

The basic objectives of the school performances in the manual are congruent with dimensions of instructional leadership (MOE, 2007). The Ethiopian education and training policy (1994; p.29-30) states that educational management should be democratic, professional, coordinated efficient and effective. In addition, the management of teachers and other educational personnel will be organized based on professional principle.

Accordingly, one of the various overall strategies of ESDP IV is to improve quality of education (MOE, 2005:37). But without appropriate leadership no quality program will work. Concerning school leadership, principals have been selected from subject teachers. This indicates that principals were not recognized as professionals. This makes usually the school leadership unstable the workload on principals and interference of worda and sub city education offices on the function of principals were apparently prevailing in the education system in Addis Ababa.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The role of the principal has become more complex, overloaded and unclear in the past decade. Fullan (1991:144) asserts that the role of the principal has been in a state of transition, progressing from the principal as an instructional leader or master teacher, to the principal as a transactional leader and, most recently, to the role of transformational leader. The duties of principals extend beyond that of instructional leaders to one that is administrative and managerial.

The principal's day is filled with activities of management – scheduling, reporting, and handling relations with parents and community, dealing with multiple crisis and special situations that are inevitable in schools (Fink and Resnick, 2001). Most principals spend relatively little time in

classrooms and even less analyzing instruction with teachers. They may arrange time for teachers' meetings and professional development, but they rarely provide intellectual leadership for growth in teaching skills.

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

Schools of developing countries including Ethiopia which manifest limited concern for instructional leadership activities have been criticized for wastage of instructional time, when teachers leave classes for various reasons and for minimum participation of parents in following up students learning progress (Lock heed and Verspoor, 1991:45).

The research studied by Mulugata Wende(2017) the practices of primary school principal's roles as instructional leader, the finding of the study revealed that the administrative tasks took much of principals' time rather than instructional activities. Furthermore, it was found that the principals gave less emphasis for: instructional supervision, extra-curricular activities, teachers' training and development, provision of instructional materials and protection of teaching time. For school to be successful, the principal has to balance the administrative tasks and instructional tasks. Finally, it was recommended that the principals need to be trained in school management and leadership in order to be competent as instructional leader along with suggestions for further empirical investigation.

Similarly, research studied by Raj Mestry and others (2013) the instructional leadership role of primary school principals, the study found that most principals experience great difficulty in balancing their administrative responsibilities with their instructional responsibilities. However, the majority of the principals demonstrated innovative means of resolving challenges that blocked them from being leaders as learners. They remain mired between the old and new paradigms of instructional leadership, yet understand the impact instructional leadership can have even in incremental steps for creating learning communities and fostering the learning of their teachers, themselves and their students.

The study shows that the traditional role of principals as managers has been expanded to instructional leaders. The manifestation of IL varied amongst the principals, continuing to evolve towards becoming shared instructional leadership and leader as learner. In order to promote their core responsibility of promoting effective teaching and learning, the principals needed to concentrate on being strategic about employing shared instructional leadership. This research has shown that the very essence of instructional leadership is to transform the school as an organization into an environment where teachers and learners may reach their full potential.

The research studied by Dawit (2018:13) in secondary school, the study indicated that most principals have exercised the instructional leadership roles they are expected to play though some principals were not able to properly exercise instructional leadership roles supposed to be played by them. Thus, improving instructional leadership in the schools requires the education department of the city administration and the regional education bureau to give attention to area of specialization while appointing school principals. In addition, principals who are on duty at present should be given adequate training on instructional leadership dimensions that are affecting performance of the schools in the city administration.

The research also studied by Simin, Komathi, Chellapan, and others (1914:1) four domains were used as factors affecting the instructional practices, which are professional leadership, shared mission and clear goals, continued monitor of teacher progress and professional growth of the teachers. Findings shows that the four domain factors were really affect the instructional leadership practices. The findings of this study can be beneficial for policy and decision makers in the Ministry of Education, school management and administration as well as teachers.

Based on the above background and the assumption that school leaders have a positive effect on instructional process of schools, their instructional leadership tasks were examined in terms of the five dimensions described earlier. Factors influencing this task are also other area of concern for this study. However, most studies were done in secondary schools to the knowledge of the researchers there is little study conducted on elementary school principals. Hence, this study would contribute to the existing research gap and to find the current practice of principals' instructional leadership performance or roles.

To this end, the following basic research questions are set;

1. How significant is the relationship between principals' personal characteristics (age, work experience and field of study) and their instructional leadership performance?
2. To what extent do school principals perform the dimensions of instructional leadership role in governmental primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city?
3. What are the challenges principals have faced in playing their instructional leadership role in governmental primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo sub-city of Addis Ababa?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study has both general and specific objectives.

1.3.1. General Objective

The General objective of this study is to analyze or explore the current status of instructional leadership performances and its influencing factors in governmental Primary Schools in Addis Ababa.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The study is targeted to achieve the following Specific objectives to:-

1. Examine how they are practicing their roles;
2. Analyze principal's performance in their instructional leadership role;
3. Assess the extent to which instructional leaders play their role;
4. Identify the major challenges that instructional leaders have faced in governmental Primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub city.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study is expected to have the following significance;

- ✓ It may help Addis Ababa Education Bureau experts understand the existing status of instructional leadership role and the influencing factors so that appropriate measures that enhance instructional leadership could possibly be taken based on the findings and recommendations of the study;
- ✓ It may help trainers of school administrators get clear insight into the magnitude and the nature of the problem, and help them gear their program towards the improvement of instructional leadership role;

- ✓ It may help governmental primary school principals, vice principals and supervisors recognize factors influencing principal's performance and may get some ideas on how to become effective in their instructional leadership role.
- ✓ It may serve as a stepping stone for other researchers to conduct more comprehensive researches on the area.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

The study is geographically delimited to Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city of Addis Ababa. The emphasis of this study is delimited on the principals and vice principals. In addition, such variables as status, practice and challenges of principals' performance were addressed.

Taking the time and the labor required in carrying out the data collection process into consideration, the study is delimited to governmental primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub city in Addis Ababa. The selection of the schools as a setting for the study is based on the researcher's experience as a student, as a teacher and as a vice principal in the schools that helped the researcher to sense the problem.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

This study was not totally free from limitation. There were some unforeseen problems that limited the findings of the study to take in absolute terms. Because of shortage of related to the study, the researcher has mainly depended on foreign sources. And also because of lack of willingness effect on research react, some respondents did not return the questionnaires. Due to several meetings some principals were not available for necessary information in their office. However, the researcher used maximum effort to find them in the school and to overcome these challenges.

1.7. Definition of Conceptual VS operational terms

The following definitions are operational for this study;

Instruction is the process or act of teaching: education (Collins Dictionary);

Leadership refers to a higher order set of abilities such as goal setting, visioning and motivating (Dimmock; 2002:3);

Instructional leadership defines those actions that principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in students learning. In practice, this means that the principals encourages educational achievement by making instructional quality the top priority of the school and brings that vision to realization. (Dimmock; 2002:3);

Instructional leadership Effectiveness is the ability and frequency of principal's engagement in the role behavior (or practices) used to represent the five instructional leadership dimensions (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987:98);

School principals: - principals and vice principals of primary schools in Kolfe Keranyo Subcity of,Addis Ababa;

1.8. Organization of the Study

This study is organized in to five chapters. Chapter one provides background pertaining of the study the problem and its approach. Chapter two deals with review of related literature, chapter three researches Design and methodology, chapter four provides presentation and analysis of the data, chapter five summaries, conclusions and recommendation of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

The chapter reviews of related literature on the definition of instructional leadership, concept of school leadership, leadership effectiveness, instructional leadership and teaching and learning, role of instructional leadership on school success and task of instructional supervision. Finally, the chapter treats factors affecting instructional Leadership performance.

2.1 Concept of School Leadership

School leadership is not something new or intrusive concern. It is what it always has been; the application of reason, logic, values to the achievement of educational objectives via the development of available resources (Holmes, 1993:9). Thus, School leaders are those persons, occupying various roles in the schools goals. So, school leaders are viewed as holding the key to resolve a numbers of problems currently facing schools. (Holmes, 1993; 39)

Successful school leadership is one of the key conventional terms where the success of a school is being celebrated. In this regard, research and practice have a great deal to say about the importance of school leadership with regard to its impact on school improvement and ultimately on students achievement. For example, Harris and Bennett (cited in Harris, et al, 2003; 9) have argued that the importance of leadership in securing sustainable school improvement has been demonstrated in both research and practice. Teddlie and Reynolds (cited in Brundr et al, 2000:56) on their part have indicated that, for many, the term leadership has become centrally synonymous with school effectiveness. School leadership is a connected and crucial issue of what is meant by successful, quality school for the present and future.

Sergiovanni, (as cited in Harris, et al, 2003; 1) has indicated the dependability of school success on effective leadership and stated that “Tomorrows schools success will depend up on the ability of leaders to harness the capacity of locals, to enhance sense and meaning and to build a community of responsibility.” Again, (warren Bennis, 2003:54) has argued that thus, one may say that effective leadership is at the core of every successful organization. In broader context, Harris and Chapman (2002:87) stated that research findings from diverse countries and different school contexts have revealed the powerful impact of leadership in securing school development and change. To clearly

know about successful school leadership, research based conclusion is summarized by Leith wood and Richi (2003:123) in to five claims as follows:

1. Leadership has significant effect on student learning and to the effect of the quality of curriculum and teachers instruction.
2. Currently, administrators and teachers provide most of the leadership in schools, but other potential sources of leadership exist.
3. A core of leadership practices form the basis of successful leadership is available in almost all educational contexts.
4. Successful school leaders respond productively to challenges and opportunities created by the accountability oriented policy context.
5. Successful school leaders respond productively to the opportunities and challenge of education in different group of students.

Brush and Bell (2003:60) have stated that, in ongoing worldwide educational reforms, how to improve educational practice for the pursuit of educational quality is one of the key concepts. Accordingly, one of the various overall strategies of ESDP IV is to improve quality of education (MOE, 2005:37).

But without appropriate leadership no quality program will work, Hence, West Burnham (1997:112) has noticed that “...before the issue of quality is raised within the school, the quality of leadership may need to be explored.” Moreover, to make quality of education more attractive and sustained, leadership does not come only from one person. Accordingly, Harris et al, (2003:1) underlined that there is a grouping recognition that deep and sustained school improvement will depend up on the leadership of the many rather than the few, Riley cited in Harris et al.(2003, p.10) has also suggested that school leader ships more than the effort of a single individual. In support of this idea, Leithwood and Richl, (2003, p.231) have also stated that although leadership is often invested in or expected of persons in positions of formal authority, leadership encompasses a set of functions that may be performed by many different persons in different roles through a school.

2.2 Definition of Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership can be defined as those actions that principals take, or delegate to others, to promote growth in students’ learning (the concepts ‘learner’ and ‘student’ will be used interchangeably). In practice, this means that the principal encourages educational achievement by

making instructional quality the top priority of the school and brings that vision to realization. Fullan (1991:161) explains that instructional leadership is an active, collaborative form of leadership where the principal works with teachers to shape the school as a workplace in relation to shared goals, teacher collaboration, teacher learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teacher commitment, and student learning. Instructional leaders spend most of their time dealing strictly with curricula matters rather than administrative functions.

The principals as instructional leaders should at all times strive for excellence in teaching and learning with the sole purpose of improving student achievement. Principals should serve foremost as instructional leaders in schools, and that their commitment to instructional improvement should not only be strongly articulated but should be reinforced with experience in the classroom (Glanz, 2006). In order to secure legitimacy in the eyes of the teachers, principals should have sufficient teaching experience and should understand with firsthand experience the instructional challenges faced by teachers.

Instructional leadership demands high standards of academic excellence: setting high expectations for learner success; having knowledge and experience with effective teaching or instructional strategies. Glanz (2006) instructional leadership is thus about encouraging best practices in teaching. Principals should become familiar with innovative theories and practices and motivate teachers to model them in classrooms.

2.3 Instructional Supervision Role of Principals

A survey of the literature dealing with supervision uncover many definitions and purposes and “these range from a custodial orientation to humanistic orientation” (Wanzare and Dacosta, cited in Glickm et al, 2004).

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1987,p.112) believed that supervisory activities needed to include the process that includes the teacher’s knowledge skills and ability to make better informed decisions or to become active researchers in to their own teaching methods as part of the supervisory process. In relation to this, Glickman (2004) states by using the supervisory skills supervisors many promote good schools with proper utilization of five tasks of supervision. These are direct assistance, group development, professional development, and curriculum development and action research.

Direct assistance can be used to gather classroom data on the extent to which moral principles are present in the classroom. Supervisor's mentors and coaches can work with teachers to develop observation tools to describe classroom culture reflect on current conditions and engage in the classroom based improvement. The supervisor gradually can increase teachers' decision making responsibility, empowering teachers, and thus enhancing the teacher's capacity to empower students.

Clinical supervision and peer coaching are currently the two most popular forms of direct assistance in schools but a variety of other forms are available. A few additional examples of direct assistances are demonstrated teaching, Co-teaching, assistance with resource and materials, assistance with student assessment, problem solving and mentoring.

Group Development can assess and improve group culture by gathering and analyzing data on how teachers treat each other. Enhancing dialogue, empathy, trust, collaboration with in adult teams will improve the function of those teams, and ultimate effect the way teachers work with students.

Professional development can address teachers as whole persons, fostering their pedagogical. Cognitive, emotional, social and ethical development, it can provide teachers' opportunities to enhance their teaching through learning and leading critical reflection and professional dialogue can help teachers develop the skills to actualize more principles in their classrooms.

Curriculum Development: - can involve teachers in preparing moral principles throughout the curriculum. Teachers can design a curriculum that educates the whole child_ teacher's compassion and implementing justice, include all children in significant learning. Teachers can develop curriculum that can integrates learning within the school and connects academic learning within the school and connects academic learning with community service.

2.4 Instructional Leadership Effectiveness

The above controversy in the concept of leadership also rises in effectiveness. This is because educational leadership is said to be effective in terms of the goals it sets itself (Bundre, et al, 2003:133).

However, for whom are the goals themselves effective? Are all goals equally morally acceptable? For example, in Germany, (in the period of Hitler) an effective school leader is one who helps to produce young fascists for the Rich. In Presbyterian Church schools, the head's leadership style

consists of doctrine Macbeth to cut out the “immoral” bits, showing how the Bible proves evaluation to be wrong, rejecting sex education of any kind and using corporal punishment to restrict the innate sinful tendencies of children, (Ghouri, cited in Brundret, 2003:134). Then, if democracy is supposed to be the foremost political goal of education, should not this be reflected in the ways in which schools are led if schools are to be judged effective? (Brundrett, et al, 2003:135). Porter et al, (2006:68) also emphasize that leadership operates within the social culture of its times. Now a days, people expect a more ‘democratic’ style of leadership, and not one where they are deceived, coerced or simply bribed to following the leader’s dictates.

Fiedler (1987:43) has developed a contingency model which, says that leadership effectiveness is the result of an interaction between the style of the leader and the characteristics of the environment in which the leader works. Drawing on the contingency theory of leadership effectiveness framework bases its notion that no single style is effective in all situations but rather the situation determines the style that will most likely be effective (Sutcliffe, 1997:1). Ayalew (2000:24) also stresses that different situations require different style and effectiveness of a style depends on the situations in which it is used. Therefore, effectiveness is context based because it depends on the situation in which it is used and the leader acts. For an organization to be successful in the achievement of its goals functioning variables are required. However, the organization of the proper functioning of these inputs lies on the capability and competence of the leader. If the leader is capable to influence subordinates in using appropriate leadership styles in accordance with their level job maturity, it is most likely that organizational goals will be achieved. Thus, the attainment of organizational goals is attributed to the effectiveness of the certain organization is a success.

Zenebe (1992:19) observes that effectiveness is an expression of a given quality of performance. Effectiveness refers to a level of achievement that result in high employer moral and attainment of organizational goals. Birnbaum, (1992:56) contends that a “leader who is able to command support constituent has met the needs of multiple and conflicting stake holders and has acclaim to be considered a good leader” and thus effective.

Though the leader cannot be effective without the support of his/her superiors and subordinates, it’s in his/her own hand that others can be made to contribute Likewise. Drucker (cited in Hersey, et al 2001:2) observes that successful managers must achieve the results valued by the people who have a stake in their organizations accomplishment. Thus an effective leader Commands the support of

his/her superiors and subordinate for boosting employee morale and successful attainment of organizational goals.

2.4.1 Instructional Leadership and Teaching and Learning

In-depth studies of teachers perceptions about characteristics of school principals that influence teacher's classroom instruction have conclude that the behaviors associated with instructional leadership positively influence classroom instructions (Larson-Knight, 2000; Blasé and Blasé 1998; Sheppard, 1996, & Chrispeels (1992). Especially (Blasé and Blasé, 1998) findings indicate that when instructional leaders monitor and provide feedback on the teaching learning process, there were increases in teacher reflection and reflectively informed. Instructional behaviors, in implementations of new ideas, greater variety in teaching strategic, more responses to students diversity, lessons were prepared and planned more carefully teachers were more likely to take risks and more focus on the instructional process, and teachers used professional discretion to make changes in classroom practice. Teachers also indicated positive effects on motivation, satisfaction, confidence and sense of security.

Instructional leadership behaviors associated with promoting professional growth and staff development yield positive effects on classroom practice, (Chrispeel, 1992:231). In particular leaders that engage in behaviors that inform staff about current trends and issues, encourage attendance at workshops, seminar and conferences, build a culture of collaboration and learning, promote coaching, use inquiry to drive staff development, set, professional growth goal with teachers, and provide resources foster teacher innovation in using a variety of methods, materials, instructional strategies, reflective practice, and technology in the classroom. This in turn, increases the student achievement, (Sheppard, 1996, Blasé and Blasé, 1998).

Locke and Latham (1990:52) assert that goal setting is effective way to increase motivation and performance. They postulate that goals increased attention to obtainment of the task, increase the effort expended on goals relevant to activities, increase persistent to achieve, increase the development of strategies to obtain the goal. This is true even loosely coupled organizations, such as public schools. Book Binder (1992) explains frequent communication of school goals by instructional leaders promote accountability, a sense of personal ownership, and instructional improvements.

A principal that define and communicate shared goals with teachers provides organizational structures that guide the school toward a common focus. This common focus on academic press challenges teacher's behaviors with in the class room, which leads to more effective schools (Book Binder, 1992; Blasé and Blasé, 1998)

2.4.2. Role of Instructional Leadership on School Success

Early studies of Anderson and Soder, Hollinger and Heck (cited in Mcewen, 2003:123), Wallence (cited in Harris and Muijs,2005:34) asserted that principal's role has significant impact on the achievement of students, their studies demonstrate that high students achievement has direct relation with the function of strong instructional leadership.

However, many of the recent finding state that the influence of the instructional leadership impact is rather indirect Bell et al, (cited in Harris and Muijs, 2005:231). In the same way, Deal and Lec (cited in Heck, 2006:65) suspected the direct link between school success and effective instructional leadership is very complex than easy to link. Blasé and Blasé (1999:221).Further forwarded their argument that early researchers could not give enough evidence, which validate the direct link between strong instructional leadership and improved learning outcome.

Regardless of the discrepancies observed on the point of view of the intellectuals, nowadays, instructional leadership are being accountable and unlike the customary management function like planning, organizing ,allocating resources, creating equilibrium, controlling etc., the present function of leadership mostly focused on developing and communicating mission and purpose, motivating and inspiring of followers towards the achievement of shared goals (Mctwen,2003, Carlson, 1996; locke, 1991) Leadership, as to Locke. (1991) is the power of inducing others towards some commonly perceived goals, his definition encompasses three basic elements, namely followers, function and influencing powers. First, leadership is rational action that exhibits the presence of followers willing to act, second as a process, there is something to be done finally as a power, the leader has to possess either formal or informal power that the influences others, leaders at the higher post may use their legitimate power to facilitate situation, however there are many other ways that formal and informal leadership motivate followers to get things done (Blasé and Blasé, 1999:154). In addition, it is the leader's responsibility to communicate picture of what the organization should be, convince followers and channel all activities towards accomplishing it (Hoy and Miskel's, 2000:32).

Definition of leadership appears to be more recent perspective; defines leadership as the art to transform people and organization with aim of improving the organization. Leaders in this perspective define the task and explain why the job is being done, they oversee the follower's activities and responsible for improved learning outcomes. Most of the responsibilities in improving instructions by developing teachers' leaders are the province solely left for instructional leaders at whatever levels. Marks & Printy (2003:272) However, stressed that the link between instructional leadership and school effectiveness is yet unclear and best indirect (Heck, 2006; Sergiovanni, 2001).

Responsibility and accountability for effective instructional outcome calls leaders to design better ways those students can learn and highest school outcome could be produced the role of the principal as instructional leaders through complex, over loaded and unclear in the past, now it is in the way of transition towards transformational leadership (Chell, 1991:311).

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

Hence, the contemporary thinking of facilitative instructional leadership requires school leaders to have vision, quality and value to transforming their school towards envisioned success. (Smith, 2003:321). Thus, elaborations of instructional leadership dimensions that support learning centered schools building can be tapped from the work of Dim mock,(2000). The components include the following focus areas of the leader.

Goal emphasis particularly towards students learning outcome, technical knowledge and management of effective teaching and learning, Knowledge and management of technology, computer, internet and etc... Knowledge and management of organization structure for service. Capacity and willingness to desirable model behaviors, Building organizational culture that value learning of all, Leadership of human resource and management of other resource, Monitoring and reviewing performance in the school accountability and Strategies for organizational change and innovations that contribute for building learning centered School (Brundret, Burton, & smith, 2003:13).

Similarly, Weber (cited in Lash way, 2007:34) identified the following main functions that instructional leader, conducive learning climate, providing feedback of class and evaluation of instructional performances. Conley and Pragger, (cited in Lash way, 2007:45) argued that aligning individual interest to common vision, value and belief is changing that needs continuous effort and dialogue of the principal with school members until collegial leadership practice become the culture of the school (Burndret, Burfon, & smith, 2003:15).

2.4.3. School Leadership Practice in Ethiopia

Principal-ship in schools is one of the influential administrative positions in the success of school plans with respect to the historical background of principal-ship, authorities give their own argument. As indicated in Knezevich, (in Ahmed, 2006) the origin of principal ship can be traced to 1515 to the time of Johann Sturm in USA. The position developed from classroom teacher with a few administrative duties to principal teacher and then to supervising principal. The history of Ethiopian education system traces its origin to the introduction of Christianity about fourth century A.D. Ethiopia for a very long time had found schools for the children of their adherents (Teshome in Ahmed, 2006).

According to Ahmed (2006) the history of principal-ship in Ethiopia, at its early stage was dominated by foreign principals. In all government owned schools that were opened before and few years after the Italian occupation expatriates from France, Britain, Sweden, Canada, Egypt and India were assigned as school principals.

After the restoration of independence in 1941, education was given priority which resulted in opening of schools in different parts of the country. As there was not enough educated Ethiopians to teach and run schools, most of the teachers and principals in schools were from foreign countries such as UK, USA, Canada, Egypt and India (ICDR 1990). According to MOE (2002), prior to 1962, expatriate principals were assigned in the elementary and Secondary Schools of different provinces of Ethiopia during the 1930's and 1940s'. During this time Indian was given the principal ship position which may be for their higher educational level and experiences in principal ship.

However, the history had developed in to a new phase where Ethiopians began to replace expatriate which started in 1964, According to Teshome (in Ahmed 2006).This new phase of principal ship started with supervising principal such a person was responsible not only for one school but also for the education system of the community where the school was located from the second half of 1940's,

documents prove that Ethiopian school Heads were directly assigned in elementary schools without competition among candidates. Only educational level and teaching experience were given highest priority of principal ship. After 1960 it was known the Ethiopians who graduated with B.A. BSC degree in any field were assigned as principals in schools by senior officials of the ministry of education. The major selection requirements were educational level and work experience (MOE, 2002; p. 42).

School improvement program in Ethiopia, since the formulation of new education and Training policy (1994), Ethiopian Government has made different educational reforms. Similarly, Ethiopian has been found implementing the newly launched school improvement program. It is one of the components of the General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) (MOE, 2007).

The current school improvement program framework was developed based on the result of the review of the best practices of the schools all over the country, related literatures and positive experience obtained from its pilot program implemented in 2006 (MOE, 2007). The main objective of the program is to maximize students learning outcomes by improving the conditions might have impact on it. As it was mentioned before, the program focuses on four major domains of the school namely improving the teaching and learning, creating conducive learning environment, improving school leadership and enhancing community participation in school affairs. The basic objectives of the school performances in the manual are congruent with dimensions of instructional leadership (MOE, 2007).

The Ethiopian education and training policy (1994; p.29-30) states that educational management should be democratic, professional, coordinated efficient and effective. In addition, the management of teachers and other educational personnel will be organized based on professional principle.

2.5 Factors Affecting Instructional Leadership Performance

Many contextual factors negatively affect instructional Leadership performance. However, the type as well as the intensity of the problem is not the same in every school. for example, Bush and Bell (2003;p.13) assert, shortage of highly educated work force is found as critical problems of those economically advanced countries, while scarcity of resource for more investment in education has created a dividing line between those developed and developing nations in the world (MOE,2007;p.1). Such factors can be classified in to personal characteristics, Organizational characteristics and district or zone education department characteristics.

2.5.1 Personal Characteristics and Leadership

Personal characteristics are factors which are most commonly used in selecting leaders for principal ship, Researchers also recognize the potential influence they have on how principals enact their role. The first factor is age. Little attention is given to age as a requirement for certification as well as selection of school leaders, one may expect the older principals tend to have greater experience in education and therefore, will offer more instructional leadership. Others, on the contrary, may expect that younger principals show more energy and capacity, and therefore ,strong instructional leadership, Research findings, however, are inconsistent about the relationship between age and leadership effectiveness,(Gross & Herriott ,1965;p.76) for instance, found “negative” relations that dictate older principals provide less leadership than do the younger, whereas. (Jacobson, et al, 1973; P.33), reported “very little” relationship between age and successful leadership”.

Work experience as a second factor, has been commonly used as criteria in selecting principles and assistant principals (MOE, 1996:7). For instance, has set criteria for selecting principals who requires at least five years teaching experience or experience as a unit leader, department head, and head of pedagogical center or school supervisor. However, research findings do not support this. For example, Gross & Herriott,(1965; p.68-73), found that the length of experience as teacher, previous administrative experience and even the number of years at the principal ship position have no significant relationship with leadership effectiveness (measured as EPL).

Educational attainment and qualification are other personal factor more often used as criteria for selecting leaders for principal ship. For instance, MOE (1996; P: 8) requires educational attainment of at least a Degree and more preferably qualified in educational planning and management. For instructional leadership role, training in educational areas is highly considered fore leader effectiveness. In this connection with, Halinger and Murphy (1987:P.55) suggested that lack of knowledge in curriculum and instruction determine the instruction leadership role.

2.5.2 Factors of School Climate

School climate in this context refers to the factors existing in the school. In instructional leadership process the availability of teachers, text books, equipment, supplies and finance are crucial for its success, Mibit, (1994; P.113), for example, stressed this when he suggested "...just as well trained personnel are important for the success of the school curricula, so are equipment and supplies", Hence, leaders instructional leadership functions may be constrained or facilitated by the extent of

resources available in their school. Confirming this, a research conducted in elementary schools of developing countries revealed that the instructional improvement effort of principals are highly constrained by the chronic shortage of materials, operating funds and staff development resource (Lockheed & Verspoor, 1991;p.44). Experience also shows that shortage of qualified teachers makes instructional leadership process problematic.

Role diversity is the other organizational factors, to which most of elementary school leaders complain reviewing different studies on principals' time allotment to their work, Jacobson, et al, (1973; p.135). Reported that the variety of roles that the principals assumed made them unable to devote enough time to matters that concern instruction Seymour (1976; p.89).also pointed out that instructional leadership role of the principal is always dwarfed by the long list of administrative duties. So the multiplicity of roles and expectations by parents, students and teachers tend to fragment whatever vision the principal maybe attempting to Shape in the school. (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; 57).

Professional norm is also another factor that influences instructional leadership effectiveness. Such professional norm makes the relationship between teachers and school leaders on the matters of instructional loosely coupled and leave educational decisions to teachers. Consequently, such professional norm limits the frequency and depth of principal's classroom visits as well as their initiatives of consulting teachers about instructional matters (Hallinger & Murphy, 2001:56).

Many authors and research findings also, identified school size as one factor that influences principal's Leadership. Zenbe (1992:127), For example, found that "the size of the school stress the job demands of the principal". Holmes (1993:41) again confirmed that the learning priorities and needs of children can easily be detected in small schools than in larger ones. The findings of gross and Herriott (1965:153) also reveal that principal' leadership effectiveness increases in small schools of the principals. Time budgeting over concluded that. Principals of small schools spent more time in teaching while principals of longer schools spent more time in curriculum and instruction, guidance and problem of the staff (Herriott, 1986:17). These imply that school size and instructional leadership effectiveness have a direct relationship. Other studies shows that principals have multiple roles they play Information over load, paper work, too many reports, many non-academic demands and work over load consume much of the Principals time, Hence ,only principals committed to instructional

improvement can choose and their time for the enhancement of the class room instruction and teachers development (sergiovanni, 2007).

2.5.3 External Factors of Education Department

The third source of influence of the principals instructional leadership performance is sub city or worda office factors, one of such factors is expectation of higher administrative officers. Different authors suggest that the expectation set by the administration of higher offices can influence the principal's instructional leadership role.

As Hallings and Murphy, (1997:56), pointed out that the informal culture of school district which emphasize managerial efficiency and political stability than instructional leadership constrains the principal effort in instructional improvement.

On the positive side, Gross and Herriot's (1985:109) findings that reveal high EPL by the principals when their superiors also have high EPL suggests that the district with a climate that promotes and rewards instructional leadership might enhance the ability and motivation of principal to successful leadership. Other district or zone administrative elements, such as rules, regulations and policies, financial and supply delivery problems numerous reporting requirements untimely teacher transfer and in deployment of teachers are suggested as constraining elements in principals instructional leadership process (Bossert et al, 1992: 53)

According to my experience, some of the sub-city or worda education office heads are external factors of principals which challenge to face in playing principal's instructional leadership roles of primary schools. For instances, problems of numerous reporting requirements, untimely teacher and principals transfer and unimportant interference with principals to teachers etc.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Design and Methodology

Under this chapter, the design of the study, method of research, sample size and sampling technique, source of data, instrument of data collection and method of data analyses are treated.

3.1 Research design and Research Method

In this study descriptive survey design was used because it helps the researcher to gather adequate data from a relatively large numbers of respondents (Best and Kahn, 1993) and of study subjects within a short period of time with minimum cost and helps to assess the recent practice and make generalization (Koul, 1996; 5). Moreover, it helps the researcher to understand the current situations pertaining to instructional leadership performance in Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city.

In this study, quantitative and qualitative methods were employed because the descriptive survey design indicated above enables the researcher to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. In other words, a questionnaire helps the researchers to generate quantitative information whereas interview guide and observation check list are appropriate to obtain qualitative information. Hence the idea of using both methods lies in the nature of the design used.

3.2. Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

In this study, the determination of the population and sample schools were based on the 2018 annual statistical reports of the Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city education office. According to this report there were 27 primary governmental schools in the 15 Woredas of Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city. Among these, 5 schools were with teaching staff size of minimum 43 and above, and the school sample were taken by 20% of staff size in all schools. These schools are also found in different woreda of Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city in Addis Ababa. A total of 124 respondents were participated from 5 schools. The following table summarizes the groups of respondents and sampling techniques used in 5 schools.

Table One Group of Five School Respondents

Roll no	Group of respondents	Sample techniques
1	Principals & v. principals	Purposive sampling
2	Teachers	Simple Random sampling
3	Supervisors	Cluster sampling
4	Woredas Education office head	Cluster sampling

Accordingly, the target population of schools were limited to those 5 out of 27 schools with teaching staff size of taking 20% of teachers in each school. Simple random sampling was used to select the schools in different woredas in order to give each school equal chance. The following table summarizes the sample schools and respondents included in the study.

Table Two Sample sizes of principals, supervisors, teachers and WEO heads

No of Schools	Sample woredas	Sample school	Principals				Teachers				Supervisors				WEO heads			
			M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%
1	8	Keranyo medhnialem primary school	3	1	4	100%	19	12	31	20%	1	-	1	100%	1	-	1	100%
2	9	Meserete Edget primary school	3	1	4	100%	9	5	14	20%	1	-	1	100%	1	-	1	100%
3	10	Selamber primary school	3	1	4	100%	21	9	30	20%	1	-	1	100%	1	-	1	100%
4	11	Abeboch frea primary school	3	1	4	100%	7	3	10	20%	1	-	1	100%	1	-	1	100%
5	12	Ewket wognae primary school	3	1	4	100%	6	3	9	20%	1	-	1	100%	1	-	1	100%
Total size			15	5	20	100%	62	32	94	20%	5	-	5	100%	5	-	5	100%

Five schools, four principals, one supervisor and one Woreda education office head were taken by purposive sampling technique, from each school. On other hand, the selection of teachers was done through two steps first, the numbers of sample teachers from each school were taken by using percentage (20%) sampling technique. Total populations of the five schools teachers were 468. From these 20% were 94 teachers, 20 principals and v. principals, five supervisors and five woredas education office heads were used as respondents. Multistage sampling; second the researcher decided to select equal numbers of primary schools from northern, southern, western and eastern geographical area. Then, simple random sample was used to select primary schools from each geographical area of the sub-city.

3.3. Sources of Data

The sources of primary data for this study were principals, v/principals, teachers, supervisors and woreda education office head from governmental primary school in Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city. These

are primary sources that bring firsthand information. For these study principals, v/principals, teachers, and supervisors were included as they are policy implementers who are directly attached to the task of instructional activity. Beside this, woreda education office heads were also included as primary sources of data because they are educational policy implementers who had direct work relationship with principals.

Secondary sources were also included as sources of data in this study. These sources of data include relevant policy documents and school reports.

3.4. Instruments of Data Collection

The data collection instruments used were: questionnaire, interview guide, and focus group discussion (FGD). A questionnaire that consists of close-ended question items and few open ended items was used to generate information from principals and teachers. Interview guide was used gathered information from school supervisors and woredas education office heads. Observation check list was used to assess the availability of adequate instruments, materials, equipment's and facilities of schools.

Questionnaire

Questionnaire was used as a main tool of data gathering instruments in this study, because questionnaire is less expensive, offers greater anonymity of respondents and appropriate for collecting factual information (Kumar, 2005:130). In addition, it helps the respondents to choose one option from the given scales that best aligns with their views. Thirty nine 5-point likert scale items were prepared and administered to principals and teachers. Items in the questionnaires reflected educational leadership problems of primary school principals. Moreover, these items also contained strategies to tackle problems of principal in educational leadership.

Interviews

Interview was used as data gathering tool, because interview useful for collecting in-depth information, allow opportunity for explanation of questions and can be applied to any type of population (Kumar, 2005:131). Data from interviews can be supplemented with other responses.

The researcher developed 13 Structured and interview questions and conducted interview sessions with school supervisors and woreda education office heads. Items in the interview reflect as

educational problems of primary school principals and views of supervisors and woreda education office heads on strategies to tackle instructional leadership.

Focus group discussion (FGD)

Focus group discussion (FGD) were used in this study because they are an efficient and interesting ways gaining insight in ways in which people share their knowledge and argue their different point views (Best and James, 2004:142).

Eight Focus groups discussion (FGD) questions were prepared and administered to teachers who did not participate in filling the questionnaires. Items in the FGD reflect instructional leadership problems principals' face and strategies teachers recommend tackling these problems. There were six teachers in FGD sessions in each school. The members of the groups were randomly selected from the schools under study.

Observation checklist

The researcher employed observation checklist to check the availability of basic school facilities like adequate library service, classrooms, separate latrines and playground that have great influence on the work of school principals as instructional leaders. It is used a tool to checked and gather information how much principals perform their roles.

Pilot Study

Before the main questionnaires were used, Pilot test was conducted in two government elementary schools, namely: Philipose and Abeboch frae primary school. Following the instrument before the final form, the questionnaire was pretested within small group that have similar characteristics with the actual respondents of the study. The purpose of the pretest was to find out ambiguities, double-barreled questions, omissions or miss understandings in the instruments that may pose problems in responding to the items. To this end, 20 questionnaires were distributed to Philipose and Abeboch frae primary schools. To examine the internal consistency of the item under each variable, the reliability coefficient of the test (α) on the basis of a split half method) was computed and found to be 0.65 for organizational characteristics, 0.87 for WEO characteristics, and 0.89 for professional norm 0.93 for possible problems and 0.91 for strategy to tackle problems. According to this method, if >0.50 , the

question will have strong internal consistency. Therefore, except for organizational characteristics (which had moderate strength) the correlations appeared to be good indications of the internal consistency among the items. So, items of the questionnaire were found to be valuable for the purpose intended except minor modifications made on two items which seemed ambiguous (under school climate)during try out. Based on the pretest, the final instruments were developed and distributed for respondents.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

At the beginning, contact was made with principals of each school by orienting the purpose of the study to create rapport with them. Then, respondents who fill in the questionnaire and focus group participants were identified by simple random sampling techniques. The distribution, continuous follow up and the collection of questionnaire were made by the principals and facilitator teachers. To maximize the quality of responses of the respondents and the rate of return, convenient time gap was arranged. Interviews with supervisors and woreda education office head administered by the researcher, observation were organized and administered by principals and the researcher.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis

The gathered data were classified and tallied in the respective groups and schools. Following that, the data of each group were arranged and organized in each tables and problem areas. Data obtained from open ended questions were used for interpreting the problem areas under consideration and for suggestions. Thus, the organized data were analyzed and interpreted using descriptive statistics. Different statistical techniques were employed on the basis of the basic questions stated and on the nature of the data collected. The data collected through questionnaire was tabulated and analyzed by using percentage, mean, standard deviation and t-test. The percentage was used to interpret the characteristics of the respondents. Mean and standard deviations were used for organizing and summarizing sets of numerical data collected by Likert type scales in the questionnaires. These mean and standard deviation were used because they are generally considered as the best measures of a sample record on a particular measure (Best and James, 2004). The t-test was also used to test whether there was any statically significant difference happened in responses of teachers and principals. To this end, descriptions were made based on the results of the tables. The results that were obtained from the interviews and observation were used for the purpose of triangulation with quantitative data. Finally, the study analyzed and interpreted based on the item and the findings presented in summary, conclusion and recommendation way.

3.7 Ethical Consideration

Efforts were made to make the research process professional and ethical. To this end, the researcher has tried to clearly inform to the respondents about the purpose of the study i.e., purely for academic. As she introduced its purpose in the introduction part of the questionnaire and interview guide to the respondents, she confirmed that subjects, confidentiality will be protected. In addition, in the study was based on their consents. The researcher also did not personalize any of the response of the respondents during data presentations, analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, all the materials used for this research have been duly acknowledged.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter comprises two parts. In the first part the characteristics of sample population involved in the study are presented. Here the study groups are discussed in terms of sex, age, service years and academic qualification. The second part deals with the analysis and interpretation of data.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents'

Based on the sampling procedure described in chapter three, five elementary Schools were included in the study. The sample size of teachers has been slightly reduced for the following reasons. A total of 94 questionnaires were distributed to teachers. However, 14 of them didn't return it. And this reduces the sample size of teachers' to 80. Principals, Woreda education office heads and Supervisors were represented as planned.

Thus, the analysis was on the basis of information obtained from the returned questionnaires (100%) of principal and (85.11%) of teacher responses. Interview held with supervisor and woreda education office heads and observation in the school used as supplementary information.

As Table 1 shows below, the gender of respondents indicates that 65 % of teachers were males and 35 % of teachers were females. This indicates the majority of primary schools teachers are males. This revealed that the participation of females in teaching area still low compare with to education policy plan. In the same item, out of the total respondents of principals 75 % were male, 25% were females, and 100% the woredas education office heads and 100 % supervisors are males. These figure revealed that there is serious problem of female participation in all leadership level.

Regarding the age distribution, 6.25 % of teachers were between 21-30 years old, 70.0 % of teachers were between 31 and 40 years, 22.5 % of teachers were 41-50 years old, whereas the remaining 1.25% of teachers' age range from 51 and above years. In the same item, out of the total respondents of principals 10.0 % of principals were between 21-30 years old, 45.0 % of principals were between 31 and 40 years, 45.0 % of principals were 41-50 years old. The data showed equal percent so that, most of principals were adult. The supervisors are, however,

mainly over 30 years, which may be due to their long years of services in their previous positions as teachers and school principals.

Table one Respondent by sex, Age and qualification

No	Characteristics Sample School		Principals		Supervisors		Teachers	
			F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Sex	Male	15	75	5	100	52	65
		Female	5	25	-	-	28	35
		Total	20	100	5	100	80	100
2	Age	21-30 years	2	10.0	-	-	5	6.25
		31-40 years	9	45.0	5	100	56	70.0
		41-50 years	9	45.0	-	-	118	22.5
		51 and above years	-	-	-	-	1	1.25
		Total	20	100	5	100	80	100
3	Educational qualification	Diploma	-	-	-	-	35	43.75
		BA/BSC/BED Degree	16	80.0	5	100	42	52.5
		MA/MSC	4	20.0	-	-	3	3.75
		Total	20	100	5	100	80	100
		Field of specialization	Social science (EDPM)	11	55.0	4	80	31
4	Field of specialization	Natural science	9	45.0	1	20	49	61.2
		Total	20	100	5	100	80	100

Regarding the educational level of respondents, the data on the part of teachers reveal that majority of teachers 43.75% were diploma holders, 52.5% were bachelor degree holders and 3.75% were master's holders. It shows that primary schools are achieving the standard of education policy in the level of education of teachers. On the part of the principals 100% were bachelor degree holders. On the part of the supervisor 100% of them are bachelor degree holders. It may, therefore, be inferred that all of the principal's considerable number of supervisor are satisfy the standard set by MOE (1996:8) which requires at least Degree for principals and

supervisor. Thus, it would be possible to assume the placement of these principals was on proper educational background.

In terms of their field of study, the data on the part of teachers shows that 61.2% were from natural science 38.8% were from the social science fields. On the part of the supervisor 80% were from natural science 20% were from the social science fields. As regard to the principals (55.0%) was graduated in different social science, 45.0% natural science subject areas. As the data shows, majority of schools are not headed by professional principals or they were not graduate of Educational Planning and Management. The key element in school leaderships is the principals. Without well qualified principal, the goal of achieving high standard of educational plans will be threatened (Mc Ewen, E.K, 2003: 57).

Such representation of respondents from different levels of education and qualification will have its contribution to the study, i.e., teachers' representation from different levels and fields of specialization makes their assessment of principals ILP more reliable and unbiased. Besides, the supervisors level of education and areas of study (professional education) make their information more professional and comprehensive. The principals' distribution or representation from different level and specialization also help test whether these characteristics can contribute to principals' success in instructional leadership role.

Work Experience

A part from professional preparation, the selection and placement of principals commonly requires work experience on the job as well as on related tasks such as teaching, unit leader, department head and other responsibilities (MOE: 1996:7). This was so because of the belief that such experiences improve the competency as well as effectiveness of principals in their position.

The data in Table 2 below also states to this tendency. About 45.0% of principals have served 1 to 5 years in teaching and 45.0% principals have served 6 to 10 years the remaining 10.0% served for 11 to 15 years in teaching. Similarly, 73.3 % of principal have served as department head for 1 to 5 years, 13.75% principal have served 6-10 years,13.75 principal have served 11-15 years and 6.25% principal have served above 15 years. This indicates that the majority of principals experienced in department head.

Table Two Respondents by Work Experience

No	Characteristics		Principals		Supervisors		Teachers	
			F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Teaching	5 years and below	9	45.0	5	100	36	45.0
		6-10 years	9	45.0	-	-	26	32.5
		11-15 years	2	10.0	-	-	7	8.8
		16 years and above	-	-	-	-	11	13.8
		Total	20	100	5	100	80	100
2	Unit leader	5 years and below	-	-	-	-	-	-
		6-10	-	-	-	-	-	-
		11-15	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Above 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Department head	5 years and below	11	73.3	-	-	-	-
		6-10	2	13.75	-	-	-	-
		11-15	2	13.75	-	-	-	-
		Above 15 years	5	6.25	-	-	-	-
		Total	20	100	-	-	-	-
3	Principalship	3 years and below	2	10.0	-	-	-	-
		4-6	18	90.0	-	-	-	-
		7-9	-	-	-	-	-	-
		9 years and above	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	20	100	-	-	-	-
3	Supervisor	3 years and below	-	-	2	40	-	-
		4-6	-	-	3	60	-	-
		7-9	-	-	-	-	-	-
		10 years and above	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	-	-	5	100	-	-

In addition, about 10.0% of principals have served for 1 to 3 years and below in their present position (principal ship), 90.0% have served for 4 to 6 years in present position. This indicates that the majority of the principals experience in principal ship 4-6 years which may mean that principals did not stay in the position for long time.

However, consensus has not yet been reached about the contribution of such experiences to instructional leadership performance. Hollinger and Murphy (1987; 55) and Gross and Herriott (1985:74) can be mentioned in this vein in this book. Yet, MOE uses it as policy alternative in the appointment of leadership position. This debatable fact initiated the researcher to consider the relationship of such experiences and instructional leadership performance, which is treated.

As shown in Table 2, Teachers who have participated in assessing principals' instructional leadership performance were with different number of years of teaching experience and a considerable size of them were also department heads and unit leaders who have had close contact with instructional leadership activities. Thus, the information obtained from teachers will increase the reliability of the study. The wide range of experiences of most supervisors as teachers, principals and supervisor also help to get relevant information on the problem under study.

4.2. Factors of School Climate

As revealed in most instructional leadership studies organizational characteristics could influence the success of school principal. Based on this assumption some organizational factors such as the instructional resources are treated in this section. Therefore in this section it was discussed instructional leadership problem of principals associated with the availability of instructional six forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from more than adequate = 5 to rarely extent = 1 .

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, a two trisecting scores 2.49 and 3.49 were used in this study. The mean values of both sets of respondents were used to analyze the availability of instructional resources in schools. Thus, mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2.49 were inadequate where implies very serious problems, from 2:50 to 3:49 were adequate, it implies moderately serious problem, and from 3:50 to 5:00 were more than adequate it implies mild problem. Concerning t-test, at $\alpha=0.05$ (probability error) and degree of freedom (1.97) then,

the t-critical = 1.96. Thus if t-value is less than t=critical, then there is no significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents. But if t-value is greater than t-critical there is a significant difference between the respondents of these two groups of respondents. In the course of discussion of data: open ended items in the questionnaires, interviews and observations were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type: study.

Table Three Adequacy of instructional Resources

No	Items	Respondents				
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		t-value
		X	Std	X	Std	
1	The availability of qualified teachers	4.09	0.715	4.30	0.571	-1.233
2	The availability of student text books	4.14	0.896	3.90	0.718	1.099
3	The availability of teachers guide	3.88	1.095	4.00	0.795	0.479
4	The availability of reference books	3.98	0.954	4.55	0.510	-2.596
5	The availability of blackboards	4.30	0.701	4.65	0.489	-2.601
6	The availability of chalk	3.90	1.05	4.35	0.79	-3.37
7	The availability of paper	4.30	0.960	4.45	0.826	-0.641
8	The availability of pens	4.15	1.045	4.35	0.813	-0.797
9	The availability of markers	4.10	0.936	3.90	0.788	-880

As depicted in item 1 of Table 3, the availability of qualified teacher for all school subjects, the calculated mean score of teacher was 4.09 and principals score was 4.30. This indicates that the availability of qualified teachers was highly rated. That is the score revealed enough qualified teachers were found in primary schools and it is not serious instructional leadership problem of principal in Addis Ababa. This shows us the requirement of qualification for primary school teachers were practical in the city. That is according to MOE the qualification of primary schools teachers should be diploma and BA/Bed. The t-value (-1.233) of item 1 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 2 of Table 3 the availability of student text book in the school, the mean score of teachers was 4.14 and principals score was 3.90. The score indicated that there were adequate numbers of student text books (one to one) in the school. Thus it is not considered as a problem at all for principals in their instructional leadership activities. Responses from interview with supervisors and woreda education office heads also approve the availability of adequate number of text books in the school. The t-value (1.099) of item 2 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is not statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 3 of Table 3 the mean score of teachers and principals for the availability of teachers guide in the school were 3.88 and 2.76 respectively, these scores indicated that teacher's guide in the school is not sufficient. Similarly interview responses with supervisors and woreda heads on this clearly indicated that there was lack of teachers guide for most subjects.' They admitted the scarcity of teachers guide in most subjects. The t-value (-0.479) of item 3 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

According to Shukla (1983) all facilities available in the school library, laboratory and audio visual unit of the school should be given a special attention by principal because they are the sources from which teacher can draw help in the form of reading and teaching materials. Based upon this assumption respondents asked to rate item 4 indicated in Table 3. Thus, mean score of teachers and principals were 3.98 and 4.55 respectively. Most of the observation also indicated that there was lack of reference books in the library. The t-value (-2.596) of item 4 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

Concerning the availability of black boards in class rooms the mean revealed in item 5 of Table 3 of teacher was 4.30 and principal's score was 4.65. This indicates that the availability of supplies such as blackboards was highly rated. Thus the scores revealed that supplies such as blackboards were found adequately in the school. This idea was approved by observation sessions. The t-value (-2.601) of item 5 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

Concerning the availability of chalk for teachers the mean revealed in item 6 of Table 3 of teacher was 4.30 and principal's score was 4.45. This indicates that the availability of chalk was highly rated. Thus the scores revealed that chalk were found adequately in the school. The t-value (0.641) of item 6 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

Concerning the availability of paper which teachers using for educational purpose the mean revealed in item 7 of Table 3 of teacher was 4.15 and principal's score was 4.35. This indicates that the availability of paper was highly rated. Thus the scores revealed that paper were found adequately in the school. The t-value (0.797) of item 7 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

Concerning the availability of pens for teachers the mean revealed in item 8 of Table 3 of teacher was 4.10 and principal's score was 3.90. This indicates that the availability of paper was highly rated. Thus the scores revealed that pen were found adequately in the school. The t-value (0.880) of item 8 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

Concerning the availability of markers for teachers the mean revealed in item 9 of Table 3 of teacher was 3.03 and principal's score was 4.70. This indicates that the availability of paper was highly rated. Thus the scores revealed that paper were found adequately in the school. The t-value (-5.684) of item 9 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents. Similarly the same idea was reflected when interview held with supervisors and woreda heads. The t-value (0.12) of item 5 depicted in Table 3 is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents. It is obvious that without educational material inputs it is difficult to achieve the main goal of an organization.

4.3 Role Diversity

The principal is the most visible and directly accessible representative of the school management. Moreover, the school leadership retains ultimate accountability for the overall operation of the school, most studies on instructional leadership revealed that the main function of principal as a

leader is making effective teaching and learning. He/she also expected to perform managerial responsibility as well. Based on this assumption principals emphasis on the instructional leadership and administrative activities was treated in this section to examine the time devoted to instructional matters. Three forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from strongly agree = 5 strongly disagree = 1.

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, the mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2.49 were disagreed, from 2:50 to 3:49 were agreed and from 3:50 to 5:00 were strongly agreed. In the course of discussion of data open ended items in the questionnaires, interviews and observations were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type.

Table Four Principals’ Role Diversity and Its influence an Instructional Leadership Performance

No	Items	Respondents				
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		t-value
		X	Std	X	Std	
1	Principals spending much of time an academic activities	4.24	0.830	4.55	0.510	-1.605
2	Principal spending much of his/her time in administrative activities	4.11	0.779	4.05	0.759	0.322
3	The dimension of roles (work load) in your school constrains instructional leadership	3.80	0.960	4.40	0.503	-2.697

As depicted in item 1 of Table 4, the calculated mean score of teacher was 4.24 while principal’s score was 4.55. This score revealed that principal spend much time in academic activities. This may indicate that they paid high attention to academic activities which are their major duties. As depicted in item 1 of Table 4, the t-value was -1.605. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As depicted in item 2 of Table 4, the calculated mean score of teacher was 4.11 while principal’s score was 4.05. This score revealed that principal spend more of his time in administrative

activities. Similarly, the interviews with supervisors woreda heads and focus group discussion with teachers approves that principals spend more of their time on administrative activities. As depicted in item 2 of Table 4, the t-value was 0.322. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This showthat there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As depicted in item 3 of Table 4, the calculated mean score of teacher was 3.8 while principal's score was 4.40. This score revealed that the diversity roles highly constrain the leadership activity of principals in primary schools of Addis Ababa. Interview held with supervisors clearly indicated that administrative assignments other than the official instructional roles were seriously constraining their leadership activities. Teachers had also greatly support supervisors views during FGDS, and they said that we observe that most of the time they spend in doing administrative activities. Woreda heads during interview reflected that the administrative assignments given to principals were one of their duties to accomplish. They added that it is unacceptable to consider the administrative assignments as a burden for principals. As depicted in item 3 of Table 4, the t-value was -2.697. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

4.4. Professional Norm

This section discusses leadership problem of principals related with professional norm in the school. Five forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from very high =5 very low = 1.

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, the mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2:49 were serious problems, from 2:50 to 3:49 were moderate problem and from 3:50 to 5:00 were mild problem. In the course of discussion of data open ended items in the questionnaires, interviews and FGDS were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type.

As the data in Table 5 below of item 1 revealed that the mean score of teachers was 4.10 while the mean score of principals was 4.45. These mean values indicated that there were a highly teachers domination in educational decisions. This indicated that teacher's domination in

educational decisions was not a problem of principals. Responses from principals and woreda education office heads during the interviews indicate that there is participation of teachers in educational decision but not that much seriously decision dominated by them.

Table Five Views on professional norm

No	Items	Respondents				t-value
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		
		X	Std	X	Std	
1	The extent of Teachers participation in educational decisions	4.10	0.880	4.45	0.510	-1.704
2	The level of Principals' involvement in educational decisions	4.06	1.023	4.15	0.813	0.355
3	The extent to which Principals' take initiative in consulting teachers about instructional matters	3.89	0.955	3.95	0.887	0.265
4	The frequency of principals' classroom visit	3.78	1.067	3.85	0.875	0.299

Similarly teachers in FGD session had also reflected that they participated in educational decisions but most of the time decisions were dominated by principals. As depicted in item 1 of Table 5, the t-value was -1.704. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents. Monahan and Hengst (1982) stated that, the principal is a key person to pass decisions on important instructional issues.

As depicted in item 2 of Table 5 the mean value of teachers was 4.06 while the mean value of department heads was 4.15. These mean scores revealed that principals dominantly involved in educational decisions. Teachers in the discussion clearly indicated that there were dominations of principals during educational decisions. However principals and woreda education office heads rejected teachers view during interview sessions. They reflected that principals were participate teachers during educational decisions. As depicted in item 2 of Table 5, the t-value was 0.355. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As revealed in item 3 of Table 5 the mean value of teachers was 3.89 while the mean value of principals was 3.95. These mean scores indicated principals initiative in consulting teachers about

instructional matters were moderate. Teachers in FGD session clearly reflected that principals' initiative in consulting teachers about instructional matters was very low. However supervisors didn't accept teachers' idea that their initiative in consulting teachers was very low, rather principals' consider themselves as if they had very high initiative in consulting teachers about instructional matters. Responses of woreda education office head during interview reflected that principals' initiative in consulting teachers about instructional matter was moderate. As depicted in item 3 of Table 5, the t-value was 0.265. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

According to Fullan (2007:360), a good principal spends more time in classrooms and listen to teachers. Taking this assumption into account respondents asked to rate the level of principals initiative for frequent classroom visit.

As indicated in Table 5 of item 4 the mean score of teachers and principals for the question principals' initiative for frequent classroom visit were 3.78 and 3.85 respectively. As can be observed from these scores, teachers' responds moderate agreement while principal respond highly agreement for principal initiative for frequent classroom visit. These group of respondent differed on the level of agreement stated in the item. Since the views of teachers supported by principals and woreda education office heads it is quite meaningful to take the views of teachers. Therefore, these mean scores indicated that principals' initiative for frequent classroom visit was moderate. Teachers in FGDS sessions clearly reflected that there was no frequent classroom observation by principals but they conduct classroom visits to evaluate the semester performance appraisal of teachers. Supervisors' woreda education office heads during interview admitted that, because of work load, principals didn't made frequent classroom visits. As depicted in item 4 of Table 5, the t-value was 0.299. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no a statistical difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents. These respondents reflected different views regarding principals' initiative for frequent classroom visits. This might be due to different position they held in the school structure.

4.5. Sub city /Woreda Education Office Responses

This section was discussed with educational leadership problem of principals associated with sub city/woreda education office (WEO). To identify major problems of elementary school principals

that originated from WEO, Ten forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from strongly agree = 5 to strongly disagree = 1.

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, the mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2.49 were lowly constraining, from 2:50 to 3:49 were moderately constraining and from 3:50 to 5:00 were seriously constraining. In the course of discussion of data open ended items in the questionnaires, interviews and FGDs were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type.

Table Six Elements constraining instructional leadership

No	Items	Respondents				
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		t- value
		X	Std	X	Std	
1	Higher officials place emphasis on instructional activities.	3.51	0.955	3.75	0.910	-1.004
2	Woredas emphasize rules and regulations.	3.51	1.067	3.60	1.273	0.315
3	There is problem of Untimely transfer of teachers.	3.59	0.977	4.10	0.968	-2.102
4	Educational offices require numerous reports.	3.96	0.999	4.05	0.826	0.362
5	Educational offices delay replacement or deployments of teachers.	3.73	1.079	3.75	1.118	0.092
6	There is problem of timely delivery of teaching materials.	3.60	1.154	3.80	0.768	0.734
7	There is timely supervisor support from sub city education office.	3.44	1.241	3.90	0.788	-1.585
8	There are clear guidelines for performance appraisal of principals	3.54	1.067	4.05	0.826	-2.001
9	There is problem of interference of WEO in the functions of principals.	3.43	1.028	4.05	0.826	-2.519
10	There is a practice of frequent reshuffling of principals by WEO	3.43	1.199	4.25	0.639	-2.966

As indicated in item 1 of Table 6, the calculated mean score of teachers was 3.51 and principals score was 3.75. This indicates that instructional activities were given moderate emphasis by higher officials. Supervisors during interview made clear the higher officials give more attention

for administrative activities than instructional activities. However, these views from supervisors were rejected by woreda education office heads; they noted that we give a great emphasis for instructional activities. Majority of teachers who participated in FGDs reflected that higher officials place fewer emphases for instructional activities. As depicted in item 1 of Table 6, the t-value was -1.004. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As revealed in item 2 of Table 6, the calculated mean score of teacher was 3.51 while principal's score was 3.60. This revealed that sub city/ woreda rules and regulations of principals. During open ended questionnaires reflected that rules and regulation that originate from sub city/woreda education office were one of the main problems in their leadership activities. Teachers in FGDs support principals view, However WEO heads rejected the view of principals and teachers; rather they consider rules and regulations help to smooth teaching learning process. As depicted in item 2 of Table 6, the t-value was 0.315. This indicated that t-value is less than t critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 3 of Table 6 respondents were asked to rate the extent that, the effect of untimely teacher transfer on instructional leadership activity of principals, and the calculated mean score of teacher was 3.59 and principals score was 4.10. This indicates untimely teacher transfer that took place by sub city education office were moderately constraining instructional leadership. The interview held with supervisors and WEO heads also admitted this result. They also clearly reflected that was occasionally untimely teacher transfer, but not that much a serious problem in the elementary schools at present. As depicted in item 3 of Table 6, the t-value was -2.102. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As depicted on item 4 Table 6 teachers, principals on this question had a mean score of 3.96 and 4.05 respectively, it can understood from these scores numerous reporting requirements were seriously constraining instructional leadership activates of principals. Principals during open ended questions clearly indicated that numerous reporting requirements by woreda education office were affecting by their day to day instructional leadership activities. The interview responses from woreda education office heads on this were different from principals. They said

that a different reporting requirement from principals help sub city education office to know what is going on in the school. A combination of all the data gave us numerous reporting requirements by woreda education office were one of serious problems of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 4 Table 6, the t-value was 0.362. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As depicted in item 5 of Table 6, the calculated mean score of teacher was 3.73 while principal's score was 3.75. This indicates delay substitute or deployment of teachers that took place by sub city education office were moderately constraining factor of instructional leadership. The interview held with supervisors' worda education office heads also admitted this result. They also clearly mentioned that sometimes there were delay substitutes of teachers. Teachers in the discussion had also reflected similar views. A combination of all the data gave us delay substitute or deployment of teachers by sub city education office were moderate problem of principals in their leadership activities. As depicted in item 5 of Table 6, the t-value was 0.09. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 6 of Table 6 the calculated mean score of teachers was 3.60, and principal's score was 3.80. This indicates teaching materials delivery problems by woreda education office were moderately constraining factor. Principals during open ended question clearly indicated that very few teaching materials delivered from sub city education office; schools mostly fulfilled teaching materials such as stationary materials and reference books, from school grant and Community participation. Responses of worda education office heads on this were not different from principals. They admitted that since the allocated budgets to their office was very low; they couldn't support schools by delivering teaching materials based on their needs. A teacher in FGDs has also reflected similar views. As depicted in item 6 of Table 6, the t-value was 0.73. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

According to Ukejo (1992:185), supervision is the element of administrative process concerned with the effort of administrator to guide the day to day operation of the organization; by stimulating, directing and coordinating the workers and their efforts, and culturing good working

personal relations so that all move collectively towards a more efficient performance of all function that lead to goal achievement. Taking this concept into account, respondents were asked to level the extent of lack of supervisory support given by sub city /woreda education office constraining instructional leadership.

As revealed in item 7 of Table 6 the mean value of teacher was 3.44 while the mean value of principals was 3.90 these mean scores indicated that lack of regular supervisory support from sub city/woreda education office was moderately constraining school leadership. Responses from interview with supervisors reflected that woreda education offices try to give supervisory support to elementary schools, but because of lack of knowledge of supervision, the assigned supervisors failed to support principals. Principals added that they were not benefited from supervisor support. The interview responses from woreda education office heads on this were different from principals. They reflected that we gave regular supervisory support for all schools and principals, and they were benefited from it. Teachers in the discussion reflected that supervisory support from sub city/woreda education office was not at encouraging level because the assigned supervisor from sub city education office lacks knowledge of supervision. As depicted in item 7 of Table 6, the t-value was -2.52. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents. It is difficult be viewed as competent and reliable if you have role ambiguity and are unsure what you are expected to do, you may be working very hard but doing the wrong things or doing things the wrong way (Yukl, 2006:136). Considering this assumption respondents asked to rate the extent that absence of clear guidelines for performance appraisal of principals affect instructional leadership.

As revealed in item 8 of Table 6 the mean value of teachers was 3.54 while the mean value of principals was 4.05. These mean scores indicated absence of clear guidelines for performance appraisal of principal were very serious problem that hinder instructional leadership performance of principals. Responses from open ended question with principals' indicated that there were no clear guide lines placed into action to evaluate their performance. Woreda education office heads during interview also admitted that there were no clear guidelines for performance appraisal of principals to evaluate their performance. Sub city education office head added that most of the time we did performance appraisal for principals by compromising the point of evaluation with

principals. As depicted in item 8 of Table 6, the t-value was -2.00. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As depicted in item 9 of Table 6, the calculated mean score of teacher was 3.43 while principal's score was 4.05. These mean score indicated that there was noticeable unwise interference from woreda education office officials in the functions of principals. Responses from principals during the open ended question clearly indicated that there were unwise interferences by the woreda education office heads in their functions. Teachers in the discussion had also approved principals' view. Response from woreda education office heads during interview rejected principals' and teachers views. They noted that we didn't interfere in principal works rather we support them. As depicted in item 9 of Table 6, the t-value was -2.52. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As depicted in item 10 of Table 6 the mean value of teachers was 3.43 while the mean value of principals was 4.25. These mean scores indicated that frequent reshuffling of principals by sub city/woreda education office was a highly constraining factor of instructional leadership. Responses from supervisors and woreda education office heads during the interviews reflected that reshuffling of principals are observed frequently.

Similarly Teachers in FGD session had also reflected that there was highly reshuffling of principals and it is serious problem at present. As depicted in item 10 of Table 6, the t-value was -2.96. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

4.6 Communicating School Goals

This section was discussed with principals instructional leadership role associated with communicating school goals. Four forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from strongly agree = 5 to strongly disagree = 1.

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, the mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2.49 were mild problem, from 2:50 to 3:49 were moderate problem and from 3:50 to 5:00 were very highly serious problem. In the course of discussion of data open ended items in

the questionnaires, interviews and FGDs were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type.

Table Seven Views on communicating school goals

No	Items	Respondents				
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		t- value
		X	Std	x	Std	
1	Principals develop a set of annual school goals focused on student learning	4.28	0.900	4.15	0.745	0.573
2	Principals use data on student academic Performance when developing the school's goals	4.06	1.023	4.20	1.056	0.534
3	Principals communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, students and parents.	4.11	0.900	3.95	1.146	0.682

Item 1 of Table 7 indicates that teachers mean score was 4.28 while principals mean score was 4.15. These values from both sets of respondents revealed that school annual goal not focus students learning. A large majority of teachers in the FGD session clearly reflected that annual school goal must be focused students learning was bench market for the achievement of instructional goal. Responses of principals and woreda education heads also forward teachers views. They noted that without focus on student learning it was difficult to achieve the required instructional goal. These data from all instruments imply that Annual school goal not focus student learning were very serious problem of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 1 of Table 7, the t-value was 0.57. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in Table 7 of item 2, respondents were requested to what extent principals use data on student academic performance when developing the school goals. Calculated mean scores of response of teacher and principals were found to be 4.06 and 4.20 respectively. These mean values indicated that there were school principals didn't consider the previous student academic performance. Teachers in the discussion head also reflected that they didn't consider student academic performance. These data from all instruments imply that principals do not use data on student academic performances were very serious problem of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 2 of Table 7, the t-value was 0.53. This indicated that t-

value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

When collaboration is characterized by open communication, mutually agreed upon goals and joint discussion making education becomes shared responsibilities (Fullan, 2007:136). Taking into account as indicated in item 3 of table 7, the respondents were requested to rate what extent principals communicate the school goals effectively to staff, students and parents. Accordingly the calculated mean score of teacher was 4.11 while principal's score was 3.95. This finding might reflect lack of communication the school goal effectively was very highly serious problem. Majority of teachers who participated in FGDs made clear that principals were not open to teachers. They added that, their door is not open for discussion with teachers. However these views from FGDs participants were rejected by supervisors during interview supervisors indicated that the doors of principals were not closed for communication and also there was staff meeting monthly that would be released for free discussion. As depicted in item 3 of Table 7, the t-value was 0.68. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

4.7 Managing Curriculum and Instruction

This section was discussed with principals instructional leadership role associated with Managing curriculum and instruction. Four forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from strongly agree =5 to strongly disagree =1.

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, the mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2.49 were mild problem, from 2:50 to 3:49 were moderate problem and from 3:50 to 5:00 were very highly serious problem. In the course of discussion of data open ended items in the questionnaires, interviews and FGDs were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type.

Table Eight Views on Managing curriculum and instruction

No	Items	Respondents				
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		t- value
		x	Std	X	Std	
1	The school principals monitor the classroom curriculum	3.94	0.959	4.35	0.745	-1.790
2	The school principals help teachers to evaluate curriculum	3.74	1.209	4.20	0.834	-1.614
3	The school principals assist teacher in lesson planning	3.99	1.013	4.40	0.754	-1.705
4	The principals assist teachers in developing instructional materials	3.91	0.957	4.55	0.510	-2.871

Item 1 of Table 8 indicates that teachers mean score was 3.94 while principals mean score was 4.35. These values from both sets of respondents revealed that lack of school principals monitor the classroom curriculum. A large majority of teachers in the FGD session clearly reflected that the school principals lack of monitor the classroom curriculum for the achievement of instructional goal. Responses of principals and woreda education heads also forward teachers views. They noted that limited concern for monitoring the classroom curriculum activities have been criticized for wastage of instructional time and teachers leave classes for various reasons therefore, it was difficult to achieve the required instructional goal. These data from all instruments imply that the school principals monitor the classroom curriculum were very serious problem of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 1 of Table 8, the t-value was -1.79. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in Table 8 of item 2, respondents were requested to what extent the school principal helps teachers to evaluate curriculum. Calculated mean scores of response of teacher was 3.74 and principals was 4.20. These mean values indicated that there were the school principal helps teachers to evaluate curriculum. Teachers in the discussion head also reflected that they didn't support the school principal evaluate curriculum. These data from all instruments imply that principals didn't support teachers to evaluate curriculum were very serious problem of principals

in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 2 of Table 8, the t-value was 1.61. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 3 of table 8, the respondents were requested to rate what extent the school principals assist teacher in lesson planning. Accordingly the calculated mean score of teacher was 3.99 while principal's score was 4.40. This finding might reflect lack of assist teacher in lesson planning was very highly serious problem. Majority of teachers who participated in FGDs made clear that principals were not assist teacher. As depicted in item 3 of Table 8, the t-value was -1.70. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 4 of Table 8, the mean value of teachers was 3.91 while mean value of principals was 4.55. These mean values indicated that the principal assists teachers in developing instructional materials were moderate problem. Teachers in the discussion indicated that there was an attempt of principal assists teachers in developing instructional materials, but it was not satisfactory. Woreda heads and supervisors admitted teachers' views. They noted that most principal were not encourage teachers in developing instructional materials but at present principal assists teachers in developing instructional materials was at much improving condition. A combination of all the data gave us, principal assists teachers in developing instructional materials was at encouraging conditions. As depicted in item 4 of Table 8, the t-value was -2.87. This indicated that t-value is less than t critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

4.8 Monitoring students' Progress

This section was discussed with principals instructional leadership role associated with monitoring students' progress. Four forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from strongly agree =5 to strongly disagree=1.

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, the mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2.49 were mild problem, from 2:50 to 3:49 were moderate problem and from 3:50 to 5:00 were very highly serious problem. In the course of discussion of data open ended items in

the questionnaires, interviews and FGDs were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type.

Table Nine Views on monitoring students’ progress

No	Items	Respondents				
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		t-value
		X	Std	X	Std	
1	Principals meet individually with teachers to discuss students’ academic progress.	3.79	1.040	4.60	0.598	-3.351
2	Principals use test results to assess progress towards school goals	4.08	0.991	4.60	0.503	-2.291
3	Principals inform the school’s performance results to teachers in a report form	4.31	0.836	4.60	0.821	-1.470

Item 1 of Table 9 indicates that teachers mean score was 3.79 while principals mean score was 4.60. These values from both sets of respondents revealed that the not open to teachers to discuss students’ academic progress. Majority of teachers who participated in FGDs made clear that principals were not open to teachers. They added that, their door is not open for discussion with teachers. These data from all instruments imply that Principals not open for discussion with teachers were very serious problem of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 1 of Table 9, the t-value was -3.35. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in Table 9 of item 2, respondents were requested to what extent Principals use test results to assess progress towards school goals. Calculated mean scores of response of teacher and principals were found to be 4.08 sand 4.60 respectively. These mean values indicated that there were school principals didn’t consider the test results to assess progress. Teachers in the discussion head also reflected that they didn’t consider test results to assess progress. These data from all instruments imply that principals do not use test results to assess progress were very serious problem of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 2 of Table 9, the t-value was -2.29. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 3 of Table 9, the mean value of teachers was 4.31 while mean value of principals was 4.60. These mean values indicated that Principals inform the school's performance results to teachers in a report form was moderate problem. Teachers in the discussion indicated that there was an attempt of performance results, but it was not satisfactory woreda heads and supervisors admitted teachers' views. They noted that most principal were not volunteer Inform performance results but at present at much improving condition. A combination of all the data gave us, Inform the school's performance results to teachers in a report form was at encouraging conditions. As depicted in item 3 of Table 9, the t-value was -1.47. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

4.9 Evaluating Teachers

This section was discussed with principals instructional leadership role associated with Evaluating Teachers. Four forecasted factors were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on a five point likert scale from strongly agree = 5 to strongly disagree = 1.

In order to make the data analysis convenient and manageable, the mean values were interpreted as: 1:00 to 2.49 were mild problem, from 2:50 to 3:49 were moderate problem and from 3:50 to 5:00 were very highly serious problem. In the course of discussion of data open ended items in the questionnaires, interviews and FGDs were summarized and used to support the finding from Likert scales type.

Table Ten Views on Evaluating Teachers

No	Items	Respondents				t-value
		Teachers N =80		Principals N =20		
		X	Std	X	Std	
1	The school principals evaluate the performance of teachers.	4.10	0.821	4.65	0.489	-2.866
2	The school principals use evaluation as a means for teacher's improvement.	3.95	0.899	4.60	0.503	-3.108
3	The school principals use more than one source in evaluating teachers.	3.71	1.138	4.60	0.503	-3.108

Item 1 of Table 10 indicates that teachers mean score was 4.10 while principals mean score was 4.65. These values from both sets of respondents revealed that the school principals evaluate the performance of teachers was moderate problem. A large majority of teachers in the FGD session clearly reflected that the school principals evaluate the performance of teachers twice a year. Responses of principals and sub city education heads also forward teachers views. These data from all instruments imply that the school principals evaluate the performance of teachers was moderate problem of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 1 of Table 10, the t-value was -2.86. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in Table 10 of item 2, respondents were requested to what extent the school principals use evaluation as a means for teacher's improvement. Calculated mean scores of response of teacher and principals were found to be 3.95 and 4.60 respectively. These mean values indicated that there was the school principals use evaluation as a means for teacher's improvement was moderate problem. Teachers in the discussion head also reflected that school principals use evaluation as a means for career structure not teacher's improvement. These data from all instruments imply that the school principals use evaluation as a means for teacher's improvement was moderate problem of principals in their instructional leadership activities. As depicted in item 2 of Table 10, the t-value was -3.11. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

As indicated in item 3 of Table 10, the mean value of teachers was 3.71 while mean value of principals was 4.60. These mean values indicated that the school principals use more than one source in evaluating teachers was moderate problem. As depicted in item 3 of Table 10, the t-value was -3.11. This indicated that t-value is less than t-critical (1.96). This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups of respondents.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

5.1 Summary

The main purpose of this study was to assess the current status of instructional leadership performance and investigate some of the factors that affect its provision in primary school principals.

In order to achieve the purpose of this study, the following questions were raised:

1. What does the relationship between principals' personal characteristics (age, work experience and field of study) and instructional leadership performance?
2. To what extent do school principals perform the dimensions of instructional leadership role in governmental primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub-city?
3. What are the challenges principals have faced in playing their Instructional leadership role in governmental primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo sub-city of Addis Ababa?

From the analysis made in chapter 4 the following major finding are summarized as follows:

With regarding to the characteristics of the respondents, it has been found that there was no female participant in both supervisor and woreda education office head leadership levels, only 25% of females participated in principal position. In the teaching position, still female participation seems low (35%) as compared to male (65%)

In terms of qualification 100% of the principals were first degree holders and there were no principals who trained in Educational Planning and Management. On the other hand concerning principals' years of experience, 10.0% of the school principals served only five and bellow five years as school principals.

Concerning principals emphasis on administrative and instructional leadership activities, in the study it was found that much of principals' time is allocated to administrative works which could

show the tendency of principals to engage themselves on activities that are not directly related teaching learning process.

The study revealed that, the availability of instructional resource such as teachers guide, reference book in the library, operative funds found to be inadequate in the schools.

Whereas resource as to qualified teachers, student text books, paper, chalks were found to be more than adequate in the school.

In the study some factors of WEO/ sub city education office characteristics were found to be very seriously constraining the instructional leadership role. These were numerous reporting requirements, absence of clear guidelines, and unwise interference of woreda education office in the instructional function of leadership. Other factors such as higher officials place emphasis on instructional activities, WEO/ sub city education office rules and regulations, untimely teachers transfer, delay substitute of deployment of teachers, teaching material delivery problems, lack of supervisory support from WEO/ sub city education office and frequent reshuffling of principals by WEO/ sub city education office were found to be moderately constraining instructional leadership role.

The study revealed that there were moderate teachers' involvements in making educational decisions, but there were highly principals' domination in instructional decisions. In addition to this it was also found that principals' initiative in consulting teachers about instructional matter, principals' initiative for frequent classroom visit and principals' constructive comments and suggestions in instructional matter was moderate.

In the study concerning principals communicating school goals were found to be very seriously problems of principals in their instructional leadership role. These were annual school goals not focused student learning, lack of communication the school goal effectively for school community. On the other hand respondent indicate principals' displays school's goals in the schools were found to be moderate problem of principals' instructional leadership role. The study revealed that there were moderate principals managing curriculum and instruction, but there were highly principals' domination in instructional decisions. In addition to this it was also found that principals' initiative in support teachers about develop instructional materials, lesson plan evaluation and principals' initiative for monitor classroom curriculum in instructional matter was moderate.

5.2 Conclusion

According to the finding of the study the following conclusion are drawn.

- Possessing adequate knowledge and skills of educational leadership has a greater power for principals to lead schools. The Ministry of Education manual stated about developing professionalization of educational administration. However, from the data we can infer that, majority of principals did not have the effectiveness of instructional leadership they provide;
- The study revealed that principals' lack of leadership experience as school principals. Lacking longer years of service in different leadership activities, may create complication and obstacles in their effectiveness. Experienced principals create a more conducive environment than inexperienced ones to the teaching learning process. Such environment increase teacher commitment, participation and sense of ownership.
- The study indicated that the focus of the principals in their leadership activities were not in academic activities, as much of their time was spent on administrative tasks. This could be resulted from heavy work load carried on by the principals, lack of supportive staff and inability to delegate tasks to teachers and department heads;
- The study revealed that most principals have given moderate attention to this part of their role. As a result, instructional leadership is not provided strongly by most school principals. Moreover, the majority of principals did not also perform effectively in each instructional leadership dimension. They were assigned the post without having Educational Planning and Management skills.
- In the hope of shading light on practical problems of instructional leadership provision in primary school of Addis Ababa city administration, the study attempted to find the correlates and factors affecting the performance of principals in this role. Accordingly, it has been found that some personal characteristics failed to discriminate significantly among principals as to their ILP, among these are age, teaching experience, experience as a unit leader, qualification and position attainment condition. The findings did reveal, however, that three personal characteristics greater quality of credit hours (courses) in education fields, experience in principals and greater experience as a department head, may have some predictive value in selecting principals who promise effectiveness in providing instructional leadership. Thus, the

cause for incapability of most principals to provide leadership strongly may be attributed to their lack of the three personal characteristics.

- Besides personal characteristics such as instructional leadership performance has been found subject to organizational and sub-city /woreda education department administrative characteristics of the organizational factors, greater availability of instructional resources, a professional norm that gives high value to the involvement of principals in curricular and instructional matters, and greater number of teachers in a school have contributed positively and significantly to the success of a principal in his/her instructional leadership role.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion reached the following possible solutions are recommended.

- This study has shown that the majority of school principals did not have previous knowledge and skills in educational leadership (EDPM). It is important for the Addis Ababa city Administration Education Bureau in collaboration with Addis Ababa city Administration Civil Service Bureau to give special attention in the implementation of professionalization of educational leadership by providing training to principals in the field of Edpm by preparing a plan of action and work it in collaboration with educational institutions;
- Modern school principal requires intense study and understanding in the field of educational leadership. And this has to start with introducing principals with appropriate instructional leadership role behaviors and skills. In doing so, Addis Ababa city Administration Education Bureau in collaboration with Sub city and Woreda education department needs to define the principals instructional duties in terms of the five dimensions: defining the school goal, managing curriculum and instruction, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress, and promoting the school learning climate as well as providing long and short term training climate as well as to equip them with appropriate knowledge and skill in the area.
- Experience gets the lines share behind principals' instructional leadership success stories. Assigning professional with longer experience in instructional leadership positions may help to reduce the problems observed in instructional leadership. Therefore principals should be appointed on the bases of experience and merit. Thus

- the Addis Ababa city administration Education Bureau in collaboration with Addis Ababa city administration civil service Bureau need to make wider study and revise the criteria used for selecting and appointing primary school principals and serious consideration should be given for field of study and work experience.
- Despite some inconsistency of the findings with those of other studies, some of personal characteristics associated with instructional leadership performance have been deemed as having little empirical justification to contribute to leadership performance in this study. The characteristics identified to contribute significantly and positively are greater experience as department head, greater experience as a unit leader and great number of courses taken in education fields. Although the findings tend to give greater weight to the above three personal characteristics in the selection and appointment of school principals, the smallness of sample size and the study unfair to give less value to other personal characteristics to serve as selection and assignment criteria.
- Without the necessary instructional materials, much progress could not be made by the principals in the teaching learning process. Therefore, in order to promote the quality of instruction, adequate provision of instructional materials for getting the work needs due attention by both the sub city and woreda education office. On the other hand education demands huge amount of investment/budget/ to accomplish its purpose. To solve budget deficit of school; government, non-government institutions and the community at large should work together to bring more resources and help schools to generate their income.
- It is hardly possible for principals to be engaged frequently in instructional leadership activities unless their involvement gets recognition and reward from both teachers and higher officials. To this end, the professional norm that limits the involvement of principals in instructional matters should be improved. One means to attain this, developing principals' skills and knowledge in instructional leadership areas so that they can be influential and confident to suggest solutions for the instructional problems. In line with this the strategies in the selection of principals should take into consideration the higher level of educational attainment of school principals. Providing seminars, workshops or formulating policies on the improvement of teacher principals work relationships could be the other alternative. Above all principals also need to create strong professional relationships with and among teachers through prolonged efforts

- Moreover, higher officials should give greater emphasis to instructional leadership part of principals' role. This could be attained by working closely with school principals on instructional aspects and by giving greater value to it in the appraisal of principals' performance and promotions. The administrative support from sub city or woreda education department should also give great emphasis to the activities that have great influence on the instructional leadership role of principals. This could be attained by providing the necessary budget and supplies adequately on time and making the transfer and deployment of teachers before the opening or after the closing of schools. As the study has indicated, principals' engagement in instructional leadership is highly constrained by role diversity they faced.
- Thus, Addis Ababa city administration Education Bureau with sub city and Woreda education office department needs to minimize the burden of roles by assigning additional administrative personnel. Finally, the researcher having identified the needs, recommends further researcher in the area with broader scope and depth including other variables like principals attitude to their profession, sex and staff morale.

Reference

- Ayalew, Shibeshi. (2000). Theories of Educational management (EDAD 611). Addis Ababa University.(unpublished teaching material).
- Best, J. W. and James, N.K (2004). Research in Education. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Best,Johan W and James. V. Kahan (1989) Research in Education. New Jersey. Prentice Hall. Inc.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). How Academic Leadership works, understanding Success and Failures in the collage presidency. San Francisco: Josser Bass Inc.
- Bishaw Tesema (1975)”The Secondary School Principalship in Ethiopia.” (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Blasé, j and Blasé J. (1998). Hand book of instructional leadership; how really good principals promote teaching and learning. Thousand oaks’. CA: Crown press.
- Bookbinder, R. (2001). The principals’ Leadership for the effective and productive schools. Springfield: IL Hares, Thomas publisher.
- Bossert, S.T.et al. 1992 “The Instructional Management Role of the principal. “Educational Administration Quarterly. Vole.18, No.3, pp.34 – 65.
- Brundrett, M.et al.(2003). Leadership in education. London: SAGE publication.
- Brundrette,et al. (2003). Leadership in Education. New Delhi: Sage publication.
- Bush, and Bell (2003). The principles and practice of educational management. London: Pall-Chapman publishing.
- Chris ,P. J. (1992). Purposeful structuring creating a culture for learning and achievement in elementary schools. Washington D.C : Palmer press
- Dawit Legesse (PhD(1918) Principals’ Instructional Leadership Performance in Hawassa City Administration Secondary Schools, Ethiopia.
- Dimmock, Clive.(2000)and 2002:3) . Designing the learning centered schools. London: Palmer press.
- Fink, E. and Resnick, L.B (2001). Developing Principals as Instructional Leaderships. Phi. Deta kappan,82/8:598-606
- Fullan, M. (1991).The New Meaning of Education Change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Glanz, Jeffery. (2006) what Every Principal should know About Instructional Leadership. Thousand oaks’, California state.

- Glickman, c. (1990). *Supervision of instructional: A developing approach*. 2nd ed. Toronto. On: Ally and Bacon.
- Grivin, N. (2005). *The principals' role in K-12 Professional development*. Retrieved on March 2008 <http://WWW.askasisa.org>.
- Hallinger, P. and J.F. Murphy 1997. "Assessing and Developing Principal Instructional Leadership." *Educational Leadership* Vol.45, No.1, pp.54-61
- Harris, A. and Daniel, Muijs. (2005). *Improving School Through teacher leadership*. New York: Open University press.
- Holmes, G. (1993). *Essential School leadership; developing vision and purpose management*. London: kogan page limited.
- Hoy, W. K. and C. G. Miskal 2000. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Jacobson, P. B. J. D. Logsdon and R.R. and R. R Wiegman (1973). *The principal ship: New Perspectives*. New Jersey: Printice-Hall.Inc.
- Krug. S.E. (1992). "Instructional Leadership: A constructivist Perspective." *Educational Administration Quarterly* Vol.28.No.3, pp.430-443
- Kumar, M, et al (1984). *Research Methodology*. London: International and professional and professional Publisher.
- Lock heed, M.E.A.M Verspoor and Associates (1991) *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries* Washington D.C. World bank Publication.
- Locke, A, Edwin and Ass.(1991). *The essence of leadership*. New York, Macmillan Inc.
- Locke, E & Latham, G.A. (1990). *Theory of good setting and task performance*. London. Cliffs NG: Prentice Hall.
- Marks, M. Helen and Susan M. Printy. (2003). *Principal leadership and school performance; an international and instructional leadership*. *Educational leadership. Quarterly*. Vol.39 (3), 370 – 397.
- McTighe, J. and Connor. K (2005) *seven practices for effective learning*. *Educational Leadership*. 10-17.
- Ministry of Education (1994). *Educational and Training policy*. Addis Ababa EMPDA
- Ministry of Education (2005). *Education Sector Development*. Addis Ababa.

- Ministry of Education (2007). Review of Ethiopian education and Training policy and Its Implementation. Addis Ababa; USARD.
- Mulugata Wende(2017) the practices of primary schools principals roles as instructional leaders.
- Porter, A. (2006). Leadership and Management for human Resource professional. New York: ELSEVUER.
- Sarantakros, S. (2005). Social Research. London: Palgrave
- RajMestry(2013) et.al. The instructional leadership role of primary school principals. EducationAs Change,Volume 17, No. S1, 2013, pp. S49–S64.University of Johannesburg
- Sergiovanni, T.T. (2001). The principal ship; a reflective practice perspective: (4thed). London; Allyn and Bacon.
- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of the instructional leadership. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 42(4), 325-334.
- Simin Ghavifekr (PhD), Komathi Chellapan and others (1914). Factors affecting strategic instructional leadership practices of school principals: teacher' perception. Department of Educational Management, Planning & Policy, Faculty of Education, University of Malaya
- Synder, 1983;32 Characteristics of Effective schools and Effective principals.

Appendix-A
Addis Ababa University College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
Questionnaire to be filled by principals, V/principals and Teachers

General Direction

Dear Respondents

This questionnaire is designed to assess principal and v/principals current status of instructional leadership performance and to investigate some of the factors that affect instructional leadership roles in governmental primary schools.

The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used by the researcher for strictly academic purpose. Your careful and honest responses determine the success of the study and the researchers as well.

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

Note - No need of writing your name

-Each question has its own instruction to follow.

Thank you in advance to your kind cooperation!

Name of the school-----

Duty-----

Section One:

Personal Characteristics

Direction: Indicate your response by putting this mark(x) on the space provide.

1. Sex: a) Male b) Female
2. Age a) 21-30 c) 41-50
b) 31-40 d) 51-60 e) 61 and above
3. Educational qualification: a) Diploma c) MA/M.sc Degree
b) (BA/B.Sc./B.Ed.) Degree
4. Field of specialization
a) Educational Planning and Management (EDPM) c) Social Science
b) Natural Science d) Other Specify _____
5. Work experience:
 - 5.1. In teaching
a) 5 years and below c) 11 – 15
b) 6 – 10 d) above 15 years
 - 5.2. In administration before your present position. Please use the **above intervals and write the letter** representing the interval for our experience (if any) as
a) A unite leader _____ c) School Supervisor _____
b) A department head _____ d) Other specify (with service years) _____
 - 5.3 In your present position
a) 3 years and below c) 7 – 9
b) 4 – 6 d) above 9 years

E. Communicating Goals						
No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	Principals develop a set of annual school goals focused on student learning					
2	Principals use data on student academic performance when developing the school's goals					
3	Principals communicate the school's goals effectively to staff, students and parents					
F. Managing curriculum and instruction						
No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The school principals monitor the classroom curriculum					
2	The school principals help teachers to evaluate curriculum					
3	The school principals assist teacher in lesson planning					
4	The principals assist teachers in developing instructional materials					
G. Monitoring students' progress						
No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	Principals meet individually with teachers to discuss students' academic progress					
2	Principals use test results to assess progress towards school goals					
3	Principals inform the school's performance results to teachers in a report form					
H. Evaluating Teachers						
No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The school principals evaluate the performance of teachers					
2	The school principals use evaluation as a means for teacher's improvement					
3	The school principals use more than one source in evaluating teachers					

Section Three

1. Please write major factors that affect principal's instructional leadership performance (you can write in Amharic or English)

1. Please, suggest solutions for the problems you mentioned above? Or what should be done to improve instructional leadership performance of school principals?

Thank you!

Appendix-B
Addis Ababa University College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
Interview Guide for supervisors and woreda education office heads

1. Background information

1.1 Age

1.2 Sex

1.3 Year of experience as:

i. A teacher-----

ii. A principal-----

iii. A supervisor-----

1.4 Qualification major -----

1.5 Level of educational attainment-----

2. How often do your woreda /sub city provide supervisory services for primary schools in a year?

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

4. How do you see the current election of school leaders for principal-ship position from professional point of view?

5. What factors influence principals' performance in instructional leadership?

6. What strategies do you suggest to alleviate the problems you raised?

Appendix-c
Addis Ababa University
College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
Focus group discussion Guide lines for teachers

1. Are supplies such a student text books, teachers guide, paper, chalk available in your school?
2. In what kinds of activities do your principals engaged more of his time?
3. To what extent does the diversity of roles in your school constrain principal instructional leadership?
4. What are the problems related to wereda /sub city education office?
5. What are the problems principals face exercising instructional leadership activities?
6. What strategies do you suggest to alleviate the problems?