

THE PRACTICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN  
GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF MIZAN-AMAN TOWN  
ADMINISTRATION

MA THESIS

BY

MEAZA MENGESHA MEKURIA



JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

APRIL, 2021

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

THE PRACTICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN  
GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF MIZAN-AMAN TOWN  
ADMINISTRATION

BY

MEAZA MENGESHA MEKURIA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL  
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND  
BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES, JIMMA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL  
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

ADVISORS: MAIN ADVISOR: DESALEGN BEYENE (PhD)

CO-ADVISOR: GETACHEW HELUF (MA)

APRIL, 2021  
JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

## **DECLARATION**

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis titled, “The Practice of Instructional Leadership in Primary Schools of Mizan–Aman Town Administration” is my original work produced under the guidance of my advisors, Dr. Desalegn Beyene (Major Advisor) and Mr. Getachew Heluf (Co-advisor) and has never been submitted to any other college or university for an award of Degree. To the best of my knowledge, all information from other sources has been duly acknowledged following appropriate scientific procedures.

Name: Meaz Mengesha Mekuria

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This thesis titled, “The Practice of Instructional Leadership in Primary Schools in Mizan–Aman Town Administration” is approved as the original work of Meaza Mengesha and has been submitted for examination with our approval as university advisors.

Name: Desalegn Beyene (PhD)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Co-advisor: -Mr. Getachew Heluf (MA)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **APPROVAL SHEET BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS**

As members of Board of examiners the final MA thesis open defense, we certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by MeazaMengesha titled, “The Practice of Instructional Leadership in Primary Schools in Mizan–Aman Town Administration” and recommended that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership.

DesalegnBeyene (PhD)

Major Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

GetachewHeluf (MA)

Co-Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

### **APPROVAL BY THE BOARD MEMBERS OF EXAMINERS**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First and for most, I thank the Lord, God Almighty for seeing me through this program. All things were made through Him and, without Him, nothing would have been possible. I thank Him!

I want to express my sincere and deepest thanks to my main advisor, DesalegnBeyene(PhD) and Mr. GetachewHeluf (MA) for their guidance, constructive comments and professional advice in the process of doing my thesis work.

My sincere and profound gratitude also goes to my mother, ZewdituWolde and my brothers., AndualemMengesha, BefkaduMengesha, MekbebMengesha My sister, SmegneMengesha and LemlemGezmu for their uninterrupted moral and financial support to complete my study.

Moreover, my deep hearted thanks extend to my daughters and son, AyantuMekonnen, KidistMekonnenand HaylamanuelGetinet respectively for their immense help and support. Furthermore, I would like to extend my special thanks to my colleagues, WondatirMamo, MamituWeldeyehuanis and AddisuAsfaw, for their help and support.

Still more, I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to my school teachers for their support and moral encouragement. Last but not last, sincere thanks go to school principals, vice principals, teachers, supervisors, members of school administration, PTA and KETB who immensely contributed to my study.

## Table of Contents

Contents	page
DECLARATION.....	I
APPROVAL SHEET BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
Table of Contents.....	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
ABSTRACT.....	VIII
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the study .....	1
1.2. Statement of the problem .....	4
1.3 Objectives of the study .....	7
1.3.1. General objective .....	7
1.3.2. Specific objectives .....	7
1.4. Significance of the study.....	7
1.5. Scope of the study .....	8
1.6. Limitation of the study .....	8
1.7. Operational definition of key terms .....	8
1.8. Organization of the study .....	8
CHAPTER TWO.....	9
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	9
2.1. Concept of Leadership .....	9
2.2 The Concept of Instructional Leadership .....	9
2.3 Purpose of Instructional Leadership.....	12
2.4. Key Elements of Instructional Leadership .....	13
2.4.1 Prioritization as an Element of Instructional Leadership .....	13
2.4.2. Focus on Alignment of Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Standards as Elements of Instructional Leadership .....	14
2.4.3 School Culture and Climate as Elements of Instructional Leadership .....	14
2.4.4 Visionary Instructional Leadership as an Element of Instructional Leadership.....	15
2.4. 5. Other related Issues in the Instructional Leadership .....	15

2.4.5.1. Promoting Frequent and Appropriate School-wide Teacher DevelopmentActivities	15
2.4.5.2 Defining and Communicating Shared Vision and Goals.....	16
2. 4.5.3 Monitoring and Providing Feedback on the Teaching and Learning Processes..	16
2.4.5.4 Monitoring the Curriculum and Instruction.....	17
2.5 Instructional Leadership in the Ethiopia Context.....	18
2.6 Challenges of Instructional Leadership.....	19
2.6 .1 Training and Professional Development of Principals .....	19
2.6.2 The Work Load.....	20
2.6 .3 Personal Quality of the Principal.....	20
2.6 .4 Social, Organizational, Cultural Context and School Nature .....	20
2.6 .5 Problems of Limited Acceptance .....	20
2.7. Managing Change .....	21
CHAPTER THREE.....	24
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	24
3.1. The Research Design.....	24
3.2. Research Method.....	24
3.3. Sources of Data .....	24
3.3.1 Primary sources .....	24
3.3.2 Secondary sources .....	25
3.4. Population, sample size and sampling techniques .....	25
3.4.1. Population of the study .....	25
3.4.2. Sample size and sampling technique .....	25
3.5. Data Collection Instruments (tools) .....	26
3.5.1. Questionnaire.....	26
3.5.2. In-depth interview.....	27
3.5.3. Focus group Discussions (FGD).....	27
3.5.4. Document Review.....	27
3.6. Pilot testing of the instruments.....	28
3.7. Procedures of data collection .....	28
3.8. Method of data analysis .....	28
3.9 Ethical Consideration .....	29
CHAPTER FOUR.....	30
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA.....	30

4.1 Characteristics of the Respondents.....	30
4.2 Presentation, analysis and interpretation of the main data.....	32
CHAPTER FIVE.....	45
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	45
5.1. Summary of the major findings .....	45
5.2. Conclusions .....	47
5.3. Recommendations .....	48
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDICES.....	52
APPENDIX A Interview Guide.....	52
APPENDIX B Focus Group Discussion Guide.....	53
APPENDIX C Document Analysis.....	54
APPENDIX D Questionnaire.....	55

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 4.1 : Demographic Characteristics of the respondents.....	31
Table 4.2: The practice of instructional leadership.....	33



Table 4.3: The current practice of instructional leadership.....	36
Table 4.4: The extent to which instructional leadership roles are played .....	38
Table4.5: strategies to alleviate the problem of Instructional leadership.....	41

## ABSTRACT

*The objective this study was to assess the practices of Instructional Leadership in Primary Schools of Mizan–Aman Town Administration. To achieve this objective, descriptive research design was employed. With regard to method, the study employed both qualitative and quantitative. Sources of data were also both primary and secondary. The primary sources were School principals, teachers, primary school supervisors and members PSTA and KETB) whereas secondary data were collected from official reports, organizational archives, policy documents, school development packages and training manuals, official rules and regulations, and organizational minutes. Population of the study comprised 28 government primary schools principals, 5 education officers, 3 primary school supervisors, 42 department heads, 49 PSTA members and 96 KETB members. Seven (58%) primary schools were chosen using lottery method of simple random sampling technique. Similarly, 64 (32.8%) teachers were selected by using lottery method of simple random sampling technique. Three (100%) supervisors were included by comprehensive sampling technique whereas 7 (100%) school principals were considered through purposive sampling technique. Two (40%) educational officers were also purposely selected through lottery method of simple random sampling technique. Thirty two (76%) department heads were taken using census sampling although there had been schools where some departments did not have heads. Questionnaire, interview, FGD and document review were used to generate both quantitative and qualitative data. The data collected were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and t-test. Based on the analysis of the data, it was found that the practice of instructional leadership, generally, was weak. The results showed that school leaders were not in a position to properly play such instructional leadership roles as decision making, conflict or disturbance handling, monitoring or negotiator roles. That is, instructional leadership was found not to be properly practised and fully implemented in this regard.”It was, however, found that instructional leaders conduct classroom visits, provide support for teachers and that they, to the extent possible, devoted to ensure the instruction is of quality. The results also showed that poor motivation, lack of instructional leadership skill, low awareness and weak readiness were among the major challenges of instructional leadership with clear negative implication on the practice of instructional leadership. Sharing of responsibility, provision of adequate resources, capacity building, continuous and close supervisory support could be among strategies to use to improve the practice of instructional leadership. Based on the findings, it was concluded that instructional leadership, generally, was poorly practised in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Twon Administration. Moreover, it could also be concluded that, as there was a clear gap as the findings indicated, primary school leaders did not fully implement instructional leadership. Furthermore, the conclusion could be that the practice of instructional leadership is entangled with different kinds of challenges like failure to provide prompt constructive feedback, lack of support and many more. In view the findings and the conclusions, it was suggested that creation of awareness through workshops, short term trainings, seminars, etc. on basic activities and principles of instructional leadership for instructional leaders, generation of adequate resources for the proper implementation of instructional leadership, provision of incentives for instructional leaders, arranging experience sharing visits to other schools that are believed to somehow perform better, organizing capacity building trainings to instructional leaders are among the possible ways to address the problems and improve the practice of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration. It is also recommended that further studie be conducted in a comprehensive way regardless of the level.*

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter deals with seven sub topic contents. The topics are background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, operational definition of basic terms and organization of the study.

### **1.1. Background of the study**

The primary purpose of education is to equip learners with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable them to render useful services to themselves and to the society at large. Education is, therefore, viewed as an indispensable catalyst that strongly influences the development and economic fortunes of a nation and the quality of life of its people. To bring any changes education is basic so that the education services should be comfortable for students and teachers.

In this context, priority of all countries, especially the developing ones, is to improve the quality of schools and the achievement of students (De Grauwe, 2001) since learning outcomes depend largely on the quality of education being offered (Barro, 2006). Barro further notes that higher quality education fosters economic growth and development. But quality education partly depends on how well teachers are trained and supervised since they are one of the key inputs to education delivery (Lockheed & Verspoor, 1991). De Grauwe (2001) posits that national authorities rely strongly on the school supervision system to monitor both the quality of schools and key measures of its success, such as student achievement.

Educational institutions have been thought to emerge at the forefront so as to ensure sustainable development in any country across the globe. The underlying cause for either impoverishment of a nation or prosperity in socioeconomic positioning often attributed to the corresponding level of focus or priority being offered in the institution of education. The contemporary experience of different nations reveals the pivotal role of education institutions in catalyzing the other domains of development for securing improvements in indicators manifesting socioeconomic prosperity (Crum & Sherman, 2008). The success or failure of any educational enterprise depends among other factors upon the supervision of such enterprise be it a school or an organization. Thus the provision of quality education success of any school achieving its goal and objectives depends on the professional responsibilities and

role of the supervisors (instructional leadership). In the school system, both auxiliary and trained teachers are faced with various problems.

The problems which may be personal, administrative, if not checked could lead to non-achievement of the school predetermined objectives. In view of this, it now becomes necessary that the principal and lead teachers as immediate supervisors, always available in schools with a supervisory role to play in order to enable the teachers solve instructional problems and the achievement of pre-determined objectives (Babson, 2005).

The experience of nations in Asia and Pacific who were in the almost similar positioning of socioeconomic development indicate the extraordinary role that education in general and their leadership paradigm employed found to play an invaluable role that education played for the contemporary miracle being witnessed (Firmaningsih, 2015).

Cognizant of the indispensable role of education, there have been endeavors by governments of Ethiopia to enhance the coverage of education and ensure the corresponding quality of education at all layers since the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup>C. Although efforts to enhance the role of education in nation's developments is tremendous, the relative focus on the need to rationalize and guide the school leadership and approaches of administration a vital component seem to have captured state attention these days in particular. FDRE government seem to have committed not only in boosting the quantitative figure but also in mainstreaming the issue of school leadership, played symbolic role despite obvious shortcomings (Blasé and Blasé, 1999)

Incorporating leadership issues as a major pillar or as part of the packages articulated to overcome the challenges manifested in quality reveal the level of focus being delivered by the side of state. Apart from making it as part of the component, the issue of leadership has been tailored to daily routines across all layers of education and yet in each field where the teaching learning activity takes place. In line with this, choices are made among the existing options of leadership perspectives where instructional leadership is thought to be suited to the contemporary context of the country as part and parcel of the dynamic environment in ever changing world. Consistent with this, there has been a concerted effort by all stakeholders to make use of the basics of instructional leadership to obtain desirable outcomes in student's results in particular.

Murphy (1988) proposed four major dimensions of instructional leadership: 1) Developing mission and goals, 2) Managing the education production function, 3) Promoting an academic learning climate, and 4) Developing a supportive work environment. Some of those elements include promoting a vision; creating alignment of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and standards; focusing on data; and maintaining a culture of continuous learning (Lashway, 2002).

Education in Ethiopia is passing through a period of transition from the emphasis on quantity to emphasis on quality. According to MoE, (2004), the Ethiopian government has now shifted its attention to improve quality of education. It has started quality education initiative called General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) of 2007. Some of its programs were school improvement program and continuous professional development of teachers. Quality education depends on several issues, among others educational planning, management, teacher's professional competence, and efforts of students, instructional supervision and classroom teaching-learning situation (MoE, 2002). This current movement demands that the process of instructional supervision undergo a movement of reform and renewal. In this movement it seems essential to assess the practices and challenges of instructional supervision. In addition, MoE (2002) stated supervision as the process in which supervisors provide professional support for the school principals and teachers to strengthen the teaching and learning process. These points are illustrated in Supervision Manual of MoE (1994) as providing direct technical support to teachers, ensuring curriculum implementation, providing on-the-job training to teachers, conducting teacher performance evaluation, conducting formative education program evaluation and monitoring and coordination. Despite the move in institutionalizing instructional leadership and demands to implement grass root, the corresponding outcome of students results lack consistency and reveal differential outcome when it is revisited across schools with diverse formats of ownership. It aspires to manipulate when and how frequently the instructional leadership provide support for teachers at different experience level and how adequately has been conducted to enhance students leaning achievement.

This study, thus, was aimed at exploring the current practice of instructional leadership, adequacy of awareness about instructional leadership, the extent to which instructional leadership is institutionalized and practiced, availability of relevant standard documents, the extent to which instructional leadership roles are played, challenges of instructional

leadership and, finally, possible strategies that would help address problems affecting instructional leadership practices in Mizan-Aman Town Administration.

## **1.2. Statement of the problem**

Leadership and management program is one of the programs of the GEQIP that encompasses instructional leadership within it. The quality of education depends on, among others, the presence of competent and committed instructional leaders. It is well understood that effective instructional leadership is essential for improving quality education. Successful educational leaders develop their districts and schools as effective organizations and sustain the performance of administrators and teachers as well as students (Leithwood, 2004:24).

Instructional leadership as a dynamic approach to meet educational goals at different layers of institutional levels, have been practiced in Ethiopia since recent past. Realization of ever declining quality the national context thus compelled state and its stakeholders to revisit the way school leadership paradigm and modes of operand being pursued in contexts where the learning and teaching task takes place, thus, instructional leadership has emerged as part of the wider package in overcoming the problem of quality education in Ethiopia (MoE. 2006)

Instructionally effective schools focuses on primarily on the improvement of student academic outcomes (cited in Hallinger, 2009).Sohighly effective instructional leaders can have a dramatic influence on the overall academic achievement of the student. Instructional leaders need to know what is going on the class room without this knowledge, they are unable to appreciate the effectiveness of the instruction and find the solution for the problems that student and teachers encounter in the class room. However, principals of primary schools of Mizan-AmanTown do not regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom and design the appropriate intervention to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms. Since then, it is not uncommon to see research findings that enable us to map out the challenges being encountered in different schools across the country. Several studies thus distilled out the gap being observed in prioritizing issues of research, pitfalls in clearly retaining the pillars of the paradigm and deficiencies in materializing in full-fledged manner.

Regarding the gap in research, the existing literature shows that much focus see to have been offered on only secondary schools. Despite ever-growing role and share in the country's educational system it is better to conduct this research. Consistent with previous research outputs have made subjects of their study and sources of information, only those in school

compound or having duties and responsibilities in the formal education system .Thus they could offer very little attention to stakeholders who are thought to play ‘distant role’ in the education system of the country.

Failure to clearly articulate and unequivocally understand the underlying philosophy and pillars of instructional leadership by those implementing agents in the school system is at forefront when we distill out the empirical pitfalls (Wonde, 2015).Consistent with this inability to clearly communicate the fundamentals of instruction leadership with diverse actors at school compound and beyond reported to constrain the possibility of implementing instructional leadership and impeded the prospect of obtain the desired result in the achievement of students(Asefa,2014). This study further out lined the shortcomings being witnessed in equipping teachers on basics of instructional leadership by supervisors who are in charge of the task (MoE, 2006)

The challenge in offering proportional time for administrative tasks compared to the rest domains of instructional leadership has also been identified in some schools. School principals often found to relegate principles of instructional Leadership, hereby spending their time on routines or doing things as usual.

The aforementioned studies and others seem to have contributed in enriching our understanding in general and more importantly issues like: school principals relegating principles of instructional leadership to margins of prioritythereby spending their time on routines or doing things as usual, inadequacy in properly articulating components of instructional leadership and making significant moves in materializing it in the context of schools where it demands action. In relation to this, the principals of primary schools of the Mizan-Aman town were not still effectively plying instructional leadership role to the expected standard for the improvement of instructional activity. Moreover, they were over burden with administrative task rather than instructional leadership tasks. The researcher also experienced that the principals of primary schools of Mizan-Aman town were not frequently monitoring student progress and they were not effectively supporting and evaluating instructional activities of the classroom. School principals should be able to promote, support and create conducive environment for effective learning and teaching activities at schools. However, principals of Mizan-Aman town were not creating conducive environment for teaching learning. The researcher was initiated to conduct on this title due to in this area no more researches was not conducted, so as it is differ regarding the level of schools , the data

collection tools, samples taken for the research , the employed method and the way of analysis techniques.

These studies revealed the corresponding fact that school community at differing ladders of responsibility seemed inadequate in building consensus on the leadership style as indispensable tool to achieve the desired outcome in students' performance. This study, unlike previous studies aimed to further enhance the depth of our understanding on the context of instructional leadership and practices among primary schools in Mizan-Aman town administration. Furthermore it was aimed in this study to broaden the implication of diverse stakeholders that were often to fall outside of the normative educational structure but having varying implication in practicing instructional leadership. Similarly, this study planned to assess how the nature of the relationship between employee and employer. The purpose of the school and the underlying orientation of learners and parents, relation between educational office and their respective schools under their supervision affect the prospects of implementing instructional leadership. Thus, the following basic research questions were the main focus of the study:

1. What is the current practice of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman town Administration? Is there an adequate awareness about instructional leadership? What standard documents are available to help guide as well as increase awareness?
2. To what extent is instructional leadership institutionalized and practiced so as to improve delivery of quality instruction in Mizan-Aman town administration?
3. To what extent do school leaders play their instructional leadership role to improve the teaching and learning process in Mizan-Aman town administration?
4. What challenges do instructional leaders face in discharging their instructional leadership roles in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration?

What possible strategies could help to alleviate the problems encountered in practicing instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration



### **1.3 Objectives of the study**

#### **1.3.1. General objective**

The general objective of this study was to assess the practices of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman administration and to enhance the instructional leadership activities.

#### **1.3.2. Specific objectives**

The study has the following specific objectives.

1. To assess the current practice of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration. There was also an intention to know adequacy of awareness as well as the availability of standard relevant documents in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration.
2. To examine the extent to which instructional leadership institutionalized and practiced in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration so as to ensure the delivery of quality instruction.
3. To investigate the extent to which school leaders play their instructional leadership roles in Mizan-Aman town administration in Mizan-Aman town administration.
4. To find out challenges instructional leaders face in discharging their instructional leadership roles in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration
5. To suggest possible strategies that would help address problems that affect the practice of instructional leadership in Mizan-Aman town administration.

#### **1.4. Significance of the study.**

The study will benefit the ministry of education, schools, learners and families that are explicitly concerned with education policy, educational outcomes and related issues. The study will also yield benefits like creating a rational policy which will be implemented in both private and government schools. Besides, the finding of the study will help to reconsider the actual practice of instructional leadership in government schools. The benefit thus enables us to witness uniform result in private and government schools to achieve desirable outcomes at national levels, regional and zonal level. Besides, this study is expected to yield valuable knowledge so as to further refine intervention strategies needed to better off conditions to materialize the essential components of instructional leadership at grass root school and their surrounding community in particular.

### **1.5. Scope of the study**

The southern nations and nationalities and people region currently encompass 17 Zones and 6 Special Woredas. Bench-Sheko zone is one of these zonal administration, hosting 6 Woredas and 2 city- administration. This city administration (Mizan–Aman) hosts 12 primary schools. Apart from this geographical delimitation, this study was conceptually delimited to assessing the practices of instructional leadership, adequacy of awareness as well as availability of relevant documents of a standard, the extent of institutionalization and practice of instructional leadership, the extent to which instructional leadership roles are played and identifying challenges of the practice of instructional leadership.

### **1.6. Limitation of the study**

It is obvious that research work cannot totally free from limitation. The study had some limitations one of which was the outbreak of the pandemic which exactly happened at the time of data collection which led to school closure and consequent on and off office works. Moreover, it was difficult to explore relevant, up-to-date literature due to fear of travel due to the pandemic as well as poor internet connections or even frequent interruptions due to several reasons.. Furthermore, respondents and officials in various offices were reluctant to provide accurate information on the issues raised. In spite of the challenges, however, the researcher made a relentless effort and managed to finalize the study.

### **1.7. Operational definition of key terms**

Government Schools: schools that are established by state and work toward promoting public welfare.

Instructional Leadership: refers to the management of curriculum and instruction by a school principal.

### **1.8. Organization of the study**

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter presents background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives both general and specific, significance, scope and limitations of the study, operational definition of terms and organization of the study. The second chapter deals with the review of relevant literature. The third chapter is all about the research design and methodology whereas the fourth chapter relates to the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data. The fifth chapter presents summary of the major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter attempted to deal with the review of related literature. In reviewing relevant literature the researcher has found it important to define and indicate the concepts of leadership, theories of leadership concept of instructional leadership, instructional leadership in global context, instructional leadership in Ethiopian context and challenges of instructional leadership

#### **2.1. Concept of Leadership**

Leadership is an activity or set of activities, observable to others, that occurs in a group, organization, or institution and which involves a leader and followers who willingly subscribe to common purpose and work together to achieve them. In other expression, leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievements in a given situation.” From this situation, it is possible to infer that leadership is duties that are clearly seen to participate to be performed in a group in other words it is the process by which a person directs and influences others to achieve organizational objectives in certain circumstances Blasé (1999). Similarly, Harris (2005 ) defines as leadership focuses on organizational direction and purpose is the broadest term related to organizational responsibility; management focuses on efficient use of resources it is doing things right and enforce rules and regulations. In addition, good leadership presupposes having consistent policies to delegate and empower others, thus sharing leadership responsibility; modeling, risk taking; focusing on people; nurturing staff members and helping them to grow; and emphasizing the educational, rather than the purely technical aspects of schooling. This implies that leadership behaves in a plan not only to lead others but also enhancing the capability of others to take and react the responsibility.

#### **2.2 The Concept of Instructional Leadership**

Instructional leadership is defined as those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning and learning outcome. 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. The role of an instructional leader differs from that of traditional school administrator in a number of meaningful ways.

Whereas a conventional principal spends the majority of his/her time dealing with strictly administrative duties, a principal who is an instructional leader charged with redefining his/her role to become the primary learner in a community striving for excellence in education.

As such, it becomes the principal's responsibility to work with teachers to define educational objectives and set school-wide goals, provide the necessary resources for learning, and create new learning opportunities for students and staff. The instructional leader provides direction, coordination, and resources for the improvement of curriculum and instruction Blasé (2004).

Instructional leadership is one of the most significant responsibilities of a school leader. Principals are not seen as managerial or organizational administrators any longer (Brazer& Bauer, 2013). However, before the mid-twentieth century, principals and other school administrators saw themselves as primarily responsible for keeping students safe and for overseeing and enforcing schedules and school policies. Managerial tasks such as ordering supplies and creating bus schedules were common daily tasks. Teacher supervision served mostly to eliminate ineffective teachers (Author, 1998). This situation changed in the 1970's and 1980's when the term "instructional leadership" began to appear in educational literature. Now, principals are responsible for acting as instructional leaders of the school by promoting best practices in teaching and learning so that students achieve academic success (Duffy, 2016). Even though principals are involved in many tasks that tend to distract from this goal, effective principals focus on instruction because they know that this will impact students the most (Arlestig&Tornsen, 2014). Many researchers have shown the importance of high-quality instruction as a necessary component of student improvement and achievement. Instructional leadership plays a key role in this goal (Marshall, 2009; Hallinger, 2011; Neumerski, 2012; Kidron, Greenberg, & Schneider, 2015; Marzano, 2011; Sullivan &Glanz, 2013; Ylimaki, 2014; Zepeda, 2012).

Regarding the state of instructional leadership in these schools, Stodolsky, Dorph, and Feiman-Nemser (2006) reported that instructional leaders need to create structures and opportunities to promote learning among teachers. The researchers found that if teachers spoke to one another at all at school, it was to discuss specific students' progress, not curriculum, teaching, or assessment. They also reported that few teachers were able to observe colleagues teaching. While most teachers acknowledged that their principals were interested and supportive of them trying new ideas, the researchers found little evidence that principals had created structures and opportunities for them to work together on teaching and learning. Instructional leadership practices are leadership roles that are directly related to the

teaching process, involving the interaction between teachers, students and the curriculum (Quah, 2011).

Instructional leadership in the area of time management and supervising teachers will improve the quality of teaching and learning outcomes and enhance the attainment of the educational goals and objectives. Ahmed (2016) highlighted instructional leadership practices to include: framing school goals, communicating school goals, supervision and evaluation of instruction, coordination of the curriculum, monitoring of students' progress, protection of instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promotion of professional development and providing incentives for students. Instructional leadership practices of principals are directly linked to creating the conditions for optimal teaching and learning. In the context of this study, instructional leadership practices could be referred to as administrative activities and roles that are geared towards providing support for teachers and students to ensure quality instructional delivery for school effectiveness. The instructional leadership practices of the above author adopted in this study are instructional supervision and time management.

Leadership in educational institutions is a process of giving direction and educational leaders are identified on the basis of their relationship with their followers (Chima, 2007; Rogers, 2006). Leaders are expected to influence the behavior of their followers by using appropriate influencing strategies. George and Georgia (2004) summarized characteristics that best describe leadership as involving and exerting influence over other members of a group or organization and supporting a group or organization to achieve its goal. A leader's vision provides followers with a sense of optimism for the future, firmness between the past and future, and a skeleton for decisions and actions. Additionally, it is well established that competencies of leadership in organizations are the combination of skills, abilities, knowledge, and personal attributes (Weiss & Molinaro, 2006; Yukl, 2002). A core characteristic of effective leadership is the ability to create a shared vision that is clearly articulated throughout the organization and aligns the energy and work of followers (Hesselbein, et al., 1996; Hopkins, 2005). In order to address the intended goal of schools, principals are expected to exhibit the instructional competency, knowledge, skill and ability expected of them. Their effectiveness is believed to be critical for successful performance of the schools they are leading. This requires witnessed performance in carrying out instructional leadership roles they are expected to play focusing on the different dimensions of instructional leadership. Principals as instructional leaders should at all times strive for

excellence in teaching and learning with the sole purpose of improving student achievement. They are expected to serve primarily as instructional leaders in schools, and that their commitment to instructional enhancement and perfection should not only be strongly articulated but should be reinforced with experience in the classroom (Boatman & Richard, 2011). In order to secure authority in the eyes of the teachers, principals should have sufficient leading as well as teaching experience and should understand with first-hand experience the instructional challenges faced by teachers so that they will be able to take corrective actions appropriate to the situation (Robert, 2003; Seyoum, 2014). Based on the premises of the Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia, school principals are expected to perform well in educational leadership by properly leading and involving the school community in instructional activities which are meant to have great influence on student academic performance (MoE, 1994). In order to meet the demanding requirements of the Ministry of education, principals in schools are expected to play a great role in supervision, research work, planning, goal setting, and provision of instructional materials in schools (MoE, 2013).

### **2.3 Purpose of Instructional Leadership**

Teaching and learning are the core business of schools, therefore it is first hand function of leadership is to play a crucial role in creating conditions for improved instruction (Murphy, Elliott, Goldring & Porter, 2007). Maximizing the effects of instructional organization, which is also referred to as organizing the instructional program, is another function of instructional leadership, which is directly aligned with setting instructional goals for the school. According to Weber (1987:15), the strategies of bringing the goals of the school to reality depend on allocating staff and organizing resources to maximum effect. Monitoring achievement and evaluating programs is also a primary function of the principal as an instructional leader. It is through the instructional leader's enactment of this function that instructional programs can be assessed and revised. The instructional leader must be able to use data collected from performance levels of learners to evaluate the school programs.

Halverson, Grigg, Prichett, & Thomas (2007) argue that the practice of instructional leadership has consistently changed with time, from its inception during the 1970s and 1980s, to how it is practiced today. Traditionally the tasks of leadership were setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. Instructional leadership today includes much deeper

involvement in the core technology of teaching and learning, carries more sophisticated views of professional development, and emphasizes the use of data in decision making. From this one can understand that ancient practice of instructional leadership is different to the current one.

## **2.4. Key Elements of Instructional Leadership**

Blasé & Blasé (2004) in the analysis of instructional leadership, administration, and management, argues that instructional leadership involves: setting clear goals; allocating resources for instruction; managing the curriculum; monitoring lesson plans; and evaluating teachers. It also involves those actions that the principal performs or delegates to others to promote growth in student learning. Some of the key elements that characterize instructional leadership and distinguish it from management and administration include prioritization; a focus on alignment of the curriculum, instruction and assessment standards; data analysis; a culture of continuous learning for adults; school culture and climate; visionary instructional leadership; and the variables related to instructional leadership. These key elements of instructional leadership are discussed below.

### **2.4.1 Prioritization as an Element of Instructional Leadership**

This element emphasizes the fact that teaching and learning must constantly be a top priority. Halverson (2007) claims that instructional leadership is so strongly connected with student performance, accessing and communicating the leadership practice is an important issue for policymakers, schools of education, and practitioners alike". Therefore, focus on teaching learning process is the first activities to be performed by the stakeholder.

According Halverson (2007) contends that leadership is a balance of management and vision and that the instructional leader must bring that vision to realization. Bringing the vision to realization needs a principal who is in constant contact with his leadership team and the entire staff to evaluate their competencies in order to assist them to improve. This endeavor becomes possible only if the principal himself/herself as instructional leader is a knowledgeable, learning and thinking person, who appreciates the value of the intellect, who is interested in ideas, and responds to experimentation and innovation. This show prioritizing activities in the instructional leadership is essential for its effectiveness.

#### **2.4.2. Focus on Alignment of Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Standards as Elements of Instructional Leadership**

The principal as instructional leader must ensure that there is alignment between the curriculum, instruction, and assessment of the required standard to ensure learner achievement. In order to realize this aim, argue Hallinger (2003).s that the principal as an instructional leader should be a practicing teacher. He further contends that instructional leaders need to know what is going on in the classroom, which is an opportunity to walk the factory floors.

Once the principal is in touch with what happens in the classroom, he/she will be able to appreciate some of the problems teachers and learners encounter, address instructional issues from a hands on‘ perspective rather than from their own teaching perspective, establish a base from which to address and make curriculum decisions, and strengthen the belief that the sole purpose of the school is to serve the educational needs of students. Thus, instructional leadership needs professional/leadership skills and human relations skills that and are essential for the development of educational excellence and to have a positive effect on learner performance. Blasé & Blasé (2004) identifies four skills which an instructional leader should have, as presented below.

##### **Skills of Instructional leadership**

Resource provider: instructional leaders in addition to their knowledge manifest of strengths and weaknesses of their school, principals should recognize that teachers desire to be acknowledged and appreciated for a job well done, Instructional resource: Teachers rely on manifest their principals as resources of information on current trends and effective instructional practices. Good communicator: Effective instructional leaders need to manifest communicate essential beliefs regarding learning, such as the conviction that all learners can learn and Create a visible Presence: Manifest leading the instructional programmer of a school means a commitment to living and breathing a vision of success in teaching and learning.

#### **2.4.3 School Culture and Climate as Elements of Instructional Leadership**

One of the core variables of this study is the responsibility of the principal, as instructional leader, to create a shared vision for the school and to provide leadership that will shape the culture and climate of the school. There are three main concepts which need to be clarified better understanding of this function, namely: vision, school culture, and school (Harris,



2005). The Harrison (2010) regard a school vision as a clearly, articulated statement of goals, principles and expectations for the entire learning community. They further indicate that an organization's vision consists of a well-defined core ideology. This ideology includes a core purpose as well as a set of fundamental values and beliefs, the essential and enduring tenets of an organization.

#### **2.4.4 Visionary Instructional Leadership as an Element of Instructional Leadership**

One of the main variables related to effective instructional leadership is the role of the principal in creating and communicating a shared vision and goals of the teachers and learners. It is a cognitive construction or a mental model, a conceptual representation used to both understand system operations and guide actions within the system. A visionary instructional leader attempts to transform the conformist culture in his/her school, partly by confronting the tendency of its members to resist change, (Mulford, 2003) . From this we can understand that a principal who shares his vision and goals with his staff (visionary leadership) boosts the teachers' and learners' morale, thereby improving the performance levels of learners.

#### **2.4. 5. Other related Issues in the Instructional Leadership**

**2.4.5.1. Promoting Frequent and Appropriate School-wide Teacher Development Activities** Blasé and Blasé (2001) reiterates that teacher development activities are another major concern of instructional leadership. Teachers' capacity to deliver the curriculum needs to be prioritized by the principal by providing continuous in-service training for all teachers in the school irrespective of their performance records. Weber (ibid.) emphasizes the importance of in-service training opportunities for teachers by indicating that "even the excellent teachers cannot renew themselves but need the intervention of the instructional leader to provide in-service training opportunities".

In support of the above views, Leithwood (2003) indicates that a school as an organization has become less in need of control and more in need of both support and capacity development. The principals, in turn, need to support and build the capacity of their teachers in carrying out their teaching obligations. Organizational needs such as described above are better served by practices associated with the concept of leadership than a focus purely on administration .This implies that the national department of education has a duty to support and build the capacity of principals to carry out their leadership roles.

### **2.4.5.2 Defining and Communicating Shared Vision and Goals**

Mulford (2003) associates the concept of a vision with what he calls strategic leadership which is defined as seeing the big picture; discerning the megatrends; understanding the implications and ensuring that others in the school can do the same; establishing structures and processes to bring vision to realization, and monitoring the outcomes. It follows that a principal must prioritize the provision of a clear sense of mission, vision, goals and objectives that are understood and supported by all groups and by key decision makers. According to (Mulford, 2003), an instructional leader is a person with a vision who is able to assess the needs of the school and community. Such a leader is able to articulate his/her vision into a plan of action in which all parties can participate and feel a sense of ownership that will enable quality learning to occur. It is giving life to the vision of a school depends on the commitment of the instructional leader (the principal) to empowering his/her staff, to ensuring that each individual can build his/her own self esteem; and where all the components of the school become part of the whole. The realization of all the above will depend on the principal's ability and willingness to communicate and engage all the involved parties in understanding what needs to be done and why. It also depends on the part that each individual needs to play in achieving the vision and goals of the school.

### **2. 4.5.3 Monitoring and Providing Feedback on the Teaching and Learning**

#### **Processes**

Monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process is one of the variables that characterize instructional leadership. Murphy, Elliott, Goldring & Porter (2007) said that the instructional leader should spend much time in classrooms, observing teaching and learning and encouraging high performance; track learners' scores and other indicators of student learning to help teachers focus attention where it is most needed; and provide opportunities for teachers to share information and work together to plan curriculum and instruction.

Hopkins (2005) asserts that the principal should encourage networks among teachers to discuss their work and ensure that the teachers do not work in isolation but share their expertise with each other. In other words, instructional leader should support teacher networks by making suggestions, giving feedback on the successes/strengths and weaknesses/challenges that teachers experience in their practice, model effective

instruction, solicit opinions, provide professional development opportunities, and give praise for effective teaching.

According to Hopikins (2005 ), the following behaviors by the instructional leader have a significant impact on learner performance: providing instructional leadership through discussion of instructional issues; observing classroom teaching and giving feedback; supporting teacher autonomy and protecting instructional time; providing and supporting improvement through monitoring progress; and using learner progress data for program improvement. Therefore, the instructional leader monitors the implementation of strategies to achieve these goals and provides feedback to the teachers with regard to their attainment.

#### **2.4.5.4 Monitoring the Curriculum and Instruction**

The success of any school depends squarely on what happens in the classrooms. What the teachers do in the classrooms with their learners (curriculum delivery and instruction) will be reflected in the performance of learners. So, understand the dynamics of the classroom; identify and apply effective instructional strategies. This understanding will enable the principal to implement educational programs/curriculum development. The principal must also be able to master and coordinate the auxiliary services that support instruction, and also establish productive relationships with parents and the community (Hallinger, 2010) .

In order to fulfill the above role, Ghavifekret al. (2013) indicates that the instructional leader needs to have up-to-date knowledge of three areas of education: curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Concerning curriculum, principals need to know about the changing conceptions of curriculum, educational philosophies and beliefs, curricular sources and conflict, and curricular evaluation and improvement. In order to be able to do this, the principal needs not only to be a head teacher or principal teacher but he/she must be the school's head learner. This author added that the principal should keep abreast of new conceptions with regard to curriculum by attending curriculum workshops with his/her teachers which will assist him/her to give the necessary support to the teachers with regard to the implementation of the curriculum. Regarding instruction, the instructional leader needs to know about different models of teaching, the theoretical reasons for adopting a particular teaching model, and the theories underlying the technology-based learning environment. The importance of classroom visits by the instructional leader to work with teachers and learners, and the participation of the principal in curriculum-related meetings to assist in the development of effective teaching and learning strategies (Hallinger, 2016).

## **2.5 Instructional Leadership in the Ethiopia Context**

In its Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV:2010:12), the ministry of education stated that although the decentralization reforms have been implemented some years ago and important responsibilities have been transferred to the Woreda offices, “many offices, however do not yet have the required capacity to exercise their responsibilities effectively. School functioning also needs further improvement, in particular concerning school leadership.” In the face of the rapid expansion of the educational system, schools are facing a crisis of quality. Improving the quality of school requires strong instructional leadership. The ministry of education has placed great emphasis on professional development for school principals, deputy school principals, department heads, as well as officers in charge of education at Federal, Regional, sub regional and Woreda levels. Several pre-service and in-service training programs are already being run through various universities.

The mode of delivery has also diversified to include distance education with short face-to-face contacts (ESDP IV:2010:12). It was thus being fully aware of these challenges that the ministry of education, in its Blue Print (MoE, 2007), acknowledged that “Educational leadership and supervision are professions by their own with established theories and practices” It also indicated that “those who assume these roles should be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to exhibit proper professional ethics that are necessitated at National, Regional, Zonal, Woreda and school levels”. The practice of instructional leadership varies according to the country, the conceptual framework developed by different leadership theories can be implemented in different countries with different rates. In Ethiopia especially after the down fall of the Derg regime, education has been given due attention and direction with an education and training policy declared during transitional government of Ethiopia (TGE, 1994). As clearly stated in the Ethiopian training policy document, educational management will be decentralized especially at institutional level and schools become autonomous in their inferior administration. This means that the role of managing the schools and teaching and learning carried out in schools distributed to all individuals involving in school activity, not limited only to principals. As a result, different measures were taken by the government and Ministry of Education in line with the policy. Among these measures, some include the education system was decentralized, different individuals were allowed to involve in the educational decision making affairs of leadership and managerial trainings were provided to those on leadership position and others .Still

educational leadership and management will be the focus of the system as indicated in the educational sector development program .

## **2.6 Challenges of Instructional Leadership**

Today leadership has become a very complex phenomenon because of the complexity of industrial, social, or political organization, globalization, and technological advancement especially in information technology (Mulford, 2003). The leadership responsibilities of principals play an important role for the achievement of educational objectives. Nevertheless, in carrying out the task of leadership, principals usually face many challenges. Stressing this point, different scholars listed different challenges that impede leadership responsibility of principals.

### **2.6 .1 Training and Professional Development of Principals**

School leadership development programs provide certain kinds of knowledge and skills about leading and managing leadership practices. School principals are front-line managers in charge of leading their team to new levels of effectiveness. Leadership preparation is important to develop skills and knowledge for the learners for later use. School principals regularly deal with emotions that come from aggressive or pleasure parents, students, and staff members. This is a common practice in a principal's schoolwork environment (Blasé& Blasé, 1999). Hence, principal training should include learning strategies to deal with the emotional trouble of the principals 'activities. Training principals for restructuring schools should prepare them to direct their available resource toward the mission, goals, and improvement priorities of schools. Training helps principals to develop technical skills such as material resources identification, purchase, information use, human resources management.

According to McEwan (2003), principals are selected from teachers. Suddenly a head teacher finds himself in a leadership position, which calls for a lot of commitment, dedication, and tolerance. Institutions restructuring their administration programs to provide more opportunities to develop leadership skills in addition to academic knowledge a gap remains between the academic and real world. Thus, lack of skills and training is the common impediments to educational leadership effectiveness.

### **2.6.2 The Work Load**

The principal is the one person in a school who oversees the entire program and holds great responsibility of his/her school. According to Suparman (2012), the principal is ultimately responsible for almost everything that happens in the school. This researcher added that exercising instructional leadership takes time and energy over and above which must be spent on administering a school or a school district. Responsibility other than instructional leadership will frequently press for the principal's time and drain his/her energy, leaving him/her with the feeling that he/she really does not have the time to function as one.

### **2.6 .3 Personal Quality of the Principal**

Schools really can make a difference in the achievement levels of students, but a school is most often only as good or bad, as creative or sterile as the person who serves as the head of that school, The principal's own personality, vision, extent of commitment, human relation skills etc. can serve to constrain/hamper the exercise of leadership. If the principal does not possess the appropriate personal qualities needed, the absence of these characteristics can be self- constraining in carrying out leadership responsibilities properly (Mulford, 2003).

### **2.6 .4 Social, Organizational, Cultural Context and School Nature**

The act of leadership and its organizational context are inseparable. Originations cannot be understood without due consideration of the culture which constitutes them. According to Organizational culture is shared philosophies, ideologies, beliefs, feelings, assumptions, expectations, attitudes, norms, and values. It can pressure the performance of employee and organizational success. It provides the framework for deciding what does or does not make sense.

### **2.6 .5 Problems of Limited Acceptance**

The schools principals are expected to act as leaders in school and the success of a school to accomplish the goals depend up on the ability of the head to lead the staff members and the willingness of the staff to be led. Nevertheless, if teachers do not accept principals as the head of the school, it may challenge the principal. In line to this, Hallinger& Heck (2010) sate that teachers do not always recognize the principal as the leader of the school .This is because they consider him/her as not having the necessary expertise regarding the activities

## **2.7. Managing Change**

The only absolute in our world is change. Changes are taking place in political, scientific, technological, and institutional areas. School organization are not exceptional, hence changes have become almost a way of life in education today. Thus, to bring about the desired change, there must be cooperation and involvement of staff members together with the school principals, the leader and agent of change. However, some staff members react negatively to change considering it as something that threatens their position, making their task more complex and demanding (Bedard, 2005).

### **Characteristics of Instructional Leaders**

Instructional leaders do have characteristics that are shared by many other leaders of other styles. But they also have some unique ones. Sergiovanni (1991) suggested that research on instructional leadership attributes and functions needed to be situation specific. Many researchers, however, seem to determine characteristics that suggest strong instructional leadership. Smith and Andrews (1989) compiled a list of characteristics from existing literature that suggest strong instructional leadership: high energy, assertiveness, ability to assume initiatives, openness to new ideas, tolerance for ambiguity, a sense of humor ,analytic ability , a practical stance toward life , referent power and strong motivation, and high self-esteem. Going through a review of related literature, Andrews, Basom and Basom (2001) found three inherent attributes common in strong instructional leaders: vision, the ability to communicate that vision, and the ability to create trust in the workplace. We can also conceptualize the characteristics of instructional leadership by contrasting it with other leadership styles. According to Jenkins (2009) instructional leadership differs from a school administrator or manager in a number of ways: principals who pride themselves as administrators usually are too preoccupied in dealing with strictly managerial duties, while principals who are instructional leaders involve themselves in setting clear goals, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating and supporting teachers. The instructional leader makes instructional quality the top priority of the school and attempts to bring that vision to realization.

A conventional principal spends the majority of his or her time dealing with strictly administrative duties, meanwhile an instructional leader focus more on redefining his or her role to become the primary learner in a community striving for excellence in education. Scholars assert that instructional leadership be viewed in the context of learning

communities. Learning communities “often operate on networks of shared and complementary expertise rather than working in hierarchies or in isolation. People who involved in a learning community usually own the problem and become the agents of its solution. Instructional leaders also make adult learning a priority by setting high expectations for performance so that it will keep them motivated and keep strive for the best. Instructional leaders create a culture of continuous learning for adults and get the community’s support for the school to success, in contrast to other leaders. Stewart (2006) makes a distinction between instructional and transformational leadership models: Instructional leaders focus on school goals, the curriculum, instruction, and the school environment. Transformational leaders focus on restructuring the school by improving school conditions. The instructional leader also needs to have up-to-date knowledge on three areas of education: curriculum, instruction, and assessment (DuFour, 2002).

*Curriculum.* Principals need to know about the changing conceptions of curriculum, educational philosophies and beliefs, curricular sources and conflict, and curriculum evaluation and improvement.

*Instruction.* Principals need to know about different models of teaching, the theoretical reasons for adopting a particular teaching model, and the theories underlying the technology-based learning environment.

*Assessment.* Principals need to know about the principles of student assessment, assessment procedures with emphasis on alternative assessment methods, and assessment that aims to improve student learning.

Blase and Blase (2000) cite specific skills of instructional leadership: making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching. Lashway (2002) recommends certain skills for instructional leaders to master: interpersonal skills; planning skills; instructional observation skills; and research and evaluation skills.

□ *Interpersonal skills* maintain trust, spur motivation, give empowerment, and enhance collegiality. Relationships are built on trust, and tasks are accomplished through motivation and empowerment wherein teachers are involved in planning, designing, and evaluating instructional programs. Empowerment leads to ownership and commitment as teachers identify problems and design strategies themselves. Collegiality promotes sharing, cooperation, and collaboration, in which both the principal and teachers talk about teaching and learning.



- *Planning skills.* Planning begins with clear identification of goals or a vision to work toward, as well as to induce commitment and enthusiasm. The next step is to assess what changes need to occur and which may be accomplished by asking the people involved, reading documents, and observing what is going on within a school.
- *Instructional observation skills.* The aim of instructional observation (supervision) is to provide teachers with feedback to consider and reflect upon. Not only can effective instructional leaders help guide classroom instruction through supervision, they can also play a primary role in bettering it.
- *Research and evaluation skills* are needed to critically question the success of instructional programs, and one of the most useful of these skills is action research. Through research and program evaluation, effective instructional leaders can be armed with a plethora of information to make informed decisions about increasing learning at their schools.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents the research design; research method; sources of data; population, sample size and sampling techniques; instruments of data collection; pilot testing of the instruments; procedures of data collection, method of data analysis and ethical consideration.

#### **3.1. The Research Design**

In this study, a descriptive survey research design was employed. This design helps gather a huge data related to the problem under the study. It is also effective in that it provides a snapshot of the current behaviors, attitudes and beliefs in a population. According to Zenebe (200), descriptive survey is more appropriate to collect several kinds of data in such a broad size, i.e., it provides adequate information that enables the researcher to suggest with some valuable alternatives. In line with this, Keeves (1990) pointed out that descriptive survey study is a fact finding study with adequate and accurate interpretation of findings. Thus, as has been mentioned, it was used in this study.

#### **3.2. Research Method**

In this study, the research the researcher employed Explanatory Sequential Design (QUAN → Qual). This was because, as it is clearly stated by John W. Creswell (2014), for mixed research method, Although it is a mixed method being used more emphasis is given on aqualitative approach as a dominant method. The reason for making emphasis on qualitative approach is the nature of the study itself. It is a study of small group for it dissected Mizan-Aman town as its subject of the study. Similarly the objectives of the study demand digging much deeper information which is to be generated through tools helping to make detailed analysis. Thus, instead of studying the entire Bench-sheko schools it can be better understood by collecting large amount of qualitative data triangulated with quantitative data .Furthermore, the quantitative approach is employed and incorporated in this study to capture views of teachers and school principals whose size requires quantitative ways of obtaining data, so that it is possible to enhance reliability of the findings.

#### **3.3. Sources of Data**

The data for this research was collected from both primary and secondary sources.

##### **3.3.1 Primary sources**

The primary sources were School principals, teachers, primary school supervisors, students

and members of community committee (PTA, KETB). These groups of respondents were selected, because they could provide, first-hand information, because of their position and responsibilities in the school and experiences in the management.

### **3.3.2 Secondary sources**

These mainly refer to those sources of information that are hosting literature in the form of official reports, organizational archives, published (books, journals, etc.) and unpublished sources, i.e., thesis's, dissertations, etc. thought to contribute in yielding data in varieties of formats. Thus, policy documents, school development packages and training manuals, official rules and regulations, and organizational minutes were consulted so as to substantiate the findings of the study.

## **3.4. Population, sample size and sampling techniques**

### **3.4.1. Population of the study**

This study aims to make an assessment in the existing context of instructional leadership among primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration. It thus encompasses only state owned primary schools. The total population in the study area: 12 government primary schools, 28 primary schools principals, 195 teachers, Department heads 35, 5 education officers, 3 supervisors, 88 department heads, 49 PSTA, 96 KETB members in the study area.

### **3.4.2. Sample size and sampling technique**

The study were focus on the education officers at Mizan-Aman town administration, department heads, supervisors, PTAs, school principals, KETB and stakeholders having varying levels of interesting in primary education matters in government school. Research techniques refer to the behavior and instruments we use in performing research operations such as making observations, recording data, techniques of processing data and the like. Sampling refers to decide to design in the study how many people with which characteristics to include as participants. In order to obtain reliable data for the study, various sampling techniques were employed. After careful identification of the population of the study, both probability and non-probability sampling techniques were utilized. Non-probability sampling techniques that consisted tools like purposive and quota sampling were used to map out units of observation. Here the researcher selected simple-random sampling technique to take samples from the entire population. From 12 primary schools of Mizan-Aman town only 7 (58.3%) primary schools were taken for this study, From the total number of teachers working in the study area 64 (32.8%) teachers were selected by using Quota sampling in this

regard especially there was equal chance of getting participation in the study, the researcher preferred Quota sampling technique from non-probability sampling because of Quota sampling generally happen to be judgment samples rather than random samples. And also quota sampling is more specific with respect to sizes and proportions of subsamples, with subgroups chosen to reflect corresponding proportions in the population. From 3 of supervisors all 3(100%) and From 7 School principals all 7 (100%) were taken as a sample by using availability sampling technique, From 5 of educational officers 2(40%) were taken as a sample by lottery method due to all the education officers have a relatively the same education levels and experience and they know very well about the topic under study. Regarding the department heads 2 for each samples schools a total of 14(40%) were taken as sample for the interview.

### **3.5. Data Collection Instruments (tools)**

In this study, data was collected through by mixed approach using interview from qualitative and questionnaire from quantitative. In addition, the researcher were used relevant reference Books, written documents about instructional leadership, teachers' portfolios, internet, sources and leadership manuals to support the findings of the study.

#### **3.5.1. Questionnaire**

The reason for gathering data through the survey questionnaire is due to huge size of respondents that are expected to deliver data needed for gathering from teachers and school leaders..The researcher was used close ended Questionnaire An estimated 64 (32.8 %) teachers and 7(100%) of sample school of primary school principals respondents were made to respond closed ended questionnaire. The researcher prepared a questionnaire in English first and translated it in to Amharic so as to enhance clarity and avoid ambiguity. The questionnaire composed of three sections. Introductory section, Socio-demographic and issues related to instructional leadership. Collecting data were conducted in the field by trained data collectors, where the researcher played the role of supervisor after making orientation before deploying them into the field. Closed-ended questionnaires can be answered more easily and quickly by respondents (Ary. et al., 2006). So, the researcher was used Close-ended questionnaire that consists of a set of questions presented to a respondent by Likert scale for their response and the questionnaires was prepared in English language and administered to sample teachers and educational leaders with the assumption all samples can as much as can understand to respond.

### **3.5.2. In-depth interview**

In-depth Interview as data collecting instrument is Chosen so as to exhaustively dig valid information on the issue of concern. This technique was performed to capture much deeper insight through a prolonged interview where diverse thought could be generated, thus the key informant interview that helps to recruit respondents capable of delivering holistic information on the issue of interest. The researcher thus interviewed department heads.

The actual setting of the interview was arranged through consent between the researcher and individuals that are recruited for the study. The amount of time for the interview was not pre-specified. It was dependent on the issue under discussion and the peculiar character of the subject of the interview. Respondents of a department heads were allowed to make use of extended time in some circumstances until the purpose of the question is met and the study objectives too. It thus on average took an hour and half. While undertaking the interview the data was taken through note taking. Although the researcher made attempts to keep records in electronic ways, respondents were not happy and shown mistrust to share their thoughts through electronic ways

### **3.5.3. Focus group Discussions (FGD)**

Data obtained through Interviews and the questioner is not expected to be sufficient to ensure validity and reliability. Triangulating findings is vital to better capture accurate figure of the reality in focus. Thus FGD (focus group discussion) is a technique to cross check information and further validate the output of the study. Thus, the researcher selected participants from PTSA and, KETB members, education officers, supervisors of varied levels of responsibility related to instructional leadership in government primary schools. The researcher played the role of facilitator or moderator and took part in each of these sessions in managing the process of discussion.

### **3.5.4. Document Review**

Document analysis is secondary source of information its purpose is it has a relative speed and can be obtained with low cost when we compare with primary source of data. Written documents and records of the overall instructional leadership activities of sampleschools. Instructional leadership plans,portfolio and documents of the instructional leadership practice, written reports on instructional leadership and feed backs were assessed. This documents helped to get more empirical information concerning on practices of instructional leadership as a result it provide a concrete data that helps to made analysis and finally for conclusion.

### **3.6. Pilot testing of the instruments**

The researcher managed to undertake pre-testing of the instruments to ensure the validity and reliability. Checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before the actual study is the core to assure the quality of the data (Yalew, 1998). To ensure validity, the development of the instruments was closely guided by the advisors who critically read and professionally commented. Consequently, the instruments were administered to primary school teachers and principals. On the basis of the feedback obtained, two items were modified and made clear, one item was removed and two more items were added. . Reliability of the instruments was checked by employing Cronbachalpha coefficient.

### **3.7. Procedures of data collection**

Data collecting started with an exploration of secondary sources already produced by zonal administration in particular. Facts and figures gathered by the researcher on the context of instructional leadership undertaken not only from education offices but also from selected schools. After getting acquainted with the general context of the issue in focus, the researcher attempted to systematically develop tools suited to generate data. Following the preparation of tools, pretest was undertaken by the researcher in two selected schools which gave an input needed for modification of items both in content and form, certain items were modified, some omitted and some new were added and got approved by the advisors. Then, data collectors were selected and were given training which was followed by deployment for actual collection of the data under close supervision of the researcher. Initial contact was made with informants and participants of the study and, consequently, actual data collection schedule was prepared and strictly followed throughout. The researcher made maximum effort in setting time and condition that would help collect much detailed data for the study. After having collected the desired data, the researcher carefully coded, analyzed and interpreted as per the research questions.

### **3.8. Method of data analysis**

The researcher used descriptive and inferential statistics. Quantitative data were analyzed using percentage and frequency mean, SD and t-test. Percentage was used to analyze the background information of the respondents whereas the mean and standard deviation were used to as the basis for interpretation of the data as well as to summarize the data in simple and understandable way (Aron et al., 2008). The t- test was used to test statistically

significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups, i.e., teachers and school leaders.  $\alpha=0.05$  level of significance.

The data collected through interview, document review and the FGDs were qualitatively by employing narrations in such a way that it would supplement the data analyzed through quantitatively. The handwritten notes of the interview, document review and FGDs were transcribed, categorized into themes and analyzed.

### **3.9 Ethical Consideration**

Ethical consideration is of very importance in research. Accordingly, the researcher informed the respondents about the purpose of the study i.e., that it was purely for academic purpose. Moreover the researcher explained to the respondents that their responses would be kept confidential and that the respondents remain anonymous so that no one would, in no way, recognize them.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA**

This chapter presents the description of the sample population, analysis and interpretation of the data based on the information obtained through the Interviews, FGD, Document analysis and questionnaires. Thus the data collected both qualitatively and quantitatively were triangulated in order to address the major research questions. It therefore hosts three major sections; exploring challenges, examine structures, and investigating community context in relation to attempts to examine instructional leadership in both private and government primary schools.

#### **4.1 Characteristics of the Respondents**

Under this section, the personal characteristics of the respondents were presented. The following table shows the distribution of the respondents' personal background characteristics of their age, sex, marital status and Educational status. Thus, the data collected on the Characteristics of the respondents were presented in the table below.



Table 4.1 : Demographic Characteristics of the respondents

No	Items	Category	Respondents				Total	
			Teachers		School Principals		No	%
			No	%	No	%		
1	Sex	Male	28	43.75	5	71.42	33	46.47
		Female	36	56.25	2	28.58	38	53.53
		Total	64	100	7	100	71	100
2	Age	23-27	1	1.56	-	-	1	1.41
		28-32	24	37.51	2	28.57	26	36.62
		33-37	32	50	4	57.14	36	50.7
		38-42	6	9.37	1	14.29	7	9.86
		Above 42	1	1.56	0		1	1.41
		Total	64	100	7	100	71	100
3	Experience	1-5 years	6	9.37	1	14.29	7	9.86
		6-10 years	22	34.38	2	28.57	24	33.8
		11-15 years	34	53.12	4	57.14	38	53.52
		16-20 years	2	3.13			2	2.82
		21-25 years						
		26-30 years						
		31 and above						
		Total	64	100	7	100	71	100
4	Level of education	Diploma	43	67.19	3	42.86	46	64.79
		Degree	21	32.81	4	57.14	25	35.21
		MA/MSC Degree						
		Total	64	100	7	100	71	100

As presented on the above table, item 1, 28(43.75%) and 36 (56.25 %) respondents teachers were male and female respectively this shows that more of the teachers in the primary schools were female high in number composition, and 5 (71.42 %) and 2 (28.56 %) of school principals were males and females respectively. All FGD,participants (Woreda Education Officers and Supervisors) were males. Similarly, department heads who participated in interview were males.

As item 2 of the above table shows, 1(1.56%) , 24(37.51%) , 32(50%), 6(9.37%) and 1(1.56%) of the respondent teacher were found to be in the ranges of 23-27, 28-32 years, 33-37 years, 38-42 years and 42 years above respectively. Regarding School principals 2(28.57%) , 4(57.14%) and 1(14.29%) were lie the ages between 28-32 years, 33-37 years and 38-42 years old.

As item 3 of the above table shows of experiences, 6(9.37%), 22(34.38%), 34(53.12%) and 2(3.13%) of the teacher have an experience of between 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16-20 years' experience respectively. Regarding school principals 1(14.29%) , 2(28.57%) and 4(57.14%) of the school principals were have an experience of between 1-5 years, 6-10 years and 11-15 years' experience respectively This shows that majority of respondents were rich in experience.

As item 4 that concerning the educational level of teachers and School principals 43(67.19%) majority of teachers diploma holders and 21 (32.81%) of teachers were degree holders. Regarding school principals 3(42.86%) and 4 (57.14%) of holds degree. From this, one may conclude that majority of the primary school teachers holds diploma whereas majority of school principals had first degree.

#### **4.2 Presentation, analysis and interpretation of the main data**

This part of the study is devoted to the presentation, analysis, and discussion of the data obtained from various groups of respondents in relation to the study on the Practices of Instructional Leadership in Government Primary Schools of Mizan–Aman Town Administration.. Teachers and school principals responded to 24 closed-ended questions. The responded questionnaire papers interpreted in terms of mean scores , t-test and standard deviation. T-test was also computed to test the significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents; standard deviation shows the central tendency of the . Standard deviation calculated to interpret the measure of dispersion of a series and also standard deviation is the most common measure of variability, measuring the spread of the data set and the relationship of the mean to the rest of the data. Item scores for each category were arranged under five rating scales. The range of rating scales were 1-1.49 = strongly disagree, 1.5 – 2.49 =Disagree, 2.5 – 3.49 = undecided, 3.5 – 4.49 = Agree, 4.5 and above = strongly agree. In categorizing the rating scales, the frequency and percentage and mean scores were also calculated for certain responses. As a result, practices of instructional supervisors with a mean value below 2.49 were rated as lower performance in their level of application; mean values from 2.50 to 3.49 rated as moderate performance and mean value from 3.50 to 5.00 were labeled in the category of high performance. Finally, the data obtained from the interview sessions and document analysis presented and analyzed qualitatively to substantiate the data collected through the questionnaires and to validate the findings.

RATING SCALE 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D),  
3= Undecided 4= Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

Table 4.2: The practice of instructional leadership

No	Items	Respondents	No	X	SD	Average SD	Overall X	Df	T-test
1	Leaders Works continuously on evaluating instructional process to check progress of planned activities in school.	Teachers	64	1.97	.844	0.689	2.06	2.02 1	0.206
		School principals	7	2.57	.534				
2	Provides support on preparing Daily lesson plan	Teachers	64	2.13	.930	0.95	2.18	2.02 1	1.127
		School principals	7	2.42	.975				
3	Creates suitable work environment in schools.	Teachers	64	1.94	.826	0.968	2.00	2.02 1	1.07
		School principals	7	2.28	1.11				
4	Contributes to establish a collegial work relationship among teachers in the school.	Teachers	64	2.13	.866	0.933	2.11	2.02 1	1.06
		School principals	7	2.00	1.00				
5	Gives sufficient support for teachers' in classroom teaching-learning process	Teachers	64	2.02	.970	0.86	2.06	2.02 1	0.645
		School principals	7	2.28	.755				
6	Devoted to install a quality instruction system in the school.	Teachers	64	2.19	.888	0.83	2.25	2.02 1	0.532
		School principals	7	2.57	.786				

Here, the range of rating five scales were design, these are 1-1.49 = strongly disagree, 1.5 – 2.49 = Disagree, 2.5 – 3.49 = undecided, 3.5 –4.49 = Agree , 4.5 and above = strongly agree. Mean scores were also calculated for certain responses. A total mean value below 2.49 were rated as lower performance in their level of application; mean values from 2.50 to 3.49 were rated as moderate performance and mean value from 3.50 to 5.00 were labeled in the category of high performance. Here X=Mean, SD= Standard deviation, and significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

As shown in item 1 of table 6, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not Leaders Works continuously on evaluating instructional process to check progress of planned activities in school. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=1.97, SD= .844) disagreed about the issue and school principals with the (X=2.57, SD= .534) were undecided (not sure) about the issue. Both respondents had small Standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.06 shows that the performance was low and the overall standard deviation is 0.689 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform and less dispersion of responses between the two groups. The significance degree of

freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than 0.206 so shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Thus, it can be said that teachers and school principals were not satisfied regarding the practice of evaluating instructional process to check progress of planned activities in school.

With regards to item 2 of table 6, provides support on preparing daily lesson plan. Teachers with the ( $X=2.13$ ,  $SD=.930$ ) were disagree and school principals ( $X=2.42$ .,  $SD= .975$ ) weredisagree . Both respondents had small Standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.18 shows of the majority of respondents with the issue responded low performance and the overall standard deviation is 0.95 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. Therefore based on the majority of teachers and school principals ; on the issue of Provides support on preparing Daily lesson plan . The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $= 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than 1.127. This shows there is no significant statistical difference between the opinions of the two groups.

As the responses to item 3 of table 6 indicate, respondents were asked how instructional leaders createsuitable work environment in schools. Teachers and school principals with the( $X=1.94$ ,  $SD= .826$ ) and ( $X=2.28$ ,  $SD=1.11$ ) respectively were disagree about the issue that Instructional supervision provides support on preparing school improvement plan (SIP) and SD of both respondents were less this shows responses were fairly uniform so that data were less dispersed. The overall mean 2.00 shows the majority of respondents responded that low performance for the issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.968is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than 1.127 so shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. From this, one can say that teachers and school principals instructional leaders were not creatinga suitable work environment in schools..

Regarding Contributes to establish a collegial work relationship among teachers inthe school. On table 6 item 4, teachers and School principals with the ( $X=2.13$ ,  $SD= .866$ ) and ( $X=2.00$ ,  $SD=1.00$ ) respectively were disagree about the issue. The overall mean 2.11 shows the majority of respondents responded that low performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.86is smaller to the mean so this shows responses were fairly uniform and respondents responses were less dispersed. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than 1.06so shows there is no significance difference

between the opinions of the two groups. This, thus, shows that there was less effort in establishing a collegial work relationship in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration.

Regarding item 5 of Table 6, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not school leaders give sufficient support for teachers' in classroom teaching-learning process. Accordingly, Teachers with the ( $X=2.02$ ,  $SD=.970$ ) were disagreed about the issue and School principals with the ( $X=2.28$ ,  $SD=.755$ ) were undecided about the issue. Both respondents had a small Standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.06 shows the majority of respondents responded that low performance for the issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.933 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform and data were less dispersed. The significance degree of freedom  $\alpha = 0.05$  (df) table value 2.021 is greater than 0.645. So, this shows there is no significant statistical difference between the opinions of the two groups.

In the 6<sup>th</sup> item of table 6, respondents were asked to rate a school devoted to install a quality instruction system in the school. For this issue Teachers ( $X=2.19$ ,  $SD=.888$ ) were disagreed and School principals ( $X=2.57$ ,  $SD=.786$ ) confirmed that they were undecided (not sure). Here also both teachers and school educational leaders SD was small this shows responses were fairly uniform and data were less dispersed. The overall mean 2.25 shows majority of respondents responded low performance for the issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.83 is smaller so this shows data were fairly uniform that obtained from respondents. The significance degree of freedom  $\alpha = 0.05$  (df) table value 2.021 is greater than 0.532 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

RATING SCALE 1= Strongly Disagree (SD)2= Disagree (D),  
3= Undecided 4= Agree (A) , 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

Table 4.3: The current practice of instructional leadership

No	Items	Respondents	No	X	SD	Average SD	Overall X	Df	T-test
1	School leaders provide constructive feedbacks when a particular task is accomplished efficiently.	Teachers	64	2.77	.680	0.58	2.76	2.021	0.234
		School principals	7	2.71	.487				
2	provide comments to teachers when there is failure in accomplishing a particular task	Teachers	64	2.91	.840	0.76	2.74	2.021	3.126
		School principals	7	1.85	.690				
3	Enhance co-operative working condition in school.	Teachers	64	3.19	.576	0.53	3.11	2.021	2.059
		School principals	7	2.71	.487				
4	School Leaders support teachers to become successful in their instructional	Teachers	64	2.72	.881	0.916	2.65	2.021	1.184
		School principals	7	2.28	.951				
5	School principals committed on enhancing instructional activities.	Teachers	64	2.66	.894	0.79	2.58	2.021	1.462
		School principals	7	2.14	.690				

Five rating scales, the range of rating scales were 1-1.49 = strongly disagree, 1.5 – 2.49 = Disagree, 2.5–3.49 = undecided, 3.5–4.49 = Agree, 4.5 and above = strongly agree. Mean scores were also calculated for certain responses. As a result, practices of instructional supervisors with a mean value below 2.49 were rated as lower performance in their level of application; mean values from 2.50 to 3.49 rated as moderate performance and mean value from 3.50 to 5.00 were labeled in the category of high performance. X=Mean, SD= Standard deviation, and significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha= 0.05$ .

As shown in item 1 of table 7, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not school leaders provide constructive feedbacks when a particular task is accomplished efficiently. Accordingly, the (X=2.77, SD= .680), the (X=2.71, SD= .487) teachers and school principals respectively undecided (not sure) about the issue. Both respondents had a small Standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall

mean 2.76 this shows that the majority respondent's response falls moderate performance for the issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.58 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than 0.234 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Thus, from the above result, it can be said that the practice of providing feedback to teachers was low.

Regarding item 2 of table 7, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not that provide comments to teachers when there is failure in accomplishing a particular task. Teachers with the ( $X=2.91$ ,  $SD=.840$ ) undecided (not sure) about the issue but school principals with ( $X=1.85$ ,  $SD=.690$ ) strongly disagreed about the issue. Both respondents possessed small standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.74 shows that major respondents response were moderate performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.76 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is less than 3.126 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. Therefore, based on the responses of the majority of respondents, it can be concluded that school leaders did not provide comments to teachers when there is failure in accomplishing a particular task.

As the responses to item 3 of table 7, respondents asked on Enhance co-operative working condition in school. Teachers and school principals with the ( $X=3.19$ ,  $SD=.576$ ) and ( $X=2.71$ ,  $SD=.487$ ) respectively undecided (not sure) about the issue. Both respondents possessed small Standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 3.11 shows the majority of respondents responses were falls moderate performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.916 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is less than 2.059 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups, null hypothesis already rejected. From this, it can be concluded that instructional leaders were weak in enhancing co-operative working condition.

In table 7 of item 4, regarding on school leaders support teachers to become successful in their instructional. Teachers with the ( $X=2.72$ ,  $SD=.881$ ) undecided (not sure) about this issue, and school principals with ( $X=2.28$ ,  $SD=.951$ ) were disagree about the issue. Both respondents possessed small standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.65 shows that respondents response were

falls on moderate performance, and the overall standard deviation is 0.53 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than 1.184 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. This shows that both groups of respondents were not satisfied with the level of support for teachers to be successful in their instructional provision.

Regarding item 5 of table 7, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not School principals committed on enhancing instructional activities. Accordingly, Teachers with the ( $X=2.66$ ,  $SD= .894$ ) undecided (not sure) about the issue and school principals with the ( $X=2.14$ ,  $SD= .690$ ) disagreed about the issue. Both respondents possessed small standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.58 shows the majority of respondents were falls on moderate performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.79 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than 1.462 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. From this, it can be concluded that instructional leaders were somehow committed in enhancing instructional activities.

RATING SCALE 1= Strongly Disagree (SD) , 2= Disagree (D),  
3= Undecided 4= Agree (A) , 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

Table 4.4: The extent to which instructional leadership roles are played

No	Items	Respondents	No	X	SD	Average SD	Over all X	Df	T-test
1	Instructional Leaders play the Interpersonal role in the school	Teachers	64	2.16	.845	0.987	2.23	2.021	1.097
		School principals	7	2.57	1.13				
2	Instructional Leaders play the Leadership role in the school	Teachers	64	2.33	.985	0.94	2.30	2.021	0.474
		School principals	7	2.14	.899				
3	Instructional Leaders play the Decisional making Role in the school	Teachers	64	2.25	.937	0.91	2.34	2.021	1.577
		School principals	7	2.85	.89				
4	Instructional Leaders play the Negotiator role in the school	Teachers	64	2.61	.90	0.69	2.39	2.021	3.752
		School principals	7	1.28	.487				
5	Instructional Leaders play the Conflict (Disturbance) handler role in the school	Teachers	64	2.33	.925	0.80	2.25	2.021	1.288
		School principals	7	1.85	.690				
6	Instructional Leaders play the Monitor role in the school	Teachers	64	2.27	.974	0.83	2.20	2.021	0.699
		School principals	7	1.85	.690				

Five rating scales, the range of rating scales were 1-1.49 = strongly disagree, 1.5-2.49 = Disagree, 2.5 – 3.49 = undecided, 3.5 –4.49 = Agree, 4.5 and above = strongly agree. Mean



scores were also calculated for certain responses. As a result, practices of instructional supervisors with a mean value below 2.49 were rated as lower performance in their level of application; mean values from 2.50 to 3.49 were rated as moderate performance and mean value from 3.50 to 5.00 were labeled in the category of high performance.  $\bar{X}$ =Mean, SD= Standard deviation, and significance degree of freedom at  $\alpha= 0.05$ .

As shown in item 1 of table 8, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not Instructional Leaders play the Interpersonal role in the school. Accordingly, teachers with the ( $\bar{X}$ =2.16, SD= .845) disagreed about the issue and school principals with the ( $\bar{X}$ =2.57, SD= 1.13) were undecided (not sure). The Standard deviation shows that data obtained from teachers (SD=0.845) were fairly uniform and less dispersed, but responses obtained from school educational leaders(SD=1.13) shows there is a little bit data dispersed than teachers. The overall mean 2.23 shows that the responses of the majority respondents were lower performance and the overall standard deviation is 0.987 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 1.097 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Thus, it can be said that Instructional Leadership were not properly discharged by the instructional leaders in primary school of Mizan-Aman Town Administration.

With regards to item 2 of table 8, whether or not instructional leaders play the leadership role in the school. Teachers with the ( $\bar{X}$ =2.33, SD= .98) and school principals ( $\bar{X}$ =2.14., SD= .899) respectively were disagree about this issue. Both respondents possessed small Standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.23 shows that the majority of respondents responses were falls low performance for this issue. and the overall standard deviation is 0.94 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.474 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. Therefore based on the majority of teachers and school principals, it can be concluded that instructional leaders were not in a position to play the instructional leadership role.

Regarding to item 4 of table 8, whether or not instructional leaders play the decisional making role in the school. Teachers responded that with the ( $\bar{X}$ =2.25, SD= .93) were disagree on this issue and school principals ( $\bar{X}$ =2.85, SD=.89) un decided (not sure) about this issue. The standard deviation of the two groups it seems nearly the same and small so this shows

that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.34 shows majority of respondents response falls in to lower performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.91 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 1.577 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. From this one can concluded that instructional leaders were not adequately playing their decisional making role in the schools under the study.

Regard to item 5 of Table 8, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not Instructional Leaders play the Negotiator role in the school. Accordingly, Teachers with the ( $X=2.61$ ,  $SD=.903$ ) undecided (not sure) on the issue and school principals with the ( $X=1.28$ ,  $SD=.487$ ) were strongly disagreed about the issue. Both respondents possessed small standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.39 shows the majority of respondents responses were lower performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.69 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. From this one can generalize that instructional leaders were not conducting organize regular evaluation programs to check the teaching-learning process and outcomes. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is less than calculated value 3.752 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. In the 6<sup>th</sup> item of table 8, respondents asked to rate how Instructional Leaders play the Conflict (Disturbance) handler role in the school. For this issue Teacher ( $X=2.33$ ,  $SD=.925$ ) disagreed and school principals ( $X=1.85$ ,  $SD=.690$ ) confirmed that they strongly disagree on this issue. Both respondents possessed small Standard deviation this shows that the responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.25 shows that majority of the respondents response were lower performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.80 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 1.288 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. From this one can concluded that instructional leaders were not fully discharging their conflict (disturbance) handling role. Regard to item 7 of table 8, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not Instructional Leaders play the Monitor role in the school. Accordingly, Teachers with the ( $X=2.27$ ,  $SD=.974$ ) were disagreed and school principals with the ( $X=1.85$ ,  $SD=.690$ ) were strongly disagreed about the issue. Standard deviation value of both respondents was small. So, this shows that the responses

given from both groups were relatively uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 2.20 shows the majority of respondents were responded lower performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.83 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.699 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. From this one can concluded that not instructional leaders were not fully playing the monitoring role in the school.

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree (SD) 2=Disagree (D) 3=Undecided 4=Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

**Table4.5: strategies to alleviate the problem of Instructional leadership**

No	Items	Respondents	No	X	SD	Average SD	Overall X	Df	T-test
1	Developing shared responsibility regarding the practice of instructional leadership in the school	Teachers	64	3.22	.897	1.2	3.25	2.021	0.494
		School principals	7	3.42	1.51				
2	Creation of awareness for teachers about the importance of instructional leadership	Teachers	64	3.58	.874	0.81	3.60	2.021	0.370
		School principals	7	3.71	.755				
3	Giving capacity building training for instructional leaders	Teachers	64	3.91	.806	0.95	3.88	2.021	0.571
		School principals	7	3.71	1.11				
4	Providing sufficient resources for the proper implementation of instructional leadership .	Teachers	64	3.13	.866	0.77	3.25	2.021	2.062
		School principals	7	3.85	.690				
5	Supporting practices of Instructional leadership in school that it to play a monitoring role to enhance teaching and learning	Teachers	64	3.77	.959	0.82	3.79	2.021	0.208
		School principals	7	3.85	.690				
6	Give limited work load for individuals who assigned to do instructional leadership in the school	Teachers	64	4.19	.624	0.579	4.23	2.021	0.926
		School principals	7	4.42	.534				
7	Provide support for leaders to enhance their decision making role in the school	Teachers	64	3.75	.967	1.058	3.79	2.021	0.607
		School principals	7	4.00	1.15				

Five rating scales, the range of rating scales were 1-1.49 = strongly disagree, 1.5 – 2.49 = Disagree, 2.5 – 3.49 = undecided, 3.5 –4.4 = Agree, 4.5 and above = strongly agree. Mean scores were also calculated for certain responses. As a result, practices of instructional supervisors with a mean value below 2.49 rated as lower performance in their level of application; mean values from 2.50 to 3.49 were rated as moderate performance and mean value from 3.50 to 5.00 were labeled in the category of high performance. X=Mean, SD= Standard deviation, and significance degree of freedom at  $\alpha= 0.05$ .

As shown in item 1 of table 9, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not Developing shared responsibility regarding the practice of instructional leadership in the school. Accordingly, teachers and school principals with the ( $X=3.22$ ,  $SD= 0.89$ ) and ( $X=3.42$ ,  $SD= 1.51$ ) both were undecided on this issue. The standard deviation tells us responses obtained from teachers were more or less dispersed and fairly uniform when we compared with response from school educational leaders. The overall mean 3.37 shows that majority respondents responses were falls moderate performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 1.2 is smaller this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.494 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. Thus, it is possible to say that the respondents are in support of the very idea of the development shared responsibility to enhance the practice of instructional leadership.

Item 2 of table 9 relates to the creation of awareness for teachers about the importance of instructional leadership. Accordingly, teachers and school principals with the ( $X= 3.58$ ,  $SD= .874$ ) and ( $X= 3.71$ ,  $SD= .755$ ) respectively both were agree with this issue. The standard deviation of the two groups the result value is nearly the same and small this shows that obtained responses fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 3.60 shows the majority of respondents were responded that high performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.81is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.370 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected.

As responses to item 3 of table 9 indicate, Giving capacity building training for instructional leaders. Teachers and school principals with the ( $X=3.91$ ,  $SD= .806$ ) and ( $X=3.71$ ,  $SD=1.11$ ) both were agree about the issue. The standard deviation implies that responses obtained from teachers were seems to be fairly uniform and less dispersed than responses obtained from school educational leaders. The overall mean 3.88 shows the majority of respondents responded that high performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.958is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.571so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. Therefore, based responses of the majority of

respondents, the provision of capacity building trainings for instructional leaders can be a possible strategy to improve the practice of instructional leadership. .

With Item 4 of Table 9, i.e., regarding provision of sufficient resources for the proper implementation of instructional leadership, teachers with ( $X=3.13$ ,  $SD=.806$ ) shows that respondents were disagree on the issue but school principals with the ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=.690$ ) were agree about the issue. The standard deviation is small so it tells the data obtained from both groups were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 3.25 shows that majority of the respondents responses were falls moderate performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.778 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform responses were less dispersed. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is less than calculated value 2.062 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. From this, it can be concluded that the provision of sufficient resources for the proper implementation of instructional leadership can be a possible strategy to improve the practice of instructional leadership.

Regard to item 5 of table 9, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not Supporting practices of Instructional leadership in school that it to play a monitoring role to enhance teaching and learning. Accordingly, Teachers and school principals with the ( $X=3.77$ ,  $SD=.959$ ) and ( $X=3.85$ ,  $SD=.690$ ) respectively were agree about the issue. The standard deviation of both respondents small in value and relatively in the same range so this shows that responses collected were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 3.79 shows that the majority of respondents responses were falls on high performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.82 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.208 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. From this, it can be said that instructional leaders properly play a monitoring role can enhance the practice of instructional leadership. .

In item 6 of table 9, respondents asked to rate give limited work load for people who assigned to do instructional supervision can be a possible strategy to improve the practice of instructional supervision. Teachers and school principals with the ( $X=4.19$ ,  $SD=.624$ ) and ( $X=4.42$ ,  $SD=.534$ ) respectively both groups were confirmed agree with this issue. And the standard deviation of the two groups shows that the value are nearly similar and small so

responses obtained from those groups were fairly uniform and less dispersed. The overall mean 4.23 shows that majority (most) of respondents responded that high performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 0.579 is smaller this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.926 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups and null hypothesis already rejected. From this, it can be said that continuous and close supervision could be a strategy to improve the practice of instructional leadership.

Regarding to the last item of table 9, respondents asked to rate their agreement levels whether or not Provide support for leaders to enhance their decision making role in the school. Accordingly, Teachers and school principals with ( $X = 3.75$ ,  $SD = .967$ ) and ( $X = 4.00$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ) respectively both groups confirmed agree with this issue. The standard deviation of teachers were somehow small when we compared with school educational leaders but both were small values from this the uniformity and dispersion of responses of teachers were less dispersed than that of school educational leaders. The overall mean 3.79 shows that majority of respondents responses were falls high performance for this issue and the overall standard deviation is 1.058 is smaller so this shows responses were fairly uniform. The significance degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha = 0.05$  table value 2.021 is greater than calculated value 0.607 so this shows there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups., So, this shows that provide support for instructional leaders to properly play their decision making role in the school can be a possible strategy for the appropriate implementation of instructional supervision.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The major purpose of this study was to assess the practices of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman administration and to enhance the instructional leadership activities. With this regard, this part deals with the summary findings, the conclusions reached and the recommendations forwarded on the basis of findings.

#### 5.1. Summary of the major findings

The findings reported in chapter four summarized along the following themes that to reflect the research questions. The study tried to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What is the current practice of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman town Administration? Is there an adequate awareness about instructional leadership? What standard documents are available to help guide as well as increase awareness?
2. To what extent is instructional leadership institutionalized and practiced so as to improve delivery of quality instruction in Mizan-Aman town administration?
3. To what extent do school leaders play their instructional leadership role to improve the teaching and learning process in Mizan-Aman town administration?
4. What challenges do instructional leaders face in discharging their instructional leadership roles in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration?
5. What possible strategies could help to alleviate the problems encountered in practicing instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration?

To this effect, the study was conducted in SNNPR, Bench-Sheko Zone, Mizan-Aman administration in Government Primary Schools. Accordingly, 64 teachers and 7 school principals samples were selected to respond questionnaires, 3 cluster supervisors and 2 Woreda educational officers selected for FGD and 14 department heads selected for interview. Questionnaire was the main data gathering tool. An interview, FGD and document analysis, conducted to substantiate the quantitative data. The quantitative data collected by using questionnaire were analyzed and interpreted by using mean scores, T-test and standard deviation. The homogeneity of the response was checked by comparing mean scores of the two groups of respondents. The qualitative data collected through interview was

analyzed qualitatively by narration in line with quantitative data. Finally, conducted FGD and documents analyzed to support the data collected through questionnaire and interview. Based on the analysis of data, the researcher came up with the following findings:

1. Based on the analysis of the data, it was found that the practice of instructional leadership in such areas as, for instance, the continuity of the instructional process so as to check the progress of planned activities, provision of support in preparing daily lesson plans, creation of a suitable work environment in schools, building of a collegial work relationship among teachers was weak. Contrary to this, the study revealed that instructional leaders visit classrooms and provide support for teachers and that they were also, to the extent possible, devoted to ensure the instruction is of quality.
2. It was identified that school leaders were not in a position to properly play such instructional leadership roles as decision making, conflict or disturbance handling, monitoring or negotiator roles in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration to improve teaching and learning process. That is, instructional leadership was found not to be properly practised and fully implemented in this regard.”
3. The results of the study indicated that poor motivation, lack of the necessary instructional leadership skill, low awareness and weak readiness were among the major challenges in primary schools of Mizan Aman Town Administration with clear negative implication on the practice of instructional leadership.
4. It was also found that sharing responsibility, creation of awareness the importance of instructional leadership, periodic capacity building training for instructional leaders, provision of adequate resources for the proper implementation of instructional leadership, provision of continuous and close supervisory support for instructional leaders were possible strategies to address the problems and improve the practice of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan Aman Town Administration



## 5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings, it was concluded that instructional leadership is poorly practised in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration.

1. There is a gap that School leaders implementation instructional leadership in the school.” From this point school principals not fully implement instructional leadership practice in the school.
2. The current instructional leadership practice, despite poor performance, can enhance co-operative working condition and schools are somehow ready to implement instructional leadership.
3. The practice of instructional leadership is entangled with different kinds of challenges like failure to provide prompt constructive feedback, lack of support and many others.
4. Creation of awareness, sharing of responsibility, providing sufficient resources, capacity building, continuous and close supervisory support for instructional leaders are among strategies to use to improve the practice of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan Aman Town Administration

### **5.3. Recommendations**

In view of the findings and the conclusion reached the researcher forwarded the recommendations:

1. In order to improve awareness related problems, it is recommended that Mizan-Aman Town Administration Education Office, Bench-sheko zone educational Department and SNNPRS Education Bureau in collaboration with schools and other voluntary organizations create awareness through workshop, short term training trainings, seminars, etc. on basic activities and principles of instructional leadership for instructional leaders.
2. It is also recommended that members of the school leadership in collaboration with Mizan-Aman Town Administration Education Office, Bench-sheko zone educational Department and SNNPRS Education Bureau work on and generate adequate resources for the proper implementation of instructional leadership.
3. It is advisable that school Mizan-Aman Town Administration Education Office, Bench-sheko zone Education Department and SNNPRS Education Bureau provide motivational incentives for instructional leaders. It is also good to arrange experience sharing visits to schools that are believed to somehow perform better in different parts the area.
4. The researcher also advises Mizan-Aman Town Administration Education Office, Bench-sheko zone Educational Department and the schools' governing bodies to arrange capacity building trainings to instructional leaders of the primary schools of MizanAman Town Administration.
5. Finally, to better address the problems, it is advisable that further studies be conducted in the study area regard the practices of instructional leadership regardless of the level.

## REFERENCES

- AbdurahimK, (2016). *Instructional Leadership Practices in Secondary Schools of Assosa Zone*. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Review .Vol 4, 7, 2016
- Assefa ,B (2014) . *The practices and challenges of instructional Supervision in Asossa zone primary schools* .MA Thesis. Jimma.Jimma University.
- AtinafuT , (2014) . *Instructional leadership practices and challenges in government primary schools* .MA Thesis. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University .
- Bedard M-J (2005). *Instructional leadership: The principal's knowledge and skills*. MA Thesis .Canada: Royal Roads University.
- Blasé J, Blasé J (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful principals promote teaching and learning (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Blase, J.&Blase, J. (2001) .*Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools*. Journal of Educational Administration, 38(2), 130-141
- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999).*Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teacher Development: Teachers' Perspectives*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 35 (3), 349–378.doi: 10.1177/0013161X99353003
- Boatman, L.& Richard, B. (2011). *Time for a Leadership Revolution.Global Leadership Forecast*. Washington. DDI's Inc.
- Creswell and John.W, 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approach: Third Edition*. Singapore: SAGE Publication
- Creswell et al.2011. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research 2nd Edition*. America: SAGE.
- Creswell, R.,2006.*Handbook of Research Methodologies* .NewYork: Oxford University Press
- Crum, K. S. & Sherman, W. H. (2008).*Facilitating High Achievement: High School Principals "Reflections on their Successful Leadership Practices*.*Journal of Educational Administration*. 46(5), 562-580.
- Firmaningsih-Kolu, Y (2015).*The Role of the Principal's Instructional Leadership at Schools in Indonesia* .MA Thesis. Indonesia: University of Jyväskylä
- Ghavifekr,S et al (2013 ) . *Factors affecting strategic instructional leadership practices of school principals: teachers' perception*. Malaysia. University of Malaya

- Glanz J (2006). *What every principal should know about instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1987). *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 24-30.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33, 329-351.
- Hallinger, P. (2016). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 1-20.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Leadership for learning: Does collaborative leadership make a difference in school improvement? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 38, 654-678.
- Halverson, R., Grigg, J., Prichett, R. & Thomas, C. (2007). *The new instructional leadership: creating data-driven instructional systems in school*. Journal of School Leadership (17), 162-163.
- Harris A. (2005). *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46 (2), 172 - 188.
- Harrison, L. (2010). *Leaders Developing Leaders: Capitalizing on the Demographic Gift to Revive Your Leadership Development Program*. Washington, D.C. HCI.
- Hopkins, D. (2005). *Instructional Leadership and School Improvement*. London: Routledge Falmer
- Jay, A (2014). *The principals' leadership styles and teachers' performance in general secondary schools of Gambella regional state*. Jimma :Jimma University.
- Legesse, D (2018). *Principals' Instructional Leadership Performance in Hawassa City Administration Secondary Schools*. Hawassa. Hawassa University.
- Leithwood, K. R. C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia. Philadelphia University.
- Lunenberg, F.C. & Ornstein, A.C. (1991). *Educational Administration Concepts and Practices*. Belmont, C.A.: Wadworth.
- McEwan, K. (2003). *Seven Steps in Effective Instructional Leadership*. USA: Crown Press.
- MoE. (1994). *the education and training policy of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Mulford, B. (2003). *School leaders: Changing roles and impact on teacher and school effectiveness*. Education and Training Policy Division, OECD.

- Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. C. (2007). *Leadership for learning: A research based model and taxonomy of behaviors*. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 27(2), 179-201.
- O'leary, Z. (2004). *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London: SAGE
- Rugg, G. and Peter, M., (2007). *A Gentle Guide to Research Methods*. England: McGraw Open University Press
- Suparman, M. A. (2012). *Design Instructional Model*. Jakarta: Erlang, p. 7, 24-32.2.
- Tafere, M (2014). *Perceptions about instructional leadership: The perspectives of a principal and teachers of Birakat Primary School*. Bahir Dar. Bahir Dar University.
- TGE. (1994). *Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia: Educational Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: St. Printing press.
- Weber, J. R. (1987). *Instructional leadership: A composite working model*. Temple University. Longman.
- Wende, M (2015). *The role of school principals as instructional leader. The case of Shambu primary school*. MA Thesis. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A Interview Guide

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Interview guide for principals Department Heads

Dear Sir /Madam:

The purpose of this interview is to collect the primary and relevant information for the study on the practice of instructional leadership in government schools of Mizan–Aman town administration. Since the success of this study entirely depends up on your genuine response, the researcher would like to express his appreciation for your frankness and sincerity. The information obtained will undoubtedly be used only for academic purposes. Your response will be kept confidential.

Thank you in advance

Part I: Background information

1. Name of School\_\_\_\_\_
2. Sex\_\_\_\_\_
3. Age (*in years*).\_\_\_\_\_
4. Marital status\_\_\_\_\_
5. Academic status \_\_\_\_\_

II: Interview guide questions

1. Do school principals have the necessary academic background to implement an instructional leadership?
2. Do school leaders practice instructional leadership to improve delivery of quality instruction in the study area?
3. Do school leaders play the required instructional leadership role to improve the teaching and learning process in the study area.
4. What are the challenges reported to have manifested in attempting to implement instructional leadership?
5. What are the possible strategies of to alleviate the problem of implementing instructional leadership?

## **APPENDIX B Focus Group Discussion Guide**

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL

SCIENCE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

FOR SUPERVISORS AND EDUCATIONAL OFFICERS

### Questions (Agenda) for Focus Group Discussion Guide

1. What do you know about instructional leadership?
2. How do you compare the changes and challenges in implementing instructional leadership in both private and government primary schools?
3. Do you think that Instructional leadership is effectively practiced in both private and government primary schools? How do you evaluate the actions?
4. Do types of ownership affect the way schools are administered or leadership choices are pursued?
5. Do the beneficiary communities manifest similar concern for all forms of ownership?
6. Do you think that the level and quality of support that educational authorities provide remain similar or fair regarding the difference in mode of ownership?
7. What solutions you may suggest to improve the problems of Implementing Instructional leadership in both private and government primary schools?

## **APPENDIX C Document Analysis**

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL

SCIENCE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

### Document Analysis CHECK LIST

Name of school \_\_\_\_\_

1. Existence of minute meeting agenda regarding instructional leadership.
2. Training materials given related with instructional leadership.
3. Reports disseminated regarding instructional leadership.



## **APPENDIX D Questionnaire**

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL

SCIENCE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaires to be completed by Teachers and school principals.

Dear respondents:

This questionnaire is prepared for the purpose of conducting a study on the practice of instructional leadership in government primary schools in Mizan–Aman town administration. To achieve the purpose, your cooperation in completing these questionnaires highly appreciated and valuable. The success of this study highly depends on your honest and sincere responses to the question. The data collected from individual respondents will be kept confidential and, whenever needed, will be reported in aggregate. You are, therefore, kindly requested to provide the required information.

Please note the following points before you start filling the questionnaires:

1. You do not need write your name on the questionnaires;
2. Read all the instructions before attempting to answer the questions;
3. There is no need to consult others to fill the questionnaires;
4. Please provide appropriate response by using a tick mark “√” or “X” to choose one of the suggested rating scales.
5. Please do not leave the question without giving your answer.

Thank you for your cooperation!

**SECTION ONE:** General information and personal data

**DIRECTIONS:** -Indicate your response by using "√" or "X" in the box provided.

1.1 Name of the school -----

1.2 Sex Male  Female

1.3 Age 18-22  23-27  28-32  33-37  38-42  Above 42

1.4. Work experience: - 1-5 years  6-10 years  11-15 years  16-20 years

21-25 years  26-30 years  31 and above years

1.5. Level of Education:- Diploma  First degree  MA/MSc degree

**SECTION TWO:** School leaders practiced instructional leadership to improve delivery of quality instruction in the study area.

**DIRECTION:** Indicate your responses for the following Likert Scale items using "√" or "X" mark in the box corresponding to each item (question).

**RATING SCALE** 1= Strongly Disagree (SD) ,2= Disagree (D) 3= Undecided 4= Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

No	Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Works continuously on evaluating instructional process to check progress of planned activities in school.					
2	Provides support on preparing Daily lesson plan					
3	Creates a suitable work environment in schools.					
4	Contributes to establish a collegial work relationship among teachers in the school.					
5	Gives sufficient support for teachers' in classroom teaching-learning process					
6	Devoted to install a quality instruction system in the school.					

**SECTION THREE:** The current practice of instructional leadership in primary schools of Mizan-Aman Town Administration.

**DIRECTION:** Indicate your responses for the following Likert Scale items using "√" or "X" mark in the box corresponding to an action (question).

**RATING SCALE** 1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3=Undecided 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

No	Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1	school provide constructive feedbacks when a particular task is accomplished in efficient manner					
2	provide comments to teachers when there is failure in accomplishing a particular task					
3	Enhance co-operative working condition in school.					
4	School Leaders support teachers to become successful in their instructional					
5	School principals committed on enhancing instructional activities.					

SECTION FOUR: School leaders play the required instructional leadership role to improve the teaching and learning process in the study area

DIRECTION: Indicate your responses for the following Likert Scale items using "√" or "X" mark in the box corresponding to an action (question).

RATING SCALE 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Undecided 4= Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

No	Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Instructional Leaders play the Interpersonal role in the school					
2	Instructional Leaders play the Leadership role in the school					
3	Instructional Leaders play the Liaison role in the school					
4	Instructional Leaders play the Decisional making Role in the school					
5	Instructional Leaders play the Negotiator role in the school					
6	Instructional Leaders play the Conflict (Disturbance) handler role in the school					
7	Instructional Leaders play the Monitor role in the school					

**SECTION FIVE:** The possible strategies to alleviate the problem of the Practices of Instructional leadership in the study area

**DIRECTION:** Indicate your responses for the following Likert Scale items using "√" or "X" mark in the box corresponding to an action (question).

**RATING SCALE** 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Undecided (U) 4= Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA)

No	Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Developing shared responsibility regarding the practice of instructional leadership in the school					
	Creation of awareness for teachers about the importance of instructional leadership					
2	Giving capacity building training for instructional leaders					
3	Providing sufficient resources for the proper implementation of instructional leadership					
4	Supporting practices of Instructional leadership in school that it to play a monitoring role to enhance teaching and learning					
5	Give limited work load for individuals who assigned to do instructional leadership in the school					
6	Provide support for leaders to enhance their decision making role in the school					